

Leadership Styles and Communication Strategies of School Heads: Its Influence on the Performance of Teachers

Levi G. Silerio¹, Fausto C. Romero Jr²

¹Instructor I, College of Arts and Sciences, Central Bicol State University-Calabanga Campus

²Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Naga College Foundation, Inc., Naga City, Camarines Sur, Philippines

Abstract

The study investigated the impact of school heads' leadership styles and communication strategies on the teaching performance of secondary school teachers in the Division of Naga City during the 2024–2025 school year. Employing a descriptive-comparative-correlational design, the research involved 108 respondents comprising school heads and teachers. Data were analyzed using Mean, Standard Deviation, ANOVA, Tukey's HSD, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, and Coefficient of Determination. Results revealed that contingent and democratic leadership styles were most frequently practiced, while authoritarian leadership was least exhibited. Non-verbal communication ranked as the most utilized communication strategy, followed by clear and direct communication. Teachers rated themselves highest in instructional delivery and student engagement. ANOVA results indicated significant differences across leadership and communication dimensions ($p < 0.05$). Correlational analysis showed a weak but significant relationship between leadership style and teaching performance ($r = 0.24$, $p = 0.015$) and a stronger correlation between communication strategy and teaching performance ($r = 0.38$, $p = 0.000$). Determination coefficients indicated that leadership and communication collectively exert limited but meaningful influence on teacher performance. The study concludes that school heads predominantly apply adaptive and participatory leadership and emphasize non-verbal communication to enhance rapport. However, leadership styles exert only a minimal impact on teaching performance, whereas communication strategies demonstrate a relatively greater, though still weak, influence. An intervention program is recommended to strengthen leadership and communication practices for improved instructional outcomes.

Keywords: Educational Leadership, Communication Strategies, Teaching Performance, Descriptive-Correlational Design

Introduction

The quality of education systems worldwide is strongly linked to the effectiveness of school leadership and teachers' professional performance. Over the past decades, research in educational leadership has consistently emphasized the central role of school leaders in shaping school culture, guiding instructional practices, and fostering professional collaboration. Empirical evidence demonstrates that leadership practices significantly influence teachers' motivation, instructional effectiveness, and

commitment to school improvement initiatives (Leithwood et al., 2020). Effective leadership cultivates supportive and empowering environments that enhance teaching quality and, consequently, student learning outcomes.

Globally, education systems are undergoing rapid transformation driven by technological advancements, evolving pedagogies, and increasing accountability demands. These changes underscore the need for competent school leaders capable of managing institutional complexities and facilitating continuous teacher development. The importance of leadership in achieving quality education is reflected in Sustainable Development Goal 4 and reinforced by reports from UNESCO and the OECD, which identify school leadership as a key determinant of teaching quality and student achievement, second only to classroom instruction.

Leadership style is a critical factor influencing teacher performance and organizational effectiveness. Prominent models include transformational, instructional, democratic, and transactional leadership. Transformational leadership promotes innovation, empowerment, and professional growth; instructional leadership prioritizes teaching quality and student outcomes; democratic leadership emphasizes participatory decision-making; and transactional leadership focuses on structured supervision and performance monitoring (Bush et al., 2022; Hallinger, 2019). However, evidence suggests that leadership effectiveness is context-dependent and often mediated by factors such as organizational culture, professional development opportunities, and collaboration (Fan & Nuruly, 2024).

In the Philippine context, improving educational quality remains a national priority. Policy frameworks such as the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020) highlight the critical role of leadership in supporting teacher development and ensuring quality learning. Complementary reforms, including the establishment of the National Educators Academy of the Philippines and legislative measures such as Republic Act No. 7784 and Republic Act No. 10533, further reinforce the need to strengthen leadership capacity and teacher competence (DepEd, 2020; Sagun, 2025). Despite these initiatives, challenges persist, including the multifaceted roles of school heads and variability in leadership and communication practices, which affect teacher support and performance.

Empirical studies consistently affirm the positive relationship between leadership and teacher outcomes. Transformational leadership, for instance, enhances motivation, job satisfaction, and instructional quality by fostering collaboration and professional growth (Kaya, 2024; Badato, 2020). Similarly, leadership practices that emphasize support and open communication significantly improve teacher commitment and productivity (Utami et al., 2024; Irwanto & Maria, 2025). Contemporary scholarship further highlights a shift from administrative to instructional leadership, emphasizing teaching and learning improvement as the core function of school leaders (Moafia Nader et al., 2019; Suh, 2024).

Educational leadership has evolved from hierarchical, control-oriented models to more participatory and adaptive approaches. Transformational leadership emphasizes vision, motivation, and capacity-building (Asbari et al., 2020; Daramola, 2025), while instructional leadership focuses on pedagogical guidance, mentoring, and data-driven decision-making (Avidov-Ungar et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2019). Contingent leadership underscores the need for adaptability based on contextual demands (Ocampo & Chua, 2023; Tansiongco & Ibarra, 2020), whereas authoritarian and transactional styles, though sometimes effective in structured or crisis situations, may limit teacher autonomy and innovation when overused (Gandolfi & Stone, 2017; Renita et al., 2026). In contrast, democratic leadership promotes shared governance, teacher empowerment, and organizational commitment (Hoque & Raya, 2023; Celestino, 2021).

Collectively, these perspectives suggest that effective leadership requires an integrative and context-responsive approach rather than reliance on a single style.

Complementing leadership, communication is a fundamental mechanism through which leadership influence is enacted. Effective communication—characterized by clarity, transparency, and empathy—strengthens trust, collaboration, and engagement among teachers (Ounis, 2016; Rave et al., 2023). Communication competence includes not only clear articulation but also active listening, emotional intelligence, and responsiveness to contextual and cultural dynamics (Manafa, 2018; Lin, 2023). Empathetic communication, in particular, enhances relational trust, teacher well-being, and organizational commitment (Holley, 2020; Jin & Ikeda, 2024; Nakamura & Milner, 2023).

Moreover, open and transparent communication practices foster shared understanding, reduce ambiguity, and strengthen organizational trust and teacher engagement (Neiroukh et al., 2024; Ahmed & Basu, 2020). Positive reinforcement strategies, including recognition and constructive feedback, further enhance teacher motivation and performance (Morales, 2022; Voelkel et al., 2024). Non-verbal communication also plays a critical role, reinforcing message clarity and leader credibility (Bambaeeroo & Shokrpour, 2017; Norris & Walker, 2020). Together, these communication strategies shape school climate and significantly influence teachers' professional practices.

Teacher performance, as a central determinant of student outcomes, encompasses instructional delivery, classroom management, student engagement, assessment, and professional reflection (Christie & Lingard, 2020; Elpisah et al., 2019). Effective instructional delivery depends on pedagogical competence and subject mastery, enabling teachers to design engaging and meaningful learning experiences (Zhang & Li, 2025; Anorue et al., 2023). Classroom management, student engagement strategies, and inclusive teaching practices further contribute to improved learning outcomes (Alsaiani et al., 2024; Cambay & Paglinawan, 2024). Additionally, assessment literacy and reflective practice support continuous professional growth and instructional improvement (Yan & Pastore, 2022; Cirocki et al., 2024).

However, the relationship between leadership, communication, and teacher performance is influenced by contextual factors such as organizational culture, school size, and resource availability. Positive organizational cultures enhance collaboration and trust, strengthening leadership impact (Şenol & Lesinger, 2018; Rivai et al., 2024). School size affects communication patterns and leadership accessibility, while resource availability determines the extent to which leaders can support instructional practices (Esogon & Gumban, 2024; Aguinaldo & Tagadiad, 2024). These factors highlight the need for context-sensitive leadership strategies.

Despite extensive research on leadership, communication, and teacher performance as separate domains, limited studies have examined their integrated effects, particularly within the Philippine context. Existing literature has largely focused on leadership typologies (Park & Seo, 2019; Kotamena et al., 2020) or communication competencies (Akinwale & Okotoni, 2018; Holley, 2020), with insufficient attention to how these dimensions interact to influence teacher performance. This gap underscores the need for more comprehensive investigations that examine the combined impact of leadership styles and communication strategies on teacher outcomes.

Although numerous studies have examined leadership styles and teacher performance, there remains limited empirical research that explores the combined influence of leadership styles and communication strategies on teacher performance within local contexts such as Naga City and the Bicol Region. Most existing studies focus on leadership styles or communication practices independently, leaving a gap in understanding how these variables interact to influence teaching performance.

Therefore, this study seeks to examine the leadership styles and communication strategies of school heads and their influence on the performance of teachers in secondary schools in Naga City. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the body of knowledge in educational leadership and provide evidence-based insights for improving leadership practices, communication strategies, and teacher performance within the Philippine education system.

Research Objectives

The study determined the influence of school heads' leadership styles and communication strategies on the teaching performance of secondary school teachers in the Division of Naga City. More specifically, this study attained the following objectives: (1) Leadership style of the School Heads in the Division of Naga City, along Instructional Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Contingent Leadership, Authoritarian Leadership, Democratic Leadership, and Transactional Leadership; (2) the level of communication strategy of school heads in the Division of Naga City in terms of Empathetic Communication, Clear and Direct Communication, Positive Reinforcement, Open and Transparent Communication, and Non-verbal Communication; (3) the level of teaching performance of secondary school teachers along Instructional Delivery, Classroom Management, Student Engagement and Support, Assessment and Evaluation, and Professionalism and Reflection; (4) the significant difference between leadership styles, communication strategies, and teaching performance of teachers among schools and among aspects; (5) the significant relationship between school heads' leadership styles and the teaching performance of teachers, as well as their communication strategies and teaching effectiveness; (6) the extent of influence of school head leadership styles on the teaching performance of teachers, communication strategies, and teaching performance; (7) intervention program to be crafted to improve the leadership styles, communication strategies, and teaching performance of teachers.

METHODOLOGY

The study utilized a descriptive-correlational design. The descriptive method was applied because it allowed for a detailed and systematic description of the characteristics and conditions of the population without manipulating variables, providing a clear snapshot of the phenomena being studied (Cabigao, 2019). The descriptive method was utilized to identify the leadership styles and communication strategies of school heads, as well as the performance of the teachers.

The correlational method was employed because it enabled the identification and quantification of relationships among variables, indicating how changes in one variable corresponded to changes in another without implying causation (Alimahan & Ubayubay, 2025). The correlational design was used to determine the relationship between school heads' leadership styles and teaching performance of teachers, communication strategies, and teaching performance of teachers. In addition, a correlational design is also used to determine the extent to which school head leadership style influences the teaching performance of teachers, communication strategies, and teaching performance of teachers. Using the coefficient of determination (r^2), which was derived from the computed correlation values, to show how much the teaching performance of teachers was influenced by the variables. The r^2 value provided a statistical representation of the proportion of variance in teaching performance of teachers explained by the independent variables, thereby illustrating the strength of their combined predictive power (Mey et al., 2021).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Leadership Styles of the Secondary School Heads

Table 1 shows that among the leadership styles of the secondary school heads, contingent leadership has the highest average weighted mean of 3.42 or Always, followed by Democratic Leadership with an average weighted mean of 3.41 or Always, Instructional Leadership with an average weighted mean of 3.38 or Always, Transformational Leadership with an average weighted mean of 3.34 or Always, Transactional Leadership with an average weighted mean of 3.15 or occasionally, and Authoritarian Leadership with an average weighted mean of 2.17 or Rarely. The leadership style of secondary school heads has an overall weighted mean of 3.145, or occasionally

The findings indicate that school heads predominantly practice adaptive and participatory leadership styles, with contingent and democratic leadership emerging as the most prevalent. The dominance of contingent leadership underscores the significance of situational adaptability, as leadership effectiveness depends on aligning strategies with contextual demands, teacher readiness, and task requirements, thereby enabling school heads to respond effectively to dynamic school environments. The high ranking of democratic leadership further emphasizes collaboration and shared decision-making, which enhance teacher engagement, organizational commitment, and a positive school climate (Knight, 2024; Park &

Table 1
Summary of Leadership Style of the School Heads

Aspects	AWM	Int.
Instructional Leadership	3.38	Always
Transformational Leadership	3.34	Always
Contingent Leadership	3.42	Always
Authoritarian Leadership	2.17	Rarely
Democratic Leadership	3.41	Always
Transactional Leadership	3.15	Occasionally
Overall AWM:	3.15	Occasionally

Seo, 2019). Instructional leadership, ranked third, reflects a continued focus on curriculum implementation, teaching quality, and professional development, consistent with studies linking it to improved teaching effectiveness and student outcomes. Transformational leadership, although present, ranked fourth, suggesting that while inspirational and visionary practices contribute to motivation and professional growth, they are less dominant compared to adaptive and participatory approaches (Daramola, 2025; Asbari et al., 2020). Transactional leadership, ranked fifth, plays a supplementary role through structured supervision and accountability mechanisms, indicating that extrinsic rewards are not the primary drivers of teacher performance (Cheng & Zhu, 2025). Authoritarian leadership ranked lowest, reflecting minimal reliance on rigid, hierarchical control and aligning with contemporary perspectives that associate such approaches with reduced teacher autonomy and engagement (Ahmad et al., 2022). Overall, the results depict a leadership profile characterized by flexibility, collaboration, and instructional focus, strongly supporting Contingency Theory while partially aligning with Transformational Leadership Theory, and diverging from studies emphasizing transactional and authoritarian approaches, thereby reinforcing the shift toward context-responsive, empowering, and collaborative leadership practices in modern educational settings.

