International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Leadership Approaches of Elementary School Principals in Parang West District: Influence on Teachers' Instructional Efficacy

Shermahal P. Amilhasan

Graduate School of Education, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Capitol Site, Patikul, Sulu, Philippines

Abstract

School principals are pivotal to the quality of instruction, yet empirical evidence on how their leadership approaches shape teachers' instructional efficacy in underserved, conflict-affected regions of the Philippines remains limited. This study examines the leadership approaches practiced by elementary school principals in Parang West District, Sulu, and determines their influence on teachers' instructional efficacy. A quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design was employed. Respondents consisted of 65 teachers and 8 principals drawn from 11 elementary schools using universal sampling. Data were gathered through validated Likert-scale questionnaires assessing three leadership dimensions—autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire—and teachers' Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings as a proxy measure of instructional efficacy. Descriptive statistics (mean, SD) and Spearman's rank-order correlation (ρ) were used for analysis. The democratic leadership approach was most prevalent among principals ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.35$ for self-report; $M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.39$ for teacher perception), with evidence of mixed leadership traits. Teachers reported a slight overall impact of principals' leadership on classroom instructional practices (general $M = 2.44$). Spearman's correlation analysis found no statistically significant relationship between any leadership style and teacher instructional efficacy (Autocratic: $\rho = .076$, $p = .545$; Democratic: $\rho = -.020$, $p = .877$; Laissez-faire: $\rho = -.019$, $p = .881$). Although democratic leadership dominates in the district, it does not significantly predict teachers' instructional efficacy as measured by IPCRF ratings. These findings suggest that teacher performance is influenced by contextual factors beyond leadership style alone and point to the need for multi-faceted professional development and further qualitative inquiry in remote and resource-constrained school contexts.

Keywords: autocratic leadership, democratic leadership, instructional efficacy, laissez-faire leadership, school principals, Sulu, Philippines, teacher performance

1. INTRODUCTION

The quality of school leadership is widely acknowledged as a critical determinant of educational outcomes, second only to classroom teaching in its potential to influence student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2020). School principals are expected not only to manage administrative operations but also to foster professional climates that enhance teachers' confidence, competence, and instructional effectiveness. This dual mandate places leadership style at the center of discussions on school improvement, particularly in contexts marked by resource constraints and geographic isolation.

In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) has consistently emphasized the role of school heads in facilitating professional development and sustaining a culture of continuous improvement. The Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) serves as the nation's standard instrument for evaluating teacher performance across instructional, professional, and school-community dimensions. Despite this policy emphasis, the relationship between principal leadership approaches and teachers' instructional efficacy remains underexplored, particularly in geographically remote and historically underserved communities such as those found in the province of Sulu.

Parang West District in Sulu comprises 11 elementary schools scattered across rural barangays, many in proximity to coastal areas and accessible only by extended travel. These schools operate in a sociocultural context characterized by a predominantly Muslim population, limited infrastructural support, and a history of armed conflict that has periodically disrupted schooling. In such settings, the capacity of principals to adopt appropriate leadership strategies may carry heightened significance for teachers' morale, motivation, and instructional performance.

Three classical leadership frameworks have dominated educational leadership research: (1) autocratic leadership, characterized by centralized authority, hierarchical decision-making, and close supervision (Lewin et al., 1939); (2) democratic (participative) leadership, which involves staff in decision-making, fosters collaboration, and promotes open communication; and (3) laissez-faire leadership, a hands-off approach granting considerable autonomy to subordinates (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985). Each approach has been linked—with varying degrees of empirical support—to different dimensions of teacher motivation and instructional behavior.

Teacher instructional efficacy, derived from Bandura's (1977) social-cognitive theory of self-efficacy, refers to teachers' beliefs in their capability to organize and execute instructional strategies that lead to meaningful student learning outcomes—even among academically challenged or unmotivated students (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). High levels of instructional efficacy have been consistently associated with sustained instructional effort, use of diverse pedagogical strategies, resilience in the face of difficulty, and improved student achievement (Klassen & Tze, 2014; Zee & Koomen, 2016).