Communication Strategies of Secondary School Heads

Table 2 shows the communication strategies of the secondary school heads. Non-Verbal Communication has the highest average weighted mean of 3.46 or Always, followed by Clear and Direct Communication with an average weighted mean of 3.43 or Always, Open and Transparent Communication with an average weighted mean of 3.39 or Always, Empathetic Communication with an average weighted mean of 3.326 or Always, and Positive Reinforcement with an average weighted mean of 3.317 or occasionally. The communication strategy of secondary school heads has an overall weighted mean of 3.385, or always.

Table 2
Summary of the Communication Strategy of School Heads

Aspects	AWM	Int.	Rank
Empathetic Communication	3.33	Always	4
Clear and Direct Communication	3.43	Always	2
Positive Reinforcement	3.32	Always	5
Open and Transparent Communication	3.39	Always	3
Non-Verbal Communication	3.46	Always	1
Overall AWM:	3.39	Always	

The findings reveal that school heads employ a multidimensional set of communication strategies, with non-verbal communication emerging as the most prominent, followed by clear and direct communication and open and transparent communication. The dominance of non-verbal cues—such as gestures, eye contact, tone, and body language—highlights their critical role in reinforcing verbal messages and building relational trust, consistent with Communication Accommodation Theory, which posits that effective communication depends on adapting behaviors to meet the informational and emotional needs of others. The high ranking of clarity further indicates that teachers value structured, explicit communication that minimizes ambiguity and enhances role understanding, while transparency strengthens trust and accountability within the school (Bucata & Rizescu, 2017; Sofia et al., 2023; Ahmed, 2025). Although empathetic communication and positive reinforcement ranked relatively lower, their consistent application underscores their continued importance in fostering emotional support and motivation; from the perspective of Thorndike’s Stimulus–Response Bond Theory, recognition and encouragement function as reinforcing stimuli that sustain desirable professional behaviors. Collectively, these results suggest that communication effectiveness in educational leadership is achieved through the integration of complementary strategies rather than reliance on a single approach, with non-verbal communication enhancing relational trust, clarity promoting organizational efficiency, transparency ensuring accountability, empathy supporting teacher well-being, and reinforcement sustaining performance. While the findings strongly support Communication Accommodation Theory and align with empirical evidence on adaptive leadership communication (Bucata & Rizescu, 2017; Sofia et al., 2023; Ahmed, 2025), they also diverge from studies that prioritize empathetic communication or reward-based strategies as dominant influences, and from concerns regarding potential misinterpretation of non-verbal cues in diverse contexts. Nonetheless, the results indicate that school heads are generally effective in cultivating a communication environment that supports teacher engagement, collaboration, and professional performance.

Performance of Teachers

Table 3 shows that among the aspects of performance of teacher, most of the secondary school teachers claims that they are well versed on Instructional Delivery with a weighted mean of 3.69 or always, followed by Student Engagement and Support with a mean of 3.67 or always; Classroom Management Support with a mean of 3.65 or always; Assessment and Evaluation with a mean of 3.64 or always; Professionalism and Reflection with a mean of 3.59 or always. It has an overall weighted mean of 3.65 or Always.

Table 3
Summary of Teaching Performance of Secondary School Teachers

Aspects	AWM	Int.	Rank
Instructional Delivery	3.69	Always	1
Classroom Management	3.65	Always	3
Student Engagement and Support	3.67	Always	2
Assessment and Evaluation	3.64	Always	4
Professionalism and Reflection	3.59	Always	5
Overall AWM:	3.65	Always	

The findings indicate that secondary school teachers demonstrate a high level of self-efficacy, reflected in consistently positive self-assessments across core domains of professional practice, particularly in instructional delivery, which emerged as the highest-rated area. This suggests strong confidence in pedagogical competence and content mastery, indicating alignment between teaching practices and institutional expectations. Similarly, high ratings in classroom management and student engagement imply that teachers effectively sustain structured and supportive learning environments. However, the comparatively lower—though still high—ratings in assessment, evaluation, and especially professionalism and reflection suggest potential areas for further development, particularly in reflective practice, continuous professional learning, and adherence to broader professional standards. From the perspective of Performance Management Theory of Action, these results indicate that while organizational goals, performance expectations, and instructional practices are well aligned—ensuring consistency and accountability—the developmental dimension of performance management may be less fully institutionalized. Specifically, the findings imply that although systems effectively support instructional delivery and classroom practices, they may provide limited opportunities for reflective practice and data-informed instructional improvement. Overall, the results portray a confident and competent teaching workforce operating within a supportive environment; however, they also highlight the need to strengthen feedback mechanisms, reflective processes, and professional development pathways to ensure continuous improvement and responsiveness to evolving educational demands.

Differences between Leadership Styles, Communication Strategies and the Teaching Performance of Teachers among Schools and among the Aspects

Leadership Style of School Heads. Differences among aspects of School Heads’ leadership style were indicated by an F-value and a P-value. The table shows that Instructional Leadership with F-value = 9.797 and p-value =0.000; Transformational Leadership with F-value = 16.882 and p-value =0.000; Contingent Leadership with F-value = 20.063 and p-value =0.000; Authoritarian Leadership with F-

value = 8.808 and p-value =0.000; Democratic Leadership with F-value = 5.879 and p-value =0.000; and Transactional Leadership with F- value = 7.977 and p-value =0.000. It all showed that there were significant differences among the schools and aspects of school heads’ Leadership Styles.

The findings indicate that leadership and communication practices are not uniform across schools, as significant variations reflect the influence of contextual factors, organizational culture, and administrative competence on how leadership is enacted. Notably, differences in contingent and transformational leadership underscore the importance of adaptive and visionary approaches in shaping teaching environments and overall school effectiveness, consistent with prior studies emphasizing variability in how leaders motivate and guide teachers (Park & Seo, 2019; Malechwani, 2019; Asbari et al., 2020). Transformational leadership was associated with higher teacher engagement and professional growth, whereas transactional approaches tended to promote compliance rather than intrinsic motivation (Bowers, 2020; Ahmad et al., 2022; Takeuchi et al., 2022).

Similarly, significant differences across all communication dimensions—empathetic, clear and direct, positive reinforcement, open and transparent, and non-verbal communication ($p < 0.05$)—indicate that communication strategies vary substantially among schools, influencing how effectively information, feedback, and motivation are conveyed. The highest variation in empathetic communication highlights its critical role in fostering trust and professional relationships, while differences in clarity and transparency affect collaboration and instructional alignment, supporting claims that communication bridges administrative intent and teacher understanding (Sidiropoulou, 2021; Ramos, 2022; Holley, 2020). In contrast, teacher performance showed significant variation only in instructional delivery ($p = 0.038$), suggesting that while most performance domains remain consistent across schools, differences in pedagogy, content delivery, and instructional practices are influenced by leadership, resources, and professional development opportunities. This aligns with literature recognizing teacher performance as multidimensional and shaped by leadership and communicative contexts (Korpershoek et al., 2016; Christie & Lingard, 2020; Quansah, 2020), with evidence that supportive and communicative leadership enhances instructional innovation and adaptability (Freeman et al., 2020; Morin et al., 2020). Overall, the results reflect varying levels of organizational maturity and adaptability within schools, emphasizing the critical role of context-responsive leadership and communication in influencing instructional quality and school effectiveness.

Table 4
Difference Between Leadership Styles, Communication Strategies, and Teaching Performance
Among Schools and Aspects

Leadership Style	df1	df2	F	p-value	Int.
Instructional Leadership	7	100	9.797	0.000	S
Transformational Leadership	7	100	16.882	0.000	S
Contingent Leadership	7	100	20.063	0.000	S
Authoritarian Leadership	7	100	8.808	0.000	S
Democratic Leadership	7	100	5.879	0.000	S
Transactional Leadership	7	100	7.977	0.000	S

Communication Strategy	df1	df2	F	p-value	Int.
Empathetic Communication	7	100	15.031	0.000	S

Clear and Direct Communication	7	100	13.223	0.000	S
Positive Reinforcement	7	100	12.908	0.000	S
Open and Transparent Communication	7	100	12.498	0.000	S
Non-Verbal Communication	7	100	9.641	0.000	S

Teaching Performance	df1	df2	F	p-value	Int.
Instructional Delivery	7	92	2.234	0.038	S
Classroom Management	7	92	0.872	0.532	NS
Student Engagement and Support	7	92	0.897	0.513	NS
Assessment and Evaluation	7	92	0.724	0.652	NS
Professionalism and Reflection	7	92	0.505	0.829	NS

Significant Relationship Between School Heads Leadership Styles And Teaching Performance of Teachers

Table 5 shows the correlation coefficient r of all pairwise comparisons between the School Heads’ leadership style and the teaching performance of teachers. The relation of Instructional Leadership which are areas of School Heads Leadership style with the different domains of teachers’ Teaching performance obtained the following: the r -value for Instructional Delivery is 0.352 with a p -value of 0.000, the r -value for Classroom Management is 0.254 with a p -value of 0.011, the r -value for Student Engagement and Support is 0.287 with a p -value of 0.004, r -value for Assessment and Evaluation is 0.209 with the p -value of 0.037, and r -value for Professionalism and Reflection is 0.231 with a p -value of 0.021. The findings showed that School Heads’ Instructional Leadership Style has a significant relationship with the aspects of teaching performance, namely: Instructional Delivery; Classroom Management; Student Engagement and Support; Assessment and Evaluation; and Professionalism and Reflection.

Table 5
Relationship Between School Heads’ Leadership Style and Teaching Performance

Leadership Style	Teaching Performance	r-value	p-value	Int.
Instructional Leadership	Instructional Delivery	.352	.000	S
	Classroom Management	.254	.011	S
	Student Engagement and Support	.287	.004	S
	Assessment and Evaluation	.209	.037	S
	Professionalism and Reflection	.231	.021	S
Transformational Leadership	Instructional Delivery	.341	.001	S
	Classroom Management	.246	.014	S
	Student Engagement and Support	.333	.001	S
	Assessment and Evaluation	.103	.309	NS
	Professionalism and Reflection	.178	.077	NS
Contingent Leadership	Instructional Delivery	.421	.000	S
	Classroom Management	.217	.030	S
	Student Engagement and Support	.328	.001	S

	Assessment and Evaluation	.088	.384	NS
	Professionalism and Reflection	.104	.304	NS
Authoritarian Leadership	Instructional Delivery	-.165	.102	NS
	Classroom Management	-.109	.281	NS
	Student Engagement and Support	-.075	.459	NS
	Assessment and Evaluation	-.116	.252	NS
	Professionalism and Reflection	-.183	.068	NS
Democratic Leadership	Instructional Delivery	.340	.001	S
	Classroom Management	.252	.011	S
	Student Engagement and Support	.342	.001	S
	Assessment and Evaluation	.153	.127	NS
	Professionalism and Reflection	.154	.126	NS
Transactional Leadership	Instructional Delivery	.221	.027	S
	Classroom Management	.091	.366	NS
	Student Engagement and Support	.218	.029	S
	Assessment and Evaluation	-.023	.821	NS
	Professionalism and Reflection	-.026	.795	NS

The relationship of Transformational Leadership of school heads to the aspects of the teaching performance of teachers revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery, $r= 0.341$, $p\text{-value}=0.001$; Classroom Management, $r= 0.246$, $p\text{-value}=0.014$; Student Engagement and Support, $r= 0.333$, $p\text{-value}=0.001$; Assessment and Evaluation, $r= 0.103$, $p\text{-value}=0.309$; Professionalism and Reflection, $r= 0.178$, $p\text{-value}=0.077$; The r and p -values of Instructional Delivery, Classroom Management, and Student Engagement and Support towards Transformational Leadership has significant relationship while it has no significant relationship in the aspects of Assessment and Evaluation together with Professionalism and Reflection.

The findings reveal important insights into the influence of transformational leadership on the teaching performance of teachers. Results indicate that transformational leadership of school heads has a moderate and statistically significant relationship with instructional delivery, suggesting that teachers tend to demonstrate more effective instructional practices when guided by leaders who exhibit transformational qualities. Similarly, a significant but weaker relationship was observed in classroom management, indicating that leadership practices characterized by vision, inspiration, and support contribute, albeit modestly, to teachers' ability to maintain discipline and order within the classroom. In addition, a moderately significant relationship was found with student engagement and support, implying that transformational leaders foster environments in which teachers are more inclined to adopt strategies that encourage active student participation and provide greater support to learners.

In contrast, the results show no significant relationship between transformational leadership and assessment and evaluation, as well as professionalism and reflection. These findings suggest that while leadership style can positively shape classroom-related practices, its influence on assessment approaches and reflective professionalism may be limited. These latter domains may be more strongly shaped by institutional policies, curricular demands, or teachers' intrinsic professional values rather than by the leadership behaviors of school heads.

The results underscore that transformational leadership plays a critical role in enhancing observable and interactive aspects of teaching performance—namely, instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement and support. However, its effect appears less pronounced in domains that require technical expertise or internalized professional reflection. This highlights the need for complementary interventions such as targeted professional development programs, capacity-building in assessment literacy, and reflective practice training to further strengthen these areas of teaching performance alongside effective leadership.

On the school heads' contingent leadership, correlated with the teaching performance of the teachers, got the following results: Instructional Delivery, $r= 0.421$, $p\text{-value}=0.000$; Classroom Management, $r= 0.217$, $p\text{-value}=0.030$; Student Engagement and Support, $r= 0.328$, $p\text{-value}=0.001$; Assessment and Evaluation, $r= 0.088$, $p\text{-value}=0.384$; Professionalism and Reflection, $r= 0.104$, $p\text{-value}=0.304$; The r and p -values of Instructional Delivery, Classroom Management and Student Engagement and Support revealed a significant relationship with contingent leadership while Assessment and Evaluation together with Professionalism and Reflection has no significant relationship on the latter.

The correlation analysis revealed that contingent leadership of school heads demonstrated a moderate and statistically significant relationship with instructional delivery. This indicates that the more school heads employ contingent leadership practices—where rewards and corrective actions are based on teachers' performance—the more likely teachers are to deliver instruction effectively. This finding suggests that contingent leadership mechanisms, such as recognition and accountability, may serve as motivating factors that enhance teachers' classroom delivery.

A weak but significant relationship was also observed with classroom management. Although the correlation is lower in magnitude, the result implies that contingent leadership can still contribute to teachers' ability to manage classroom environments. The significance of this relationship suggests that when teachers are provided with clear expectations, structured monitoring, and performance-based reinforcement, they are more likely to adopt effective classroom management practices.

Likewise, a moderate and significant correlation was found between contingent leadership and student engagement and support. This result highlights that leadership practices emphasizing contingent rewards and monitoring can influence teachers' approaches to student-centered practices. It implies that teachers who perceive strong accountability and reward structures may exert greater effort in engaging students and providing necessary support to ensure academic success.

In contrast, no significant relationships were found between contingent leadership and assessment and evaluation or professionalism and reflection. These results suggest that such leadership practices may not substantially shape teachers' assessment strategies or their capacity for reflective practice. Assessment and reflective professionalism may be more closely influenced by institutional policies, professional training, or intrinsic motivation, rather than by leadership styles based on rewards and corrective measures.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that contingent leadership is significantly associated with observable aspects of teaching performance, such as instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement and support. However, its influence appears limited in domains requiring higher-order judgment, technical expertise, and self-reflective practice. This underscores the need for leadership approaches that combine contingent mechanisms with developmental and supportive strategies to address the broader spectrum of teaching performance.

On the school heads' authoritarian leadership, correlated with the teaching performance of the teachers, got the following results: Instructional Delivery, $r = -0.165$, $p\text{-value} = 0.102$; Classroom Management, $r = -0.109$, $p\text{-value} = 0.281$; Student Engagement and Support, $r = -0.075$, $p\text{-value} = 0.459$; Assessment and Evaluation, $r = -0.116$, $p\text{-value} = 0.252$; Professionalism and Reflection, $r = 0.183$, $p\text{-value} = 0.068$; The r and p -values of all aspects of teaching performance of the teachers revealed no significant relationship with authoritarian leadership.

The result implies that an authoritarian leadership style, characterized by a leader who exerts strong control, makes decisions unilaterally, and demands obedience, does not have a substantial impact on how teachers perform in the classroom. Teachers may have a degree of autonomy in their classroom practices, regardless of the school head's authoritarian style. This could mean that even in schools with authoritarian leaders, teachers still make their own decisions about how they deliver instruction, engage students, assess learning, and approach their professional responsibilities. The lack of a significant relationship implies that authoritarian leadership does not directly determine how well teachers perform in the classroom. Instead, other factors may play a more significant role in influencing teaching effectiveness.

Moreover, the relationship between the school heads transactional leadership style correlated with the aspects of teaching performance of teachers yielded the following results: Instructional Delivery, $r = 0.221$, $p\text{-value} = 0.027$; Classroom Management, $r = 0.091$, $p\text{-value} = 0.366$; Student Engagement and Support, $r = 0.218$, $p\text{-value} = 0.029$; Assessment and Evaluation, $r = -0.023$, $p\text{-value} = 0.821$; Professionalism and Reflection, $r = -0.026$, $p\text{-value} = 0.795$; The r and p -values of Instructional Delivery and Student Engagement and Support revealed a significant relationship with Transactional Leadership while Classroom Management, Assessment and Evaluation together with Professionalism and Reflection has no significant relationship on the latter.

The findings indicate that the transactional leadership style of school heads bears a weak yet statistically significant relationship with instructional delivery. Although the magnitude of the correlation is small, the significance suggests that transactional leadership—characterized by reward systems and corrective actions—can exert some influence on how teachers deliver instruction. This implies that clear expectations and performance-based reinforcement from school heads may motivate teachers to demonstrate better classroom delivery, albeit to a limited extent.

A similar pattern is observed in the domain of student engagement and support, where a weak but significant relationship was found. This result suggests that transactional leadership can contribute to improving teachers' ability to engage students and provide necessary support. The presence of structured accountability and contingent rewards may encourage teachers to invest effort in sustaining student participation and addressing learner needs.

In contrast, the results reveal no significant relationships between transactional leadership and classroom management, assessment and evaluation, and professionalism and reflection. Notably, the negative but non-significant correlations with assessment and evaluation, as well as professionalism and reflection, suggest that transactional leadership may have little to no beneficial impact on these more complex and intrinsic aspects of teaching performance. These domains are likely shaped by internal professional values, reflective practice, or systemic guidelines, rather than by leadership styles centered primarily on compliance and extrinsic reinforcement.

Taken together, these findings indicate that transactional leadership exerts some influence on observable and performance-driven aspects of teaching, such as instructional delivery and student engagement, but

its impact is limited and not as far-reaching in areas requiring higher-order judgment, self-regulation, and professional reflection. This suggests that while transactional leadership may provide structure and short-term motivation, it may be insufficient in fostering deeper professional growth and innovation among teachers. A more balanced leadership approach—integrating both transactional mechanisms and transformational elements—may therefore be necessary to comprehensively enhance teacher performance across all domains.

The overall school heads' leadership style in relation to the performance of teachers revealed an $r=0.242$, $p=0.015$. This revealed a significant relationship between school heads' leadership styles and the Performance of teachers. This finding confirms that school heads play a crucial role in shaping teacher performance. Their leadership style is not just a matter of personal preference but has a real impact on how effectively teachers do their jobs. This result is consistent with the work of Park and Seo (2019) and Avidov-Ungar et al. (2022), who emphasized that instructional leadership is inherently oriented toward improving teaching and learning by placing pedagogy at the center of leadership practices. Bowers (2020) further supports this claim, arguing that when school heads prioritize instructional guidance, they empower teachers to explore new pedagogical approaches and foster collaborative professional growth. Likewise, Berg et al. (2019) highlighted that instructional leaders build teacher trust and respect, leading to meaningful student learning. The current study, therefore, reinforces prior scholarship by providing empirical evidence that instructional leadership directly enhances not only the observable aspects of teaching, such as instructional delivery, but also more reflective domains, including assessment practices and professional development. These findings address a noted gap in the literature, where previous studies often highlighted the conceptual importance of instructional leadership but provided less empirical data linking it explicitly to multiple aspects of teacher performance.

In contrast, Transformational Leadership showed significant associations only with instructional delivery and student engagement, but not with assessment and evaluation or professionalism and reflection. This pattern aligns with Kotamena et al. (2020) and Asbari et al. (2020), who described transformational leadership as inspiring and motivating teachers toward innovation and collaboration. By encouraging creativity and building supportive environments, transformational leaders appear to positively shape teachers' capacity to deliver instruction effectively and foster student engagement, echoing the findings of Jaafar et al. (2021) on teamwork and tolerance in academic settings.

However, the absence of significant relationships with evaluative and reflective domains suggests limitations to transformational leadership in strengthening technical competencies, such as assessment literacy (Schildkamp et al., 2020) or reflective practice (Molloy et al., 2020). This gap highlights the need for further inquiry into whether transformational leadership requires complementary support structures, such as professional development programs, to enhance its influence on more complex aspects of teacher practice. Similarly, Contingent Leadership was found to be highly influential in observable performance areas, yielding the strongest correlation overall with instructional delivery and a significant relationship with student engagement. This finding supports Takeuchi et al. (2022) and Ong (2020), who argued that contingent leadership adapts to situational demands and emphasizes accountability through monitoring, rewards, and sanctions. The fact that it was less effective in influencing assessment and reflection aligns with Ahmad et al. (2022), who noted that intrinsic motivation and professional values, rather than external reinforcement, are critical drivers of reflective practice and evaluative judgment. This finding underscores an important distinction: while contingent

leadership ensures short-term compliance in teaching practices, it may not cultivate the deeper, self-regulatory dimensions of teacher performance that are essential for long-term professional growth.

The results for Transactional Leadership followed a similar trend, showing modest but significant correlations with instructional delivery and student engagement while exhibiting no significant effect on assessment and reflection. This is consistent with Nazim and Mahmood (2016) and Jekelle (2021), who emphasized that transactional leadership motivates through clear expectations, rewards, and corrective measures. Teachers may therefore align their practices with externally set standards to meet expectations, but such an approach does not necessarily foster reflective practice or promote advanced assessment strategies. This reflects the critique of Malechwanzi (2019), who noted that transactional leadership limits leaders' ability to adjust to outcomes, thereby constraining its impact on higher-order teacher competencies.

In contrast, Authoritarian Leadership was found to have no significant correlation with any domain of teacher performance. This finding reinforces the critiques of Al Rahbi et al. (2017) and Wiesenthal et al. (2015), who argued that authoritarian leadership, while sometimes effective in urgent or time-critical contexts, is inherently detrimental to creativity and teacher autonomy. The lack of measurable influence in the present study indicates that even under authoritarian leadership, teachers maintain a degree of autonomy in the classroom, making decisions about instruction, student engagement, and reflection independently of rigid hierarchical control. This result also suggests that authoritarian leadership does not contribute to sustainable teacher performance improvements, reinforcing the argument that modern educational contexts demand more participative and collaborative approaches to leadership.

Taken collectively, these findings revealed a statistically significant overall relationship between school heads' leadership styles and teaching performance ($r = 0.242$, $p = .015$). This supports the claims of Elpisah et al. (2019) and Christie and Lingard (2020), who emphasized the centrality of leadership in shaping educational outcomes. However, the study contributes to the literature by specifying which leadership styles influence particular domains of teacher performance. Instructional leadership is confirmed as the most comprehensive and effective style, while transformational leadership is particularly influential in motivating teachers and enhancing student engagement. Contingent and transactional leadership, though effective in ensuring compliance and observable performance, is limited in its capacity to foster reflection and assessment literacy. Finally, authoritarian leadership appears misaligned with the demands of contemporary educational practice.