Despite the theoretical salience of these constructs, empirical investigations into how different principal leadership styles relate to teacher instructional efficacy in underserved Philippine school districts are sparse. Most existing studies in the Philippine context focus on urban or semi-urban settings and employ self-reported efficacy scales rather than performance-based measures. This study addresses that gap by utilizing actual IPCRF ratings as a performance-based proxy measure of instructional efficacy in a remote, predominantly Muslim school district.

1.1 Research Objectives

This study was designed to:

1. Describe the demographic profile of principal and teacher respondents in Parang West District.
2. identify the dominant leadership approach practiced by principals;
3. determine the perceived impact of principals' leadership on teachers' instructional practices; and
4. Examine the relationship between principal leadership approaches and teacher instructional efficacy.

1.2 Hypotheses

H_0: There is no significant relationship between the leadership approaches of elementary school principals and the instructional efficacy of teachers in Parang West District.

H_1: There is a significant relationship between the leadership approaches of elementary school principals and the instructional efficacy of teachers in Parang West District.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Foundations of Leadership

Scholarly interest in leadership theory dates to the early twentieth century, when researchers debated whether leaders are born (the Great Man Theory; Carlyle, 1841) or made through experience and social learning. Contemporary leadership scholarship recognizes that effectiveness is contingent on situational factors rather than fixed traits alone—a position articulated by Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Theory and Hersey and Blanchard's (1969) Situational Leadership Model. Both frameworks hold that no single leadership style is universally effective; instead, effectiveness depends on the interplay between the leader's behavioral tendencies and situational variables such as follower readiness, task structure, and position power.

Transformational leadership theory, originally conceptualized by Burns (1978) and operationalized by Bass (1985), has garnered considerable empirical attention in educational contexts. Transformational leaders motivate followers by connecting their individual identities to a shared organizational vision, encouraging intellectual stimulation, and providing individualized consideration. The Full-Range Leadership Model (Bass & Avolio, 1994) further distinguishes transformational behaviors from transactional (reward-and-punishment) behaviors and laissez-faire (passive-avoidant) behaviors, offering a comprehensive typology that informs the present study's conceptual framework.

2.2 Principal Leadership and Teacher Efficacy

A growing body of research documents the indirect pathways through which principal leadership influences teacher efficacy. Heck and Marcoulides (1993) identified four instructional leadership practices—supportive supervision, professional development, collaborative learning communities, and instructional coaching—that consistently predict positive teacher outcomes. Goddard et al. (2015) demonstrated that principals who cultivate a culture of collective efficacy contribute to elevated individual teacher self-efficacy beliefs. Similarly, Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) found that transformational leadership behaviors predicted teacher commitment and professional engagement in Canadian schools.

In the Philippine context, Rodriguez and Ibiloa (2019) reported that democratic and instructional leadership styles were positively associated with teacher performance in Mindanao schools, while Arcena (2021) found that transformational principals significantly boosted teachers' sense of classroom efficacy in Davao Region public schools. These studies suggest a context-specific relationship between leadership and teacher outcomes that may not hold uniformly across all districts, particularly those facing unique socioeconomic and security challenges.

2.3 Bandura's Self-Efficacy Framework Applied to Teaching

Bandura (1977, 1986) proposed that self-efficacy—a person's belief in their capacity to execute behaviors required to produce specific outcomes—is shaped by four primary sources: mastery experiences, vicarious learning, social persuasion, and physiological states. Applied to teaching, instructional efficacy reflects a teacher's judgment about their ability to engage students in meaningful learning activities, manage classroom behavior, and adapt instruction to diverse learner needs (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Caprara et al. (2006) further linked teacher self-efficacy to personality traits, particularly conscientiousness and openness to experience, while Sousa et al. (2012) found that personal values—notably conservation values—predicted self-efficacy among professionals working in institutional settings.