These findings have important implications for both policy and practice. From a policy perspective, the results highlight the need for leadership development and training programs for school heads to emphasize instructional and transformational leadership approaches, as these styles are most effective in enhancing teacher performance across multiple domains. From a practical standpoint, school heads should be cautious in relying heavily on contingent or transactional leadership, as their effects may be confined to compliance and short-term outcomes. Moreover, the lack of influence of authoritarian leadership highlights its limited value in modern schools, pointing to the need for more flexible, participative approaches. Finally, the study identifies a gap for future research: while the current findings establish clear links between leadership styles and teacher performance, further studies should examine moderating variables such as teacher motivation, school culture, or professional development opportunities that may strengthen or weaken these relationships.

Significant Relationship Between Communication Strategies And Teaching Performance Of Teachers

Table 6 shows the correlation coefficient r of all pairwise comparisons between the School Heads' communication strategy and the teaching performance of teachers. The relation of Empathetic Communication, which is an aspect of School Heads' communication strategy with the different domains of teachers' Teaching performance, obtained the following: the r -value for Instructional Delivery is 0.457 with a p -value of 0.000, the r -value for Classroom Management is 0.296 with a p -value of 0.003, the r -value for Student Engagement and Support is 0.451 with a p -value of 0.000, r -value for Assessment and Evaluation is 0.203 with the p -value of 0.043, and r -value for Professionalism and Reflection is 0.245 with a p -value of 0.014.

Table 6
Relationship Between School Heads' Communication Strategies and Teaching Performance

Communication Strategies	Teaching Performance	r-value	p-value	Int.
Empathetic Communication	Instructional Delivery	.457	.000	S
	Classroom Management	.296	.003	S
	Student Engagement and Support	.451	.000	S
	Assessment and Evaluation	.203	.043	S
	Professionalism and Reflection	.245	.014	S
Clear and Direct Communication	Instructional Delivery	.490	.000	S
	Classroom Management	.315	.001	S
	Student Engagement and Support	.387	.000	S
	Assessment and Evaluation	.097	.336	NS
	Professionalism and Reflection	.155	.124	NS
Positive Reinforcement	Instructional Delivery	.452	.000	S
	Classroom Management	.262	.008	S
	Student Engagement and Support	.387	.000	S
	Assessment and Evaluation	.108	.284	NS
	Professionalism and Reflection	.157	.118	NS
Open and Transparent Communication	Instructional Delivery	.442	.000	S
	Classroom Management	.290	.003	S
	Student Engagement and Support	.383	.000	S
	Assessment and Evaluation	.136	.179	NS
	Professionalism and Reflection	.107	.291	NS
Non-verbal Communication	Instructional Delivery	.504	.000	S
	Classroom Management	.336	.001	S
	Student Engagement and Support	.529	.000	S

	Support			
	Assessment and Evaluation	.205	.041	S
	Professionalism and Reflection	.277	.005	S

The relationship of Clear and Direct Communication Strategy of school heads to the aspects of the teaching performance of teachers revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery, $r= 0.490$, $p\text{-value}=0.000$; Classroom Management, $r= 0.315$, $p\text{-value}=0.001$; Student Engagement and Support, $r= 0.387$, $p\text{-value}=0.000$; Assessment and Evaluation, $r= 0.097$, $p\text{-value}=0.336$; Professionalism and Reflection, $r= 0.155$, $p\text{-value}=0.124$; The r and p -values of Instructional Delivery, Classroom Management, and Student Engagement and Support towards Clear and Direct Communication has significant relationship while it has no significant relationship in the aspects of Assessment and Evaluation together with Professionalism and Reflection.

The analysis revealed that the school heads' clear and direct communication strategy is significantly associated with several aspects of teaching performance. A moderate and statistically significant relationship was observed with instructional delivery. This relatively strong coefficient, compared to other leadership-related variables, suggests that when school heads communicate expectations, goals, and feedback with clarity and precision, teachers are better able to translate these into effective instructional practices. Clear communication appears to reduce ambiguity, enabling teachers to focus on delivering content with confidence and coherence.

Similarly, a moderate positive and significant relationship was found with student engagement and support. This finding implies that teachers who receive unambiguous guidance and consistent feedback from their school heads are more likely to adopt practices that foster student involvement and provide appropriate academic and emotional support. The role of communication here may lie in setting clear standards for student-centered teaching practices, which teachers can readily implement.

A weaker but still significant positive correlation was found with classroom management. This result suggests that clarity in leadership communication helps teachers manage their classrooms more effectively, likely because clear policies, consistent expectations, and unambiguous feedback promote consistency in maintaining order and discipline. Although weaker than the correlation with instructional delivery, the significance highlights the important role of communication in shaping teacher practices within the classroom environment.

In contrast, no significant relationships were found between clear and direct communication and assessment and evaluation, nor with professionalism and reflection. These results indicate that while communication clarity is crucial in guiding externally observable aspects of teaching performance, it has a limited influence on more internalized and individualized domains. Assessment practices are often governed by institutional policies, curriculum standards, and technical expertise, while professionalism and reflection are largely driven by personal dispositions and intrinsic motivation. As such, these areas may not be substantially shaped by leadership communication strategies alone.

Taken together, the findings emphasize that clear and direct communication from school heads significantly enhances teacher performance in instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement and support—domains where practical guidance and explicit expectations are critical. However, its influence does not extend to assessment practices or reflective professionalism, which may require additional supports such as professional development, training, and personal growth

initiatives. These results underscore the necessity of coupling clear communication strategies with other leadership practices that target deeper, internalized aspects of teaching performance.

On the school heads' Positive Reinforcement strategy, correlated with the teaching performance of the teachers, got the following results: Instructional Delivery, $r = 0.452$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$; Classroom Management, $r = 0.262$, $p\text{-value} = 0.008$; Student Engagement and Support, $r = 0.387$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$; Assessment and Evaluation, $r = 0.108$, $p\text{-value} = 0.284$; Professionalism and Reflection, $r = 0.157$, $p\text{-value} = 0.118$; The r and p -values of Instructional Delivery, Classroom Management, and Student Engagement and Support revealed a significant relationship with Positive Reinforcement while Assessment and Evaluation together with Professionalism and Reflection has no significant relationship on the latter.

The findings of the correlation analysis indicate that the school heads' use of positive reinforcement demonstrates significant associations with several aspects of teaching performance. A moderate and statistically significant relationship was found with instructional delivery. This suggests that when school heads acknowledge and reward teachers' effective practices, it fosters greater motivation and confidence, which in turn enhances the quality of teachers' instructional delivery. Positive reinforcement appears to serve as an encouraging mechanism that supports teachers in sustaining effective teaching strategies.

A moderately significant correlation was also observed with student engagement and support. This indicates that teachers who experience recognition and affirmation from their leaders are more likely to create supportive learning environments and actively engage students. Such reinforcement may reinforce teachers' willingness to go beyond routine instruction, thereby promoting practices that prioritize learner involvement and holistic support.

In addition, the results revealed a weak but significant positive relationship with classroom management. This finding suggests that school heads' use of positive reinforcement contributes, though modestly, to teachers' ability to maintain order and establish productive learning environments. Recognition and encouragement likely enhance teachers' consistency in applying classroom management strategies, as they feel valued and supported by their leaders.

By contrast, no significant relationships were found with assessment and evaluation, professionalism, and reflection. These results imply that positive reinforcement may be less influential in domains requiring technical expertise, judgment, and self-regulated professional growth. Teachers' assessment practices are often shaped by standardized policies and training, while professionalism and reflective practice are more intrinsic qualities influenced by individual values and professional ethos, rather than by external reinforcement.

Overall, the results suggest that positive reinforcement is most effective in enhancing externally observable and practice-oriented aspects of teaching performance—namely instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement and support. However, its impact is limited in domains requiring deeper internalization, such as assessment practices and reflective professionalism. These findings underscore the importance of combining positive reinforcement with other leadership strategies—such as capacity-building programs and reflective practice initiatives—in order to foster holistic improvements in teacher performance.

On the school heads' Open and Transparent Communication strategy, correlated with the teaching performance of the teachers, got the following results: Instructional Delivery, $r = 0.442$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$; Classroom Management, $r = 0.290$, $p\text{-value} = 0.003$; Student Engagement and Support, $r = 0.383$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$.

value=0.000; Assessment and Evaluation, $r = 0.136$, $p\text{-value} = 0.179$; Professionalism and Reflection, $r = 0.107$, $p\text{-value} = 0.291$; The r and p -values of Instructional Delivery, Classroom Management, and Student Engagement and Support revealed a significant relationship with Open and Transparent Communication while Assessment and Evaluation together with Professionalism and Reflection has no significant relationship on the latter.

The correlation analysis revealed that the school heads' open and transparent communication strategy is significantly associated with several aspects of teaching performance. A moderate and statistically significant relationship was observed with instructional delivery. This suggests that when school heads communicate openly, share relevant information, and establish transparency in decision-making, teachers are better able to align their instructional practices with institutional expectations, thereby enhancing the effectiveness and clarity of lesson delivery. Transparency appears to reduce uncertainty, providing teachers with the confidence and direction needed to implement instructional strategies more effectively.

A weaker but still significant positive correlation was found with classroom management. This indicates that transparent communication from school heads—such as clarifying policies, setting consistent expectations, and addressing issues openly—contributes to teachers' ability to maintain order and manage classroom dynamics. Although the strength of the correlation is modest, the significance underscores that transparency in leadership communication fosters consistency and fairness in teacher practices that support classroom discipline.

The results further showed a moderately significant correlation with student engagement and support. This implies that when leaders communicate openly and cultivate trust through transparency, teachers are encouraged to adopt more student-centered approaches, prioritizing active engagement and providing both academic and emotional support. Open communication may foster a school culture where teachers feel empowered to innovate and invest in practices that strengthen student-teacher relationships.

In contrast, no significant relationships were found between open and transparent communication and assessment and evaluation, or professionalism and reflection. These findings suggest that while open communication is instrumental in shaping externally observable aspects of teaching performance, it exerts limited influence on areas that are largely internalized and self-regulated. Teachers' assessment practices are often dictated by curriculum standards and institutional policies, while professionalism and reflection stem more from intrinsic values and self-directed professional growth, which may not be directly influenced by communication transparency alone.

Taken together, the findings indicate that open and transparent communication by school heads enhances teaching performance primarily in domains that benefit from clarity, consistency, and trust—specifically instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement and support. However, its effect on assessment practices and reflective professionalism appears minimal, suggesting the need for complementary strategies such as professional development programs and reflective practice initiatives. These results highlight the importance of combining transparency with targeted developmental support to comprehensively improve teacher performance.

On the school heads' Non-Verbal Communication strategy, correlated with the teaching performance of the teachers, got the following results: Instructional Delivery, $r = 0.504$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$; Classroom Management, $r = 0.336$, $p\text{-value} = 0.001$; Student Engagement and Support, $r = 0.529$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$; Assessment and Evaluation, $r = 0.205$, $p\text{-value} = 0.041$; Professionalism and Reflection, $r = 0.277$, $p\text{-value} = 0.005$; The r and p -values of Instructional Delivery, Classroom Management, Student

Engagement and Support, and Assessment and Evaluation revealed a significant relationship with Non-verbal Communication together with Professionalism and reflection.

The analysis of correlations revealed that the school heads' non-verbal communication strategy is significantly associated with multiple dimensions of teaching performance, suggesting its broad influence as a leadership practice. A moderate and statistically significant relationship was observed with instructional delivery. This relatively strong correlation indicates that non-verbal cues from school heads—such as gestures, facial expressions, tone, and body language—play a vital role in reinforcing expectations and motivating teachers to enhance the clarity, effectiveness, and quality of their instructional practices.

Similarly, the strongest correlation emerged with student engagement and support, indicating a moderate to strong and highly significant relationship. This suggests that teachers are especially responsive to the non-verbal affirmations and signals of their school heads. Positive non-verbal communication, such as supportive gestures, attentive listening, and encouraging expressions, likely cultivates a sense of trust and motivation among teachers, which translates into more engaging and supportive approaches toward students. A weaker but still significant positive relationship was found with classroom management. This implies that non-verbal leadership behaviors, such as consistent presence, firm yet respectful gestures, and visible attentiveness, may contribute to teachers' confidence in managing classroom dynamics. Although the strength of the correlation is less than that for instructional delivery and student engagement, the significance highlights that leadership's non-verbal signals reinforce discipline and order indirectly.

Interestingly, unlike other communication-related strategies, non-verbal communication also showed significant relationships with assessment and evaluation, professionalism, and reflection. These findings imply that subtle cues of approval, encouragement, or concern conveyed non-verbally by school heads can influence teachers' attitudes toward evaluation practices and their commitment to reflective professionalism. Such results underscore the importance of implicit leadership communication in shaping behaviors that are typically more internalized and self-driven, suggesting that teachers may interpret leaders' non-verbal signals as indicators of standards, expectations, and trust.

Overall, the results highlight that non-verbal communication has a widespread and significant influence across all aspects of teaching performance, from observable practices like instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement, to more intrinsic domains such as assessment and evaluation, and reflective professionalism. These findings suggest that leadership effectiveness is not only contingent upon verbal clarity and structured strategies but also deeply rooted in the subtle, implicit messages conveyed through non-verbal behavior. As such, the study underscores the need for school heads to be mindful of their non-verbal expressions, as these significantly shape teacher motivation, performance, and professional growth.

The overall school heads' communication strategy concerning teachers' performance revealed an $r=0.378$, $p=0.000$, indicating a significant relationship between communication strategy and teachers' performance. The positive correlation coefficient ($r = 0.378$) indicates a positive relationship between the school heads' communication strategy and teachers' performance. This result means that as the effectiveness or quality of the communication strategy improves, teachers' performance also tends to improve. Conversely, less effective communication strategies may be associated with lower teacher performance.

These results strongly suggest that how school heads communicate has a real and measurable impact on how well teachers perform. It implies that investing in and refining the communication strategies employed by school heads could be a valuable approach to enhancing teacher performance within the school. When school heads communicate effectively, teachers tend to perform better, and this is not likely due to mere coincidence.

The results support the theoretical stance of Contingency Theory by showing that no single leadership or communication strategy uniformly influenced all dimensions of teaching performance. For instance, strategies such as transformational leadership, clear and direct communication, and non-verbal communication had stronger associations with instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement, while assessment and reflection were less responsive. This aligns with contingency theory's proposition that leadership effectiveness is situationally dependent; strategies that are highly effective in enhancing observable, practice-oriented tasks may not be equally effective in influencing technical or reflective domains. Thus, school heads may need to adaptively shift leadership approaches depending on whether the goal is to improve observable classroom practices or to nurture deeper professional reflection.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory provides additional insight into why leadership and communication strategies have stronger impacts on certain performance dimensions. Teachers who perceive consistency between their leaders' expectations (conveyed clearly, transparently, and even non-verbally) and their own classroom practices are less likely to experience dissonance, thereby maintaining higher performance in instructional delivery and student engagement. Conversely, in domains like assessment and reflection, where leadership influence is less direct, teachers may rely more on their internal standards or professional training. The weaker correlations in these areas may reflect an attempt to reduce cognitive dissonance by adhering to institutional norms and personal values rather than to leadership signals.

The results also resonate with Thorndike's Stimulus-Response (S-R) Bond Theory, particularly through the significant impact of positive reinforcement and non-verbal communication. According to the S-R framework, behaviors followed by satisfying outcomes are more likely to be repeated. In this study, teachers' instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement improved significantly when school heads employed reinforcement strategies—whether verbal, non-verbal, or reward-based. For example, teachers who receive encouraging gestures or recognition from their leaders are likely to repeat effective teaching behaviors, thereby reinforcing a cycle of performance improvement. This reflects the "law of effect" within Thorndike's theory, wherein reinforcement strengthens the bond between stimulus (leadership action) and response (teaching performance).

Finally, the findings may also be situated within the Performance Management Theory of Action, which emphasizes the alignment of organizational systems, communication, and feedback with performance outcomes. The significant role of clear communication, open and transparent communication, and positive reinforcement demonstrates the importance of feedback loops in guiding teacher behavior. Performance management theory underscores that for performance to improve, leaders must provide unambiguous signals, reinforce desired behaviors, and establish mechanisms for accountability. The weak correlations with assessment and reflection suggest that in these domains, feedback loops are either insufficient or overshadowed by systemic policies and personal professional standards. Thus, applying performance management principles would require school heads not only to provide

reinforcement and communication but also to integrate structured developmental feedback and reflective opportunities to address these less externally influenced aspects of teacher performance.

Extent of Influence of School Heads’ Leadership Style to the Performance of Teachers and School Heads’ Communication Strategies for PerformanceOf Teachers

Tables 7.1 and 7.2 show the extent to which School Heads’ leadership styles and Communication Strategies influence teachers' performance.

Table 8A shows the extent of influence of School Heads’ Leadership styles in terms of Instructional, Transformational, Contingent, Authoritarian, and Transactional on Teachers’ performance along the Instructional Delivery, Student Engagement and Support, Assessment and Evaluation, and Professionalism and Reflection domains.

The influence of Instructional Leadership on the aspects of Teaching Performance is determined by the coefficient of determination, r^2 value. It revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery r^2 value = 0.124; Classroom Management r^2 value = 0.065; Student Engagement and Support r^2 value = 0.082; Assessment and Evaluation r^2 value = 0.044; and Professionalism and Reflection r^2 value = 0.053. Instructional Leadership has a very weak influence on the aspects of Teaching Performance.

In statistical terms, this means that only 4.4% to 12.4% of the variability in teachers’ performance across these areas can be attributed to differences in their leaders’ instructional leadership practices, while the remaining 87.6% to 95.6% of the variation is explained by other factors not captured by leadership style, such as teacher motivation, institutional resources, organizational culture, workload, and professional development opportunities. The influence of Transformational Leadership on the aspects of Teaching Performance revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery r^2 value = 0.116; Classroom Management r^2 value = 0.061; Student Engagement and Support r^2 value = 0.111. Instructional Leadership has a very weak influence on the aforementioned aspects of Teaching Performance. The influence of Contingent Leadership on the aspects of Teaching Performance revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery r^2 value = 0.177; Classroom Management r^2 value = 0.047; Student Engagement and Support r^2 value = 0.108. Contingent Leadership has a very weak influence on the aforementioned aspects of Teaching Performance. In addition, the influence of Democratic Leadership on the aspects of Teaching Performance revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery r^2 value = 0.116; Classroom Management r^2 value = 0.064; Student Engagement and Support r^2 value = 0.117. Democratic Leadership has a very weak influence on the aforementioned aspects of Teaching Performance. While the influence of Transactional Leadership on the aspects of Teaching Performance

Table 7.1

Influence of School Head Leadership Styles on the Teaching Performance of Teachers

Leadership Style	Teaching Performance	r^2	Int.
Instructional Leadership	Instructional Delivery	0.124	Very Weak
	Classroom Management	0.065	Very Weak
	Student Engagement and Support	0.082	Very Weak
	Assessment and Evaluation	0.044	Very Weak
	Professionalism and Reflection	0.053	Very Weak
Transformational Leadership	Instructional Delivery	0.116	Very Weak
	Classroom Management	0.061	Very Weak

	Student Engagement and Support	0.111	Very Weak
Contingent Leadership	Instructional Delivery	0.177	Very Weak
	Classroom Management	0.047	Very Weak
	Student Engagement and Support	0.108	Very Weak
Democratic Leadership	Instructional Delivery	0.116	Very Weak
	Classroom Management	0.064	Very Weak
	Student Engagement and Support	0.117	Very Weak
Transactional Leadership	Instructional Delivery	0.049	Very Weak
	Student Engagement and Support	0.048	Very Weak

revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery r^2 value = 0.049; Student Engagement and Support r^2 value = 0.048. Transactional Leadership has a very weak influence on the aforementioned aspects of Teaching Performance.

The weak coefficients suggest that while Leadership Style plays a role in shaping teacher performance, it is not a dominant determinant. The influence is more contextual and indirect, possibly mediated by other organizational or personal factors. This finding aligns with several theoretical and empirical assertions in the reviewed literature. The studies of Park and Seo (2019), Malechwani (2019), and Asbari et al. (2020) emphasize that leadership effectiveness is not uniform but contingent upon situational variables, organizational climate, and follower readiness. The relatively low values suggest that while school heads may employ instructional leadership strategies, their practical impact depends on how teachers internalize and translate such leadership into classroom practices.

In the context of the Division of Naga City, this could imply that school leaders' instructional initiatives are not sufficiently strong or consistent to produce measurable effects on teaching behaviors, or that teachers rely more heavily on their own professional judgment and experience rather than direct supervision or modeling from administrators. While Instructional Leadership contributes modestly to variations in Teaching Performance, its overall influence is weak, suggesting that leadership alone does not strongly determine how teachers perform across instructional, managerial, and reflective dimensions. This statistical reality aligns with the reviewed literature, asserting that leadership effectiveness is mediated by communication quality, shaped by contextual and organizational factors, and bounded by teacher autonomy.

Therefore, for leadership to translate into measurable teaching improvements, it must go beyond supervision—embracing transformational communication, empathy, and participatory decision-making, as consistently advocated in the literature from Ali & Sherman (2017) to Chin & Rosario (2024). Moreover, the results support the perspective of Bovill et al. (2021) and Salas-Pilco et al. (2022), who highlight that organizational infrastructure, institutional policies, and resource availability are equally—if not more—critical in determining teaching performance. Hence, weak values suggest that the impact of leadership might be diluted by systemic constraints, such as workload imbalance, limited support structures, or inadequate professional development systems.

Table 7.2

Influence of School Head Communication Strategies on the Teaching Performance of Teachers

Communication Strategies	Teaching Performance	r ²	Int.
Empathetic Communication	Instructional Delivery	0.209	Weak
	Classroom Management	0.088	Very Weak
	Student Engagement and Support	0.203	Weak
	Assessment and Evaluation	0.041	Very Weak
	Professionalism and Reflection	0.060	Very Weak
Clear and Direct Communication	Instructional Delivery	0.240	Weak
	Classroom Management	0.099	Very Weak
	Student Engagement and Support	0.150	Very Weak
Positive Reinforcement	Instructional Delivery	0.204	Weak
	Classroom Management	0.069	Very Weak
	Student Engagement and Support	0.150	Very Weak
Open and Transparent Communication	Instructional Delivery	0.195	Very Weak
	Classroom Management	0.084	Very Weak
	Student Engagement and Support	0.147	Very Weak
Non-verbal Communication	Instructional Delivery	0.254	Weak
	Classroom Management	0.113	Very Weak
	Student Engagement and Support	0.280	Weak
	Assessment and Evaluation	0.042	Very Weak
	Professionalism and Reflection	0.077	Very Weak

Table 7.2 shows the extent of influence of School Heads' Communication Strategy in terms of Empathetic Communication, Clear and Direct Communication, Positive Reinforcement, Open and Transparent Communication, and Non-verbal Communication on Teachers' performance aspects along Instructional Delivery, Classroom Management, Student Engagement and Support, Assessment and Evaluation, and Professionalism and Reflection.

The influence of Empathetic Communication on the aspects of Teaching Performance is determined by the coefficient of determination, r² value. It revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery r² value = 0.209 (weak); Classroom Management r² value = 0.088 (very weak); Student Engagement and Support r² value = 0.203 (weak); Assessment and Evaluation r² value = 0.041 (very weak); and Professionalism and Reflection r² value = 0.060 (very weak).

The influence of Clear and Direct Communication on the aspects of Teaching Performance revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery r² value = 0.240 (weak); Classroom Management r² value = 0.099 (very weak); Student Engagement and Support r² value = 0.150 (very weak).

The influence of Positive Reinforcement on the aspects of Teaching Performance revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery r² value = 0.204 (weak); Classroom Management r² value = 0.069 (very weak); Student Engagement and Support r² value = 0.150 (very weak).

The influence of Open and Transparent Communication on the aspects of Teaching Performance revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery r² value = 0.195 (very weak); Classroom

Management r^2 value = 0.084 (very weak); Student Engagement and Support r^2 value = 0.147 (very weak).

The influence of Non-verbal Communication on the aspects of Teaching Performance revealed the following results: Instructional Delivery r^2 value = 0.254 (weak); Classroom Management r^2 value = 0.113 (very weak); Student Engagement and Support r^2 value = 0.280 (weak); Assessment and Evaluation r^2 value = 0.042 (very weak); and Professionalism and Reflection r^2 value = 0.077 (very weak).