These theoretical insights suggest that instructional efficacy is multiply determined—shaped not only by school leadership but also by personal dispositions, prior professional experiences, training quality,

resource availability, and the broader organizational climate. This multi-causal view provides the interpretive lens for understanding the null results obtained in the present study.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study adopted a quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component characterized the demographic profile of respondents and the distribution of leadership approaches and instructional efficacy scores. The correlational component employed Spearman's rank-order correlation to examine associations between principal leadership approaches and teacher instructional efficacy. This non-parametric statistic was chosen given the ordinal nature of Likert-scale data and to avoid assumptions of normality with the small principal sample (n = 8).

3.2 Setting and Participants

The study was conducted in Parang West District, Municipality of Parang, Sulu Province, Philippines. The district encompasses 11 elementary schools (8 main schools and 3 annexes) situated in rural barangays, with several located near coastal areas. The schools are geographically dispersed and require extended travel time from the municipal center.

Universal sampling was employed to capture all permanent and classroom teachers within the district. The final sample comprised 65 teacher respondents and 8 principal respondents across the 11 schools. The distribution of respondents by school is detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by School

School	Teachers (n)	Principals (n)
Alu Layag-Layag ES	11	1
Alu Panggoh PS (Annex)	1	—
Buka-Buka PS	4	1
Taingting PS (Annex)	1	—
Kahoy Sinah ES	8	1
Kutah Sairap ES	6	1
Hadji Panglima Tingkahan ES	6	1
Sampunay Upper PS	4	1
Sampunay Lower PS (Annex)	1	—
Silangkan ES	16	1
Utoh Laja Sangkula ES	7	1
Total	**65**	**8**

Note. ES = Elementary School; PS = Primary School (Annex). n = sample size.

3.3 Instruments

Two survey instruments were administered:

1. Leadership Approaches Questionnaire (LAQ). A 10-item Likert-scale instrument (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) adopted from Lewin et al. (1939) and Campbell (2024) assessed three leadership dimensions: Autocratic (4 items), Democratic (4 items), and Laissez-faire (2 items). The questionnaire was administered in parallel to both principals (self-assessment) and teachers (perception of their principal).
2. Teachers' Instructional Efficacy Scale (TIES). A 10-item Likert-scale instrument adapted from Betts et al. (2013) and Troop-Gordon et al. (2019) measured teachers' perceived impact of leadership on ten classroom instructional practices (e.g., activating prior knowledge, guiding text-based comprehension, facilitating collaborative activities). Scores were interpreted using anchors: 1.00–1.80 = No impact; 1.81–2.60 = Slight impact; 2.61–3.40 = Moderate impact; 3.41–4.20 = High impact; 4.21–5.00 = Very high impact.

Additionally, IPCRF ratings—the official DepEd annual performance appraisal tool—were obtained as an objective, performance-based measure of teacher instructional efficacy. Spearman's correlation was computed between IPCRF ratings and all three leadership approach mean scores.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

Following institutional approval from the Parang West District focal person and individual school principals, the researcher personally distributed and retrieved questionnaires from respondents. An orientation session was conducted to explain the purpose of the study and ensure informed consent. Anonymity was preserved: respondents were not required to provide their names. Data collection took place during the first quarter of the 2024–2025 academic year.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary. Written consent was obtained from all respondents before survey administration. Respondents were assured of the confidentiality of their responses, and no personally identifiable information was recorded in the dataset. The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of Mindanao State University-Sulu's Graduate School of Education.