Across all dimensions, communication strategies exhibit weak to very weak explanatory power, implying that while communication is a necessary leadership function, it alone does not strongly predict teaching performance. This aligns with the findings of Korpershoek et al. (2016), Christie & Lingard (2020), and Quansah (2020), who noted that teacher performance results from multifactorial influences—combining leadership, motivation, context, and teacher self-efficacy. Moreover, the weak coefficients suggest that communication serves primarily as a mediating variable between leadership style and teacher performance rather than a direct causal determinant. Effective communication enhances the relational climate and trust but must operate alongside instructional guidance, professional development, and supportive supervision to yield substantive performance gains.

This is consistent with Park & Seo (2019, 2021), Asbari et al. (2020), and Takeuchi et al. (2022), who emphasize that leadership effectiveness emerges when instructional and communicative competencies interact synergistically—where communication amplifies the leader’s instructional intent and aligns teacher actions with organizational goals. Statistically, the weak to very weak values signify that School Heads’ Communication Strategies contribute only modestly to the variance in Teaching Performance, explaining less than one-third of its variability at best. Conceptually, this indicates that communication—though vital for trust and motivation—must be embedded within a broader leadership framework that includes instructional supervision, feedback systems, and teacher empowerment.

Practically, the findings suggest that school heads in the Division of Naga City may benefit from strengthening not only the content but also the consistency, responsiveness, and relational depth of their communication. Integrating empathetic, clear, and non-verbal cues with active coaching and feedback mechanisms can enhance the translation of leadership communication into tangible instructional improvements.

Intervention Program for Leadership Styles, Communication Strategies, and Teaching Performance of Teachers

The LEAD-HS Program provides a structured, research-based intervention for school heads aimed at improving leadership styles, communication strategies, and supervisory practices. By equipping school leaders with the necessary skills and tools, the program seeks to directly influence teacher performance and foster an environment conducive to professional growth and high-quality education. Implementing this program ensures that school heads are not only managers but transformational leaders who inspire, guide, and support their teachers toward sustained educational excellence.

CONCLUSION

1. Secondary school heads predominantly adopt leadership approaches that are adaptive, inclusive, and supportive of both teachers and students. The highest ratings for contingent and democratic

- leadership imply that school heads value participatory decision-making and situational responsiveness, adjusting their leadership strategies according to the needs of their schools.
2. The findings indicate that among the communication strategies employed by secondary school heads, non-verbal communication emerged as the most frequently utilized, as reflected in its highest weighted mean. This underscores the significance of gestures, expressions, and other non-verbal cues in reinforcing messages and establishing rapport within the school environment.
 3. Secondary school teachers perceive themselves to be most proficient in instructional delivery, as evidenced by their highest weighted mean, followed closely by student engagement and support, and classroom management support. This suggests that teachers place considerable emphasis on effectively transmitting knowledge, actively involving learners, and maintaining a conducive learning environment.
 4. The findings underscore that significant variability exists in both leadership and communication practices, and these differences contribute, though modestly, to disparities in teacher performance. The results reveal that leadership and communication are interdependent mechanisms: leadership style determines how school heads guide and motivate teachers, while communication strategy operationalizes these leadership intentions through empathy, clarity, and feedback. Thus, leadership effectiveness within the Division of Naga City is not solely determined by authority or structure but by how school heads communicate, connect, and respond to the needs of teachers.
 5. There was a significant relationship between school heads' leadership style and communication strategy towards teachers' performance. School heads' leadership styles have a very weak influence on the performance of teachers, while school heads' communication strategies have a weak influence on the performance of teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Since contingent, democratic, instructional, and transformational leadership styles are consistently practiced, training and professional development programs for secondary school heads should reinforce these approaches. Emphasis may be placed on deepening skills in participatory decision-making, instructional supervision, and motivational strategies that inspire teachers and learners alike.
2. Empathetic communication and positive reinforcement obtained comparatively lower weighted means; it is advisable to design leadership development programs that specifically cultivate these areas. Training may include workshops on active listening, emotional intelligence, and constructive feedback, which can enhance the leaders' ability to foster supportive teacher-student relationships and sustain a motivating school climate.
3. It is recommended that schools and educational leaders continue to strengthen and sustain professional development initiatives in these domains. Such reinforcement will ensure that teachers' instructional practices remain dynamic, student-centered, and responsive to the evolving needs of learners. It is imperative to design targeted capacity-building programs that will enhance teachers' competencies in these critical areas. Workshops, peer-learning sessions, and mentoring activities should be implemented to promote a deeper understanding of authentic assessment strategies, effective use of feedback, and reflective practices that foster continuous professional growth.
4. Strengthen Transformational and Instructional Leadership Practices. Training programs for school heads should emphasize transformational and instructional leadership competencies—particularly those that inspire, motivate, and empower teachers to innovate and self-reflect. Mentoring systems

- and leadership workshops should be established to promote adaptive and context-sensitive leadership. School heads should cultivate empathy-driven communication, involving active listening, genuine feedback, and understanding of teachers' professional and personal contexts.
5. Communication training modules should focus on clarity, consistency, and relational communication to ensure that instructions, expectations, and feedback are well-understood and positively received. Leadership development programs should integrate positive reinforcement strategies that recognize teacher achievements and encourage reflective practices. Regular feedback sessions and peer communication channels should be institutionalized to maintain open and transparent professional dialogue.
 6. It is recommended that school systems and governing bodies prioritize leadership development programs that emphasize both adaptive leadership practices and strategic communication competencies. Specifically, school heads should be provided with structured training on transformational and participative leadership approaches, as these styles are often associated with higher levels of teacher motivation, commitment, and performance. Equally important is the cultivation of communication strategies that are transparent, two-way, and supportive, ensuring that information flows efficiently while also fostering trust, collaboration, and shared accountability among teachers.
 7. It is recommended that capacity-building efforts for school leaders should place greater emphasis on the refinement of effective communication practices. Clear, consistent, and supportive communication between school heads and teachers can foster collegiality, strengthen professional relationships, and enhance the overall teaching-learning environment. While leadership style demonstrated minimal impact, professional development programs should not disregard their role. Instead, such programs should encourage school heads to adopt more adaptive, participatory, and transformational leadership approaches that may yield stronger effects when combined with effective communication. Leadership development initiatives should thus integrate modules that link leadership practices with communication strategies, enabling school heads to exercise influence not only through managerial authority but also through collaborative engagement.

References

1. Abdi, S. J. (2023). *A Comprehensive Guide for Selecting Appropriate Statistical Tests: Understanding When to Use Parametric and Nonparametric Tests*. 464–474. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojs.2023.134023>
2. Ahmed, S. (2025). Strategic Communication by Principals and its Impact on Teachers' Job Performance in Post-basic Schools in North-East Nigeria. *Direct Research Journal of Education and Vocational Studies*, 7(October), 84–90. <https://journals.directresearchpublisher.org/index.php/drjevs,%0AResearch>
3. Akinwale, A. S., & Okotoni, C. A. (2018). Assessment of principals' communication styles and administrative impact on secondary schools in Osun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, 2(1), 43–48. <http://paper.researchbib.com/view/paper/167701>
4. Al-Kubaisi, H., Shahbal, S., Khan, A., Ahmad, Z., & Usman, M. (2022). Leadership Styles, Role, And Opportunities; Reflection In Educational Management System Article. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results*, 13(9), 1452–1465. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pnr.2022.13.S09.176>

5. Alimahan, G. A., & Ubayubay, R. M. (2025). Classroom Management Practices and Learning Environment in Select Districts, Division of Misamis Oriental. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 08(05), 2615–2624. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i05-38>
6. Alsaiari, O., Baghaei, N., Lahza, H., Lodge, J., Boden, M., & Khosravi, H. (2024). *Emotionally Enriched Feedback via Generative AI*. 1–19. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.15077>
7. Amici, M., & Cepiku, D. (2020). Performance management in international organizations. In *Performance Management in International Organizations* (Issue April, pp. 1–237). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39472-1>
8. Amos, O., Siamoo, P., & Ogoti, E. (2022). Influence of Delegation of Responsibility in Participative Leadership Style on Improving the Quality of Education in Public Secondary Schools in Arusha Region, Tanzania. *British Journal of Education*, 10(7), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.37745/bje.2013/vol10n7pp119>
9. Anorue, H. C., Ekuma, J. E., Olinya, T. O., & Nwandu, L. O. (2023). Empowering vocational educators instructional delivery through information and communication technology training in universities. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 17(4), 555–565. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v17i4.20311>
10. Ardiles Cruz, E. G. (2022). Modeling Social Learning: An Agent-Based Approach. *Old Dominion University, 2019*. <https://doi.org/10.25776/ppbs-8751>
11. Arifin, Suryaningsih, & Arifudin, O. (2024). The Relationship Between Classroom Environment, Teacher Professional Development, And Student Academic Performance In Secondary Education. *International Education Trend Issues*, 2(2), 151–159.
12. Asbari, M., Purwanto, A., Bernarto, I., Mayesti Wijayanti, L., & Chi Hyun, C. (2020). Effect of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Style. *Journal of Research in Business, Economics, and Education*, 2(2), 38–87. <http://e-journal.stie-kusumanegara.ac.id>
13. Asim, F. (2024). Effect of Formative Assessment on Student’s Achievement in Secondary Grades in Private Schools of Pakistan. *Open Access Education and Leadership Review*, 2(1), 27–38. [https://doi.org/10.59644/oaer.2\(1\).2024.112](https://doi.org/10.59644/oaer.2(1).2024.112)
14. Aunga, D. A. O., & Masare, O. (2017). Effect of Leadership Styles on Teacher’s Performance in Primary Schools of Arusha District Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 4(4), 42–52. <https://www.journalissues.org/IJEPRR/%0Ahttps://doi.org/10.15739/IJEPRR.17.006>
15. Avidov-Ungar, O. (2025). Empowering Teacher Professionalism Through Personalized Continuing Professional Learning: A Systematic Literature Review Using a Multidimensional Approach to Self-Assessment and Growth. *Education Sciences*, 15(12), 158–173. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15121686>
16. Azmi, N., & Musa, K. (2025). The Role Of Instructional Leadership , Teacher Efficacy , And Collaborative Practices In Shaping Teacher Development And Well-Being : A Systematic Review Of Current Educational. *International Journal Of Education, Psychology And Counselling (IJEPC)*, 10(61), 657–679. <https://doi.org/10.35631/IJEPC.1061046>
17. B. Decir, E. G., & L. Paglinawan, J. (2024). Communication Competence and Organizational Commitment on School Improvement Plan Implementation of School Heads. *International Journal*

- of *Scientific and Management Research*, 07(11), 246–260.
<https://doi.org/10.37502/ijfmr.2024.71122>
18. Baah, C., Govender, I., & Subramaniam, P. R. (2024). Enhancing Learning Engagement: A Study on Gamification's Influence on Motivation and Cognitive Load. *Education Sciences*, 14(10). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101115>
 19. BADATO, G. (2020). Transformational and Organizational Leadership of School Heads: Their Relationship with the Performance of Teachers. *SMCC Higher Education Research Journal*, 7(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.18868/sherj7j.07.010120.01>
 20. Bambaeroo, F., & Shokrpour, N. (2017). The impact of the teachers' non-verbal communication on success in teaching. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 5(2), 51–59. <https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v10i1.156>
 21. Barowski, J., & Karin Gonzalez. (2023). *Communication Skills | Definition, Types & Examples*. Study.Com. <https://study.com/academy/lesson/communication-skills-definition-examples.html>
 22. Beijaard, D., & Meijer, P. C. (2017). Developing the personal and professional in making a teacher identity. In *Research in Teacher Education*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402042.n10>
 23. Bowers, A. J. (2020). *Examining a congruency-typology model of leadership for learning using two-level latent class analysis with TALIS 2018*. 219. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/c963073b-en>
 24. Brandmo, C., & Gamlem, S. M. (2025). Students' perceptions and outcome of teacher feedback: a systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1572950>
 25. Bucata, G., & Rizescu, A. M. (2017). The Role Of Communication In Enhancing Work Effectiveness. *Revista Academiei Fortelor Terestre*, 1(85), 49–57. https://www.armyacademy.ro/reviste/rev1_2017/Bucata.pdf
 26. Bulado, A. M. M., Amper, M. I., Daling, Z. A. A., Entima, D. G. O., Madamba, S. B. L., Millara, L. S., Ombac, C. L. E., Paradiang, G. O., Pedronio, D. E., Semaña, A. M. G., Yucor, M. J. C., Clamares, K. J. M., & Pelandas, A. M. O. (2025). The Influence of Classroom Learning Environment and Study Habits on Academic Engagement of Junior High School Students. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 9(3), 1596–1607. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90300126>
 27. Bush, T., Kirezi, J., Ashford, R., & Glover, D. (2022). *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership School Leadership and Gender in Africa : A Systematic Overview*. December, 680–712.
 28. Cabigao, J. R. (2019). Professional competencies of school heads and their Impact on school outcome, organizational culture, and principals' performance. *Research Gate*, May 2019, 1–79.
 29. Cambay, D. J. D., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2024). Classroom Management Strategies and School Environment on Student Engagement. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 8(12), 1–13. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90300126>
 30. Carseta, C. M. D., Martinez, C. J. S., & Jesus, L. F. De. (2025). The Lens of Effective School Principals' Leadership Styles through Teachers' Preference: An Integrative Literature Review. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 9(5), 4388–4404. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS>
 31. Castillo, J. A. (2025). *School Heads Educational Leadership in Enhancing Proficient Teachers' Organizational Commitment and Teaching Effectiveness*. 8(1), 457–475.

32. Celestino, M. R. (2021). The principals' leadership styles and teachers' performance of selected elementary schools at the District of Norzagaray East. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies.*, 1(2), 274–313.
33. Cheng, Z., & Zhu, C. (2025). Academics' Leadership Styles and Their Motivation to Participate in a Leadership Training Program in the Digital Era. *Education Sciences*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030369>
34. Christie, P., & Lingard, B. (2020). Teachers and schooling making a difference: Productive pedagogies, assessment and performance. *Advance for Nurse Practitioners*, 13(9), 82.
35. Cirocki, A., Indrarathne, B., & Calderón, V. E. A. (2024). Effectiveness of professional development training on reflective practice and action research: a case study from Ecuador. *Reflective Practice*, 25(5), 676–694. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2024.2384124>
36. Comighud, S. M. T., & Arevalo, M. J. (2021). Motivation In Relation To Teachers' Performance. 2021 UBT International Conference. <https://knowledgecenter.ubt-uni.net/conference/2021UBTIC/all-events/507>
37. Costa, J., Mariana, P., & Moreira, A. C. (2023). Leadership Styles and Innovation Management: What Is the Role of Human Capital? *Administrative Sciences*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13020047>
38. Costa, L. M. G., & Reis, M. J. C. S. (2025). Motivational Teaching Techniques in Secondary and Higher Education: A Systematic Review of Active Learning Methodologies. *Digital*, 5(3), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/digital5030040>
39. Daramola, J. S. (2025). The Effect of Leadership Styles on Employee Performance in Higher Education: Evidence from a Tertiary Institution in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 9(14), 2281–2300. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.914MG00174>
40. DepEd. (2020). National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippines standards for school Head. In https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf.
41. Diadori, P. (2024). Nonverbal Communication in Classroom Interaction and Its Role in Italian Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. *Languages*, 9(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9050164>
42. Dung, L. Q. (2024). A Study On The Effects Of Critical Thinking On The Development Of Speaking Ability. 14(3), 375–384. <https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.14.03.2024.p14733>
43. Education, D. of. (2020). *DepEd Order No. 1, s. 2020: Guidelines for the National Educators Academy of the Philippines*.
44. Education, S. of. (2023). *Educational Leadership: Definition and Impact*. American University, Washington DC. <https://soeonline.american.edu/blog/educational-leadership/>
45. Eliseo, P. R. (2024). Enforcing Positive Discipline in the Classroom: Accounts of Elementary Teachers. *International Journal of Research in Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(4), 19–24.
46. Elpisah, E., Yahya, M., & Hartini, H. (2019). Study of Teacher Performance in South Sulawesi Through Intrinsic Motivation As an Intervening Variable. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 17(2), 244–253. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam.2019.017.02.07>
47. Eslaban, R. D., Garcia, N. P., & Amada, A. T. (2022). School Instructional Leadership of Far-Flung Schools in the New Normal. *International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning*, 9(2), 55–89. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6496649>

48. Fan, Y., & Nuruly, S. (2024). *The Impact of Leadership Style on Teachers ' Performance at SMP Al-Ikhlas Lombok*. 3(4), 607–622.
49. Ferdig, R., & Kennedy, K. (2020). Handbook of research on K–12 online and blended learning. In *ETC Press* (2nd Editio). ETC Press.
50. Ferrando, C. A., & Guhao, E. S. (2024). *Ethical Climate , Charismatic Leadership Of School Heads And Teachers ' Sense Of Self -Efficacy : A Structural Equation Model On Teacher Engagement Ethical Climate , Charismatic Leadership of School Heads and Teachers ' Sense of*. 2, 171–186. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11243541>
51. Francisco, L. B. (2022). School Heads as Instructional Leaders in Support of Teachers' Holistic Development. *American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 1(2), 14–27. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajiri.v1i2.498>
52. G. Soroño, C., & A. Quirap, E. (2023). School Heads' Instructional Leadership And Teachers' Performance. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 125(1), 356–366. <https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001251520234916>
53. Gandolfi, F., & Stone, S. (2017). The Emergence of Leadership Styles: A Clarified Categorization. *Review of International Comparative Management*, 18(1), 18–30. <https://rmci.ase.ro/no18vol1/02.pdf>
54. Gepila, E. C. (2020). Assessing teachers using Philippine standards for teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(3), 739–746. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080302>
55. Gisore, O. F., Ogalo, P., Benard, T. &, Nyatuka, O., Titus, O., & Benard, &. (2021). Influence of the Principal's Communication Skills on Students' Discipline in Public Day Secondary Schools in West Pokot Sub County, Kenya. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, 21(15).
56. Granaderos, R. D., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2025). *Technology Integration , Collaborative Cohesion , And Feedback Mechanisms On Teachers ' Instructional Delivery Skills In*. 10(3), 748–755.
57. Hadziahmetovic, N., & Salihovic, N. (2022). The Role of Transparent Communication and Leadership in Employee Engagement. *International Journal Of Academic Research In Economics And Management Sciences*, 11(2), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJAREMS/v11-i2/14067>
58. Halim, H. A., Hamzah, M. I., & Zulkifli, H. (2024). Secondary school teachers' conceptions of assessment: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 124(July 2023), 107958. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102311>
59. Hallinger, P. (2019). Science mapping the knowledge base on educational leadership and management from the emerging regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America, 1965–2018. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(2), 209–230. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218822772>
60. Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2020). Professional capital after the pandemic: Revisiting and revising classic understandings of teachers' work. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5(3–4), 327–336.
61. Haryadi, I., & Bahiroh, E. (2024). The Influence of Leadership Style on Employee Performance. *Indonesian Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Science and Technology*, 2(8), 1281–1288. <https://doi.org/10.55927/marcopolo.v2i8.7156>
62. Hasnanto, A. T. (2024). Effective Classroom Management to Create a Positive Learning Environment. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 4(001), 257–268. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v4i001.388>

63. Holley, P. (2020). *What is an “ Empathetic Communication Style ,” and Why Does it Increase Engagement with Your Team ?* <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/what-empathetic-communication-style-why-does-increase-perry-holley>
64. Hoque, K. E., & Raya, Z. T. (2023). Relationship between Principals’ Leadership Styles and Teachers’ Behavior. *Behavioral Sciences*, *13*(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13020111>
65. Huang, Y., Liu, H., & Huang, L. (2021). How transformational and contingent reward leaderships influence university faculty ’ s organizational commitment : the mediating effect of psychological empowerment. *Studies in Higher Education*, *46*(11), 2473–2490. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1723534>
66. Insider, L. (2024). *Teaching Performance definition*. Law Insider. <https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/teacher-performance>
67. Institute, T. (2023). *The Changing Role of School Leaders: Adapting to Modern Educational Needs Last updated on:* <https://teachers.institute/head-teachers-as-school-leaders/changing-role-school-leaders/>
68. Irwanto, S., & Maria, A. D. (2025). *Exploring the Role of Leadership in Managing Teacher Performance*. *3*(01), 279–290.
69. J. Stewart Black, & Bright, D. S. (2019). Organizational Behavior. In *OpenStax*. OpenStax.
70. Jaafar, S. B., Mamat Zambri, N., & Fathil, N. F. (2021). Leadership style: Is it autocratic, democratic or laissez-faire? *ASEAN Journal of Management and Business Studies*, *3*(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.26666/rmp.ajmbs.2021.1.1>
71. Jayme, P. I. B., & Tantiado, R. C. (2025). Teachers’ Classroom Management Practices and Learners’ Behavior. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, *08*(05), 2269–2277. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i05-04>
72. Jekelle, H. E. (2021). Leadership Styles Dimensions and Organizational Commitment Nexus: Evidence from a Public Sector in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Business*, *4*(1), 255–271. <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1992.04.01.336>
73. Jelovac, D. (2025). Redefining the Moral Attributes of an Excellent Secondary School Teacher. *Education Sciences*, *15*(7), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15070875>
74. Jin, J., & Ikeda, H. (2024). The Role of Empathic Communication in the Relationship between Servant Leadership and Workplace Loneliness: A Serial Mediation Model. *Behavioral Sciences*, *14*(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14010004>
75. Karabina, M. (2016). the Impact of Leadership Style To the Teachers’ Job Saticfaction. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *0*(0), 80–94.
76. Kaya, A. (2024). The association between transformational leadership and teachers ’ creativity : professional resilience and job satisfaction as mediators. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*(1990). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1514621>
77. Khuntia, U., & Sahoo, P. K. (2025). Impact of classroom management on student performance in secondary schools. *Journal of Education, Social & Communication Studies*, *2*(3), 175–185. <https://ojs.ptmjbb.com/index.php/JESCS>
78. Kim, S., & Lopez, J. (2022). Non-verbal Communication Cues in principal-teacher interactions. *Educational Studies*, *48*(4), 398–413.
79. Korpershoek, H., Harms, T., Boer, H., Kuijk, M., & Doolaard, S. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Classroom Management Strategies and Classroom Management Programs on Students

- Academic, Behavioral, Emotional, and Motivational Outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 86, 643–680. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626799>
80. Kotamena, F., Senjaya, P., & Prasetya, A. (2020). A Literature Review: Is Transformational Leadership Elitist and Antidemocratic. *International Journal of Social, Policy and Law*, 1(1), 36–43.
81. Legaspi, J. A., & Brobo, M. A. (2023). Classroom Management Practices and Teachers' Performances. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 128(1), 313–326. <https://doi.org/10.47119/10.47119/IJRP1001281720235224>
82. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.
83. Leithwood, Kenneth, Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
84. Li, J., & Yongqi Gu, P. (2024). Formative assessment for self-regulated learning: Evidence from a teacher continuing professional development programme. *System*, 125(July), 103414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103414>
85. Lima, L., de Oliveira Martins, A., Estrela, E., & Duarte, R. S. (2024). Challenges posed to leadership: systematic review based on the relationships between curricular autonomy and teachers' well-being. *Frontiers in Education*, 9(December). <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1520947>
86. Lin, F. (2023). Conflict Management and Communication Styles of Educational Leaders in Guangdong Business and Technology University: Towards a Leadership Development Training Program Fuchun. *Conflict Management and Communication Styles of Educational Leaders in Guangdong Business and Technology University: Towards a Leadership Development Training Program*, 128–165. <https://philarchive.org/rec/LINCMA-6>
87. Loquias, D. A. S. (2025). Instructors' Teaching Methods and Competence on the Teaching Performance of Pre-Service Teachers in Bukidnon. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 9(3s), 7077–7086. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS>
88. Luo, M., Albrecht, N., & Liu, Q. (2025). Classroom-Based Action Research: Facilitating a Robust Model of Teacher Professionalism. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 13(1), 40–50. <https://doi.org/10.31686/ijier.vol13.iss1.4250>
89. Macaday-Quioco, D. (2024). The Prevalent Skills and Competencies of Emotional Intelligence for Effective Educational Leadership: A Systematic Review of Literature. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 07(10), 4761–4765. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i10-22>
90. Malanog, J. S. (2025). Variety of School Heads Skills and Teachers' Efficiency of Towards Work. *International Journal of Science and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15063587/NIJSE.2025> Variety
91. Manafa, I. (2018). Communication skills needed by principals for effective management of secondary schools in Anambra State. *Online Journal of Arts, Management and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 17–25.
92. Mangulabnan, B., Dela rosa, R., & Vargas, D. (2021). Effects of Leadership Styles and Conflict Management Strategies To School Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 6(8), 7638–7657. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3804898>