3.6 Data Analysis

Frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations were computed to describe the demographic profile and leadership approach distributions. Spearman's rank-order correlation (ρ) was used to test H_0, with the significance threshold set at $\alpha = .05$ (two-tailed). All analyses were performed using SPSS v26.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 2 presents the age distribution of principals and teachers. The workforce in Parang West District is relatively mature: the largest proportion of teachers (31.5%) was in the 51–60 age bracket, followed by those aged 41–50 (26.0%). Only 6.8% of teachers were 30 years old or younger. Among principals, most (6.8%) were also in the 51–60 age range, with only one principal aged 20–30 (1.4%) and two in the 41–50 range (2.7%).

Table 2: Age Distribution of Respondents

Age Group	Role	n	% of Total
20–30	Principal	1	1.4%
	Teacher	5	6.8%
31–40	Principal	0	0.0%
	Teacher	16	21.9%
41–50	Principal	2	2.7%
	Teacher	19	26.0%
51–60	Principal	5	6.8%
	Teacher	23	31.5%
61–70	Principal	0	0.0%
	Teacher	2	2.7%

Note. N = 73 (65 teachers + 8 principals).

Table 3 shows that the workforce is predominantly female: 80.8% of teachers and 6.8% of principals were female. Only 8.2% of teachers were male, reflecting national trends of female predominance in Philippine elementary education.

Table 3 Gender Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Role	n	% of Total
Female	Principal	5	6.8%
	Teacher	59	80.8%
Male	Principal	3	4.1%
	Teacher	6	8.2%

Regarding educational attainment (Table 4), the majority of teacher respondents (87.7%) held a bachelor's degree, with one teacher (1.4%) holding a master's degree. Among principals, seven (9.6%) held a bachelor's degree, and one (1.4%) held a doctoral degree. Notably, no principal held a master's degree, which represents a gap relative to DepEd requirements for school-head positions that recommend graduate education.

Table 4: Educational Attainment of Respondents

Educational Attainment	Role	n	% of Total
Bachelor's Degree	Principal	7	9.6%
	Teacher	64	87.7%

Master's Degree	Principal	0	0.0%
	Teacher	1	1.4%
Doctoral Degree	Principal	1	1.4%
	Teacher	0	0.0%

4.2 Dominant Leadership Approach Among Principals

Table 5 presents descriptive statistics for the three leadership approaches as rated by both school heads (self-report) and teachers (perception). Among all three approaches, democratic leadership received the highest mean ratings from both principals (M = 3.75, SD = 0.35) and teachers (M = 3.61, SD = 0.39). Laissez-faire leadership was rated second highest by both groups (School Head: M = 3.56, SD = 0.42; Teacher: M = 3.47, SD = 0.40), while autocratic leadership received the lowest mean scores (School Head: M = 3.44, SD = 0.42; Teacher: M = 3.33, SD = 0.42).

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Approaches by Role

Leadership Approach	Respondent Group	M	SD
Autocratic	School Head	3.44	0.42
	Teacher	3.33	0.42
Democratic	School Head	3.75	0.35
	Teacher	3.61	0.39
Laissez-faire	School Head	3.56	0.42
	Teacher	3.47	0.40

Note. Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.

At the item level (Table 6), democratic leadership indicators received the highest ratings, particularly fostering collaboration and open communication (M = 3.71) and involving staff in decision-making (M = 3.66). Among autocratic indicators, acting as the primary spokesperson for the school and giving clear orders were equally rated (both M = 3.60), while using rewards and punishment was the lowest-rated item across all dimensions (M = 2.73). These patterns suggest that while principals identify with democratic leadership as their primary approach, elements of autocratic and laissez-faire behavior remain present, indicating situationally flexible or hybrid leadership practice.

Table 6 Item-Level Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Approach Indicators

Item	M
Autocratic Approach	
The principal closely supervises staff	3.44
The principal uses rewards and punishment to motivate staff	2.73

The principal acts as the primary spokesperson for the school	3.60
The principal gives orders and clarifies procedures	3.60
Democratic Approach	
The principal involves staff in decision-making	3.66
The principal provides guidance and support without micromanaging	3.49
The principal fosters collaboration and open communication	3.71
The principal maintains positive relationships with staff	3.64
Laissez-faire Approach	
The principal allows staff significant autonomy	3.47
The principal trusts the staff to make sound judgments	3.49

Note. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale by teacher respondents (N = 65).

4.3 Impact of Leadership Approaches on Teachers' Instructional Practices

Table 7 presents teachers' perceived impact of principals' leadership on ten classroom instructional practices. The general mean across all items was 2.44 (SD not reported at scale level), corresponding to a slight impact on the adopted interpretation scale. The highest-rated items were using various assessment methods (M = 2.83, SD = 0.38, moderate impact), encouraging learners to read independently (M = 2.75, SD = 0.50, moderate impact), and guiding learners to determine word meanings from context (M = 2.62, SD = 0.65, slight–moderate boundary). The lowest-rated item was encouraging learners to predict story content based on clues (M = 1.91, SD = 0.74, slight impact).

Table 7 Teachers' Perceived Impact of Principal Leadership on Instructional Practices (N = 65)

Instructional Practice	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Helping learners understand the lesson using prior knowledge	2.54	0.61	Slight Impact
2. Guiding learners to determine word meanings from context	2.62	0.65	Slight Impact
3. Teaching learners to analyze word parts (roots, prefixes, suffixes)	2.25	0.71	Slight Impact
4. Having learners discuss the text theme before reading	2.17	0.76	Slight Impact
5. Encouraging learners to predict story content based on clues	1.91	0.74	Slight Impact
6. Having learners identify the main idea and key events in a text	2.51	0.50	Slight Impact
7. Guiding learners to summarize texts and stories	2.51	0.50	Slight Impact

8. Encouraging learners to read independently (self-selected text)	2.75	0.50	Moderate Impact
9. Having learners engage in collaborative activities (e.g., discussion)	2.29	0.68	Slight Impact
10. Using various assessment methods (quizzes, projects) to evaluate learning	2.83	0.38	Moderate Impact
General Mean	2.44	—	Slight Impact

Note. Scale interpretation: 1.00–1.80 = No impact; 1.81–2.60 = Slight impact; 2.61–3.40 = Moderate impact; 3.41–4.20 = High impact; 4.21–5.00 = Very high impact.

4.4 Relationship Between Leadership Approaches and Teacher Instructional Efficacy

To test H_0, Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficients were computed between each leadership approach score and teachers' IPCRF ratings (Table 8). None of the correlations reached statistical significance. The correlation between autocratic leadership and IPCRF was negligible and non-significant ($\rho = .076$, $p = .545$). Democratic leadership showed an equally negligible and non-significant negative correlation ($\rho = -.020$, $p = .877$), as did laissez-faire leadership ($\rho = -.019$, $p = .881$). Accordingly, H_0 is retained: there is no statistically significant relationship between principal leadership approaches and teacher instructional efficacy in this sample.

Table 8 Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation Between Leadership Approaches and Teacher IPCRF Ratings

Variable	Leadership Approach	ρ	p-value
IPCRF Rating	Autocratic	.076	.545
	Democratic	−.020	.877
	Laissez-faire	−.019	.881

Note. N = 65. Two-tailed significance threshold: $\alpha = .05$. ρ = Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient. IPCRF = Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Democratic Leadership as the Dominant Approach

The finding that democratic leadership is the most prominent style among principals in Parang West District aligns with national educational policies that emphasize participatory school governance and distributed decision-making (DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2021). The relatively high mean scores for collaborative and communication-oriented behaviors are consistent with literature showing that democratic principals are more likely to build trust, encourage teacher voice, and sustain professional learning communities (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). However, the moderate means observed across all three leadership styles (ranging from 3.33 to 3.75 on a 5-point scale) suggest that none of the approaches is practiced in an extreme or exclusive form.