93. Meneses-la-riva, M. E., Suyo-vega, J. A., Ocupa-cabrera, H. G., Alvarado-suyo, S. A., & Fernández-bedoya, V. H. (2026). Transformational , Transactional , and Ethical Leadership in Sustainable Family Entrepreneurship: A Global Systematic Review. *Administrative Sciences*, 16(120), 1–38. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci16030120>
94. Mestry, R. (2017). Principals ’ perspectives and experiences of their instructional leadership functions to enhance learner achievement in public schools Raj Mestry. *Journal of Education*, 69, 257–280. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i69a11>
95. Mey, M. R., Poisat, P., & Stindt, C. (2021). The influence of leadership behaviours on talent retention: An empirical study. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v19i0.1504>
96. Moafia Nader, Aziz, F., & Khanam, A. (2019). Role of Instructional Leadership in Successful Execution of Curriculum: Head Teachers’ Perspective. *Global Social Sciences Review*, IV(IV), 317–323.
97. Molenda, M. (2017). In search of the elusive ADDIE model. *Performance Improvement*, 56(1), 40–42.
98. Morales, J. (2022). The Evaluation of Teacher Performance in Higher Education. *International Journal of Science and Society*, 4(3), 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.54783/ijssoc.v4i3.507>
99. Morin, K. L., Ganz, J. B., & Nagro, S. A. (2020). Video analysis as a professional development tool for teachers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(3), 302–315.
100. Mull, M. (2020). The Influence of School Principals’ Communications Styles on Experienced Teachers’ Job Satisfaction [Ashford University]. In *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses*. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/b0c57fce67a598e5aa9ced8bc74e2fe1/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
101. Nakamura, Y. T., & Milner, J. (2023). Inclusive leadership via empathic communication. *Organizational Dynamics*, 52(1), 2023–2026. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2023.100957>
102. Nazim, F., & Mahmood, A. (2016). Principals’ Transformational and Transactional Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction of College Teachers. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(34), 18–22. www.iiste.org
103. Neiroukh, N., Ansari, A. A., Dalu, R. A., Khlaif, E., Barahmah, D., Zubeidi, J., Shtayeh, B., & Daher, W. (2024). Organizational communication competence of public secondary school principals through utilizing WhatsApp. *Frontiers in Education*, 9(May), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1374279>
104. Nitko, A. J., & Brookhart, S. M. (2021). *Assessment and Evaluation in Education: Concepts and Practices* (8th ed.). Pearson. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-61735-507-320251017>
105. Norris, J., & Walker, P. (2020). The power of body language in school leadership. *Journal of Educational Psychology and Leadership*, 12(1), 56–71.
106. Ocampo, O. R., & Chua, E. N. (2023). Contingency Leadership Model in a Changing Educational Landscape for an Improved Work Commitment and Performance of Classroom Executives. *International Journal of Social Science Humanity & Management Research*, 2(09). <https://doi.org/10.58806/ijsshmr.2023.v2i9n14>
107. Ong, W. J. (2022). Gender-contingent effects of leadership on loneliness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(7), 1180.

108. Oshin, L. O., & Badmus, T. A. (2021). Teachers' competencies and utilization of ICT for instructional delivery in post-COVID-19 classrooms. *International Journal of Education and Development Using ICT*, 17(4), 122–135.
109. Osias, N., & Ladica, R. (2024). Work Ethics on Teachers' Behavior, Attitude and Performance: Basis for Professional Development Plan. *American Journal of Arts and Human Science*, 3(3), 41–70. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajahs.v3i3.3046>
110. Ounis, A. (2016). Investigating the role of ICT in teaching English at the tertiary level. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 1036–1059.
111. Paguta, N. (2021). Mentoring practices for new lecturers: Enhancing professionalism in higher education. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 11(2), 56–67.
112. Parveen, K., Quang Bao Tran, P., Kumar, T., & Shah, A. H. (2022). Impact of Principal Leadership Styles on Teacher Job Performance: An Empirical Investigation. *Frontiers in Education*, 7(May). <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.814159>
113. Pizzolitto, E., Verna, I., & Venditti, M. (2023). Authoritarian leadership styles and performance : a systematic literature review and research agenda. *Management Review Quarterly*, 73(2), 841–871. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-022-00263-y>
114. Prananto, K., Cahyadi, S., Lubis, F. Y., & Hinduan, Z. R. (2025). Perceived teacher support and student engagement among higher education students – a systematic literature review. *BMC Psychology*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02412-w>
115. Quansah, F. (2020). Validity of students' evaluation of teaching in higher education: A systematic review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(7), 1033–1049.
116. Ralebese, M. D., Jita, L. C., & Badmus, O. T. (2025). Perceptions and practices of principals: examining instructional leadership for curriculum reform. *Frontiers in Education*, 10(May), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1591106>
117. Ranganathan, P. (2021). *An Introduction to Statistics : Choosing the Correct Statistical Test*. 1–3.
118. Rave, R., Itzhakov, G., Weinstein, N., & Reis, H. T. (2023). How to get through hard times: Principals' listening buffers teachers' stress on turnover intention and promotes organizational citizenship behavior. *Current Psychology*, 42(28), 24233–24248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03529-6>
119. Renita, Gagaramusu, Y. B. M., Hariana, K., Purnamasari, D. I., & Wilade, S. (2026). Building Student Discipline Through Classroom Management Strategies : A Qualitative Study in Indonesian Elementary Schools. *Journal Of Innovation And Research In Primary Education*, 5(1), 1761–1775. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.56916/jirpe.v5i1.3223>
120. Rino, P. P., & Setiawan, D. (2025). Disciplined Behaviour And Students' Responsibility Through The Role Of The Classroom Environment: A Qualitative Study. *JTP - Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan*, 27(1), 253–264. <https://doi.org/10.21009/jtp.v27i1.54148>
121. Rito, P. N. (2024). The Use Of Gamification Techniques In Higher Education: A Literature Review On Support Technologies. *ICERI2024 Proceedings*, 4774–4781. <https://doi.org/10.21125/iceri.2024.1176>
122. Rivera, L. (2023). Tone and facial expression as indicators of principal support. *Teacher Development*, 27(1), 79–96.

123. Sagun, I. G. (2025). *Enhancing Filipino Teaching Pedagogy: A Proposed Program To Improve Teachers' Instructional Competence*. 10(9), 692–704.
124. Sarah Lewis. (2025). The Effects of a Non-Vocal Individual's Prerequisite Skills on the Mode of Communication Used for Manding [Capella University]. In *Capella University ProQuest Dissertations & Theses*.
<https://www.proquest.com/openview/0820b8b4c572eed4d642dcadf72bb76d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
125. Sasan, J. M. V., & Timtim, J. M. F. (2024). *Leadership Styles and School Climate: Implications for Educational Outcomes*. 2010–2011.
126. Schildkamp, K., van der Kleij, F. M., Heitink, M. C., Kippers, W. B., & Veldkamp, B. P. (2020). Formative assessment: A systematic review of critical teacher prerequisites for classroom practice. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 103(January), 101602.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101602>
127. Şenol, H., & Lesinger, F. Y. (2018). The Relationship between Instructional Leadership Style, Trust and School Culture. *IntechOpen*. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.75950>
128. Seprudin. (2024). Teacher Professional Development: A Systematic Literature Review on Strategies for Effective Continuous Learning Pengembangan Profesi Guru: Tinjauan Pustaka Sistematis. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Approach Sciences and Technologies (MULTI)*, 1(1), 45–54. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.62207>
129. Shala, B., Prebreza, A., & Ramosaj, B. (2021). The Contingency Theory of Management as a Factor of Acknowledging the Leaders-Managers of Our Time Study Case: The Practice of the Contingency Theory in the Company Avrios. *OALib*, 08(09), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1107850>
130. Sharma, H., Jain, V., Mogaji, E., & Babbili, A. (2023). Restorative Power of Empathetic Communication for Participatory Governance and Community Well-Being. *International Journal of Communication*, 17, 7115–7138.
131. Simfuego, K., & Doronio, F. I. R. (2025). Impact Of Leadership And Administrative Practices On Teacher Performance And Job Satisfaction: A Quantitative Inquiry. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, 11(4), 1286–1319.
132. Sofia, Syaidah, K., & Shunhaji, A. (2023). Principal's Effective Communication and Teacher Performance: A Classroom Perspective. *Kelola Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 10(2), 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.24246/j.jk.2023.v10.i2.p101-114>
133. Suh, R. (2024). *Instructional Leadership*. EBSCO Information Services, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-588-4_100536
134. Sumagang, S. J., & Balano, N. L. (2025). Embracing Diversity: General Education Teachers' Lived Experiences in Teaching Learners with Special Needs in an Inclusive Setting. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, XII(VI), 729–739. <https://doi.org/10.51244/ijrsi.2025.12060059>
135. Tan, C., & Koh, J. (2024). Reflection and instructional improvement in K-12 teaching. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-022-09304-x>
136. Tancredi, H., Graham, L. J., Killingly, C., & Sweller, N. (2025). Investigating the impact of Accessible Pedagogies on the experiences and engagement of students with language and/or attentional difficulties. *Learning Environments Research*, 28(2), 289–306. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-024-09514-z>

137. Tansiongco, L. A., & Ibarra, F. (2020). Educational Leader's Adversity Quotient, Management Style, and Job Performance: Implications to School Leadership. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education |IRJE|*, 4(2), 386–401. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v4i2.9264>
138. Thompson, J. H., Mcbride-, K., Hales, C., & Rook, H. (2022). Understanding of empathetic communication in acute hospital settings: a scoping review. *BMJ Open*, 12(9). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-063375>
139. *understanding-different-leadership-styles*. (2024). <https://www.Nsls.Org/Understanding-Different-Leadership-Styles>. <https://www.nsls.org/understanding-different-leadership-styles>
140. Utami, B. Y., Al-kadri, H., & Padang, U. N. (2024). *The Influence of Principal Transformational Leadership on Teacher Performance and Learning Quality in Schools*. 6(2), 555–559.
141. Valerio, C. J. C., & Ching, D. A. (2024). Adaptive Competencies and Contingency Leadership Practices towards Organizational Performance in Public Elementary Schools. *Twist Journal*, 19(3), 503–520. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10049652#257>
142. Veerapu, N., Swaminathan, P. S., & Nallamotu, V. C. (2023). Non-verbal communication skills among teaching staff and medical students in a medical educational Institution in. *International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences*, 11(12), 4376–4378. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.18203/2320-6012.ijrms20233702>
143. Voelkel, R. J. H., Prusak, K. J., & Tassell, F. Van. (2024). Effective Principal Leadership Behaviors That Enhance Teacher Collective Efficacy. *Education Sciences*, 14(4), 431. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14040431>
144. Warman, W., Poernomo, S. A., Januar, S., & Amon, L. (2021). Leadership Style and Principal Supervision in Improving Teacher Performance at State High Schools in Kutai Kartanegara Regency, East Kalimantan Province, Indonesia. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 2(1), 17–24. <https://doi.org/10.35877/454ri.eduline581>
145. Yan, Z., & Pastore, S. (2022). Are teachers literate in formative assessment? The development and validation of the Teacher Formative Assessment Literacy Scale. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 74(June), 101183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2022.101183>
146. Zeedan, R. (2024). College student engagement and success through inclusive learning environment and experiential learning in courses about Israel and Palestine. *Frontiers in Education*, 9(December). <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1497045>
147. Zega, N. A. (2025). Strategic Leadership: Enhancing Teacher Performance Through Principal Leadership And Effective Communication. *Inovasi Pembangunan : Jurnal Kelitbangan*, 13(02), 247–256. <https://doi.org/10.35450/jip.v13i2.1140>
148. Zhang, Y., & Li, C. (2025). Leveraging pedagogical knowledge for effective technology integration in education: A research-based approach. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 130(102553). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2025.102553>
149. Zuo, X. (2025). Communication Transparency in School Management and Teachers' Organizational Trust in a University in Beijing, China. *Pacific International Journal*, 8(5), 97–104. <https://doi.org/10.55014/pij.v8i5.885>