The co-occurrence of democratic, laissez-faire, and autocratic elements across items supports a pattern of situational or hybrid leadership, consistent with Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Theory and Hersey and

Blanchard's (1969) Situational Leadership Model. In rural, resource-scarce schools, principals may shift between directive behaviors (e.g., acting as the primary spokesperson, giving clear procedures) for operational decisions, and participative behaviors for professional and instructional matters. The notably low score for using rewards and punishment (M = 2.73) indicates restrained reliance on transactional control mechanisms, which may reflect cultural norms of collegial respect prevalent in Muslim-majority communities of Sulu.

5.2 Modest Perceived Impact on Instructional Practices

The slight overall impact (general M = 2.44) that teachers attributed to principal leadership on their instructional practices calls for careful interpretation. While the democratic approach is associated with open communication and supportive supervision, teachers may not directly attribute gains in specific instructional behaviors—such as text-prediction strategies or collaborative discussion facilitation—to the principal's leadership. This may reflect the primarily administrative rather than instructional orientation of principals in the district, a finding consistent with Torres (2019), who observed that Philippine school heads frequently allocate disproportionate time to administrative compliance rather than instructional leadership.

Moderate impact was observed for assessment-related practices and encouraging independent reading, suggesting that where principals actively resource or monitor these practices, teachers perceive leadership as relevant. This aligns with Heck and Marcoulides' (1993) finding that principal support for assessment and professional development is among the most impactful instructional leadership behaviors. The slight impact on comprehension and collaborative learning strategies may indicate that instructional coaching in these domains is underdeveloped in the district.

5.3 Null Correlation Between Leadership Approaches and IPCRF Ratings

The absence of statistically significant correlations between any leadership approach and teachers' IPCRF ratings is the most consequential finding of this study. Several explanations warrant consideration.

First, the IPCRF is a multi-dimensional performance appraisal tool that encompasses teaching-learning processes, student outcomes, professional development, and community engagement. While principal leadership may influence the teaching-learning dimension, its effect may be diluted or confounded across the broader IPCRF domains, which are also shaped by individual teacher motivation, subject matter expertise, available learning materials, and parent-community support.

Second, the small number of principal respondents (n = 8) significantly limits statistical power. With fewer than 10 leaders, even substantively meaningful leadership differences may not produce detectable correlational signals when aggregated at the teacher level. Future studies should consider multilevel modeling approaches that appropriately account for teacher-within-principal nesting.

Third, the present study assessed leadership approaches through self-report and teacher perception, which captures the direction and style of leadership as experienced by teachers but may not capture the frequency, intensity, or quality of specific leadership behaviors. Observational or behavioral-frequency measures might yield different results. Consistent with the multi-causal model of teacher efficacy (Bandura, 1986; Caprara et al., 2006), factors such as teacher experience, training quality, collegial relationships, classroom resource adequacy, and socio-cultural community dynamics may account for more variance in IPCRF ratings than leadership style alone.

Fourth, the socio-political context of Sulu—including periodic security disruptions, geographic isolation, and infrastructural constraints—may attenuate the otherwise documented positive relationship between democratic leadership and teacher efficacy. Teachers in such contexts may develop high levels of

professional resilience and internal motivation largely independent of leadership style, as survival and community service become intrinsic professional values.

5.4 Implications for Practice and Policy

These findings carry several practical implications. For school district administrators and DepEd regional offices, the results signal that simply promoting democratic leadership—while valuable—may be insufficient to measurably enhance teacher performance. Leadership development programs should be complemented by targeted instructional coaching, mentoring of experienced teachers, and investment in instructional materials and technology.

Given that the majority of the teaching workforce is in the 51–60 age bracket and holds only a bachelor's degree, succession planning and graduate scholarship programs are urgently needed. The district should also consider structured mentorship programs that leverage the pedagogical wisdom of senior teachers while progressively building the instructional leadership capacity of principals.

6. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the leadership approaches of elementary school principals in Parang West District, Sulu, Philippines, and their relationship to teachers' instructional efficacy. The findings revealed that democratic leadership is the dominant style practiced in the district, with evidence of mixed or situationally flexible leadership traits. Teachers perceived the overall impact of principal leadership on instructional practices as slight. Spearman's correlation analysis found no statistically significant relationship between any of the three leadership approaches—autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire—and teachers' IPCRF performance ratings.

These results suggest that while principal leadership style matters for school culture and teacher morale, its direct influence on measurable instructional performance may be mediated or moderated by contextual, institutional, and individual teacher factors that were beyond the scope of the current investigation. The null findings underscore the complexity of the leadership–efficacy relationship in remote, resource-constrained, and conflict-affected school settings.

Future research should employ multilevel modeling with larger and more geographically diverse samples, integrate observational measures of leadership behavior, and incorporate qualitative methods to uncover the contextual mechanisms that shape teacher instructional efficacy in schools serving marginalized communities. Additionally, longitudinal studies that track changes in leadership style and teacher performance over multiple academic years are needed to establish stronger evidence of directional effects.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses sincere gratitude to Professor Abdel Ajim M. Salasain, Ph.D., thesis adviser, for his guidance and constructive feedback; to Mrs. Aida A. Ibrahim, District Focal Person of Parang West District, for permitting the conduct of this study; and to all school principals and teachers of Parang West District for their generous participation as respondents.

FUNDING

This research received no external funding. It was conducted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Education Major in Educational Management at Mindanao State University-Sulu.

REFERENCES

1. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191
2. Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall.
3. Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. Free Press.
4. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. SAGE Publications.
5. Betts, J. E., Appleton, J. J., Reschly, A. L., Christenson, S. L., & Huebner, E. S. (2010). A study of the factorial invariance of the Student Engagement Instrument (SEI): Results from middle and high school students. School Psychology Quarterly, 25(2), 84–93. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020259
6. Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. Harper & Row.
7. Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. Journal of School Psychology, 44(6), 473–490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.001
8. Carlyle, T. (1841). On heroes, hero-worship, and the heroic in history. James Fraser.
9. Department of Education, Philippines. (2021). School-based management assessment tool (DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2021). DepEd.
10. Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. McGraw-Hill.
11. Goddard, R. D., Goddard, Y., Kim, E. S., & Miller, R. (2015). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the roles of instructional leadership, teacher collaboration, and collective efficacy beliefs in support of student learning. American Journal of Education, 121(4), 501–530. https://doi.org/10.1086/681925
12. Hattie, J. (2008). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.
13. Heck, R. H., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1993). Principal leadership behaviors and school achievement. NASSP Bulletin, 77(553), 20–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/019263659307755303
14. Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. Training and Development Journal, 23(5), 26–34.
15. Klassen, R. M., & Tze, V. M. C. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 12, 59–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.06.001
16. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17(2), 201–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565829
17. Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Pollock, K. (Eds.). (2020). How school leaders contribute to student success: The four paths framework. Springer.
18. Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. Journal of Social Psychology, 10(2), 271–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366
19. Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2007). Leadership: Theory, application, & skill development (3rd ed.). Thomson/South-Western.
20. Reigeluth, C. M. (1999). Instructional design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory (Vol. 2). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

21. Sousa, C., Coelho, F., & Guillamon-Saorin, E. (2012). Personal values, autonomy, and self-efficacy: Evidence from frontline service employees. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 20(2), 159–170. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2012.00589.x
22. Torres, A. S. (2019). Instructional leadership practices of school principals in urban public schools in Metro Manila. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 7(1), 43–51.
23. Troop-Gordon, W., Labella, M. H., Ettekal, I., & Kochel, K. P. (2019). Classroom dynamics and peer influence on reading motivation and achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 111(3), 467–480. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000290
24. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. Teaching and Teacher Education, 17(7), 783–805. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1
25. Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. Review of Educational Research, 86(4), 981–1015. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626801