The Leadership Styles and Performance Commitment of the School Administrators in Gigaquit District, Divison of Surigao Del Norte

Louvyl Mae Cutang Canda

Researcher, Surigao del Norte Division - Department of Education

Abstract— The school administrators of Gigaquit District - Surigao del Norte Division, like any other government employees, are required to comply with and accomplish the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) – Office Performance and Commitment Review (OPCR) every end of the school year as mandated by the Civil Service Commission. This is used for development purposes and basis for rewards and development which covers the performance commitment for the year. Moreover, this study aimed to assess the extent of leadership styles and the performance commitment of the school administrators. Within the quantitative research; a descriptive correlational research design particularly the survey method was used to describe relationship between leadership styles and the performance commitment of the respondents. The significant difference among the leadership styles of which 18 school administrators responded thru a survey questionnaire and which data were treated using the statistical tools such as simple percentage, weighted mean, cluster analysis and Pearson product-moment correlation. The results showed that servant and transformational leadership style had a positive relationship with performance commitment, whereas authentic and transactional leadership style had a negative relationship. And since there was a significant relationship between transformational leadership styles and performance commitment, this implies that transformational leadership style is deemed suitable for school administrators to practice achieving higher quality of performance commitment. Therefore, who wants to adopt higher quality of performance commitment must resource their vii initiatives and increase the capabilities of the institution aiming to be world class by providing leadership programs to school administrators.

Keywords— leadership styles, performance commitment, school administrators.

I. INTRODUCTION

For decades, leadership styles have been considered an essential tool in determining effectiveness, not only in the business world but also in educational systems worldwide. Mahdinezhad (2013) asserted that leadership styles could assist in the development of leadership capability of both leaders and enhance their performance and commitment. Moreover, several researchers have concentrated on a partial variety of leadership styles. The more widely recognized leadership styles of which a comparison could be made to assess how they might be applied to school situations include: servant leadership, authentic leadership, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership (Damanik, 2014).

Globally, recent studies relate different leadership styles to numerous variables such as motivation, team performance, school effectiveness and school impact, among others (Herrera, 2010). While in the Southeast Asian region, countries like Malaysia, Indonesia and China talk about the different roles and relationship of leadership styles on school performance, self-efficacy and job performance. Other Asian countries like the United Arab Emirates, Iran and Pakistan show on their studies that leadership styles recount to learning outcomes of the school, performance level, principal effectiveness, and employee performance (Yousef, 2000).

Since the 21st century has been hailed as an important era of school reform in the Philippines, during which new regulations and policies have been put in place to improve the education system, a great contributing factor in the implementation of this new system lies on the hands of the highest-ranking administrator in each school in the country, either in the primary or secondary level – the school principal.

The role of a school principal has become increasingly complex as the nature of society, political expectations, and schools, as organizations, have changed. Though the principal's role is fundamental to how well teachers teach and how much students learn, it can be recognized that there are not many studies concerning their leadership styles and management performance and commitment. It is the country's perpetual adaptation of the research findings from Western systems and the need for information relevant to the Philippines' existing

educational scenario which has provided the impetus for the present study.

The present situation of school administrators in Gigaquit District, Division of Surigao del Norte has 18 school administrators who are equally qualified school administrators but differ in their way of administering their respective school assignments. It could be said that thirty-nine percent (39%) of the total population of school administrators are full-pledged school administrators while the other sixty-one percent (61%) are schools-in-charge who are ordered to act as school administrators but still given subject loads to teach. They lead and manage their schools in a diverse way.

The Department of Education's way of evaluating the school administrators' performance commitment is through the Office Performance and Commitment Review (OPCR), which is done annually to effectively assess the administering skills and commitment of the school administrators. Some excel while others perform satisfactorily based on the annual review.

It is assumed that the extent of leadership styles of these school administrators naturally affects the holistic school situation. The researcher would like to determine the influence of the principals' leadership styles on their performance commitment.

Leadership styles and its relationship to the performance commitment could give the power to advance the leadership and management skills of school administrators in Gigaquit District, Division of Surigao del Norte.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership. Leadership is considered as a widely discussed topic in the literature. Leadership is considered as a way a person uses to lead the other people. Employees play a critical role in ensuring the quality of service. Although leaders are responsible for the proper task and job allocation, different leadership styles have several approaches on how tasks are being allocated. Numerous definitions of leadership have been proposed over the years and Bass (1990) used these to create a rough scheme of classification. This scheme included nine concepts of leadership, these being: as a focus of group processes; as a matter of personality; as a matter of inducing compliances; as an exercise of influence; as a particular behavior; as a form of persuasion; as a power relation; as an instrument to achieve goals; and as a combination of these definitions (Bass, 1990).

Leadership is a process of interaction between leaders and followers where the leader attempts to influence followers to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2010; Yukl, 2005). According to Chen and Chen (2008), previous studies on leadership had identified different types of leadership styles which leaders adopt in managing organizations (e.g., Davis, 2003; Spears & Lawrence, 2003; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman & Gupta, 2004; Hirtz, Murray & Riordam, 2007). Among the more prominent leadership styles are Burns' (1978) transactional and transformational leadership styles. Transformational leaders emphasize followers' intrinsic motivation and personal development. They seek to align followers' aspirations and needs with desired organizational outcomes.

When viewed as the combination of concepts of leadership, some scholars have used several definitions of leadership to provide a larger set of meanings. Bogardus (1928), for example, described leadership as the creation and setting forth of exceptional behavioral patterns in such a way that other people respond to them. Jago (1982), on the other hand, described leadership as the exercise of non-coercive influence to coordinate the members of an organized group to accomplish the group's objectives. Bass (1985) described leadership as a person's ability to influence others to perform at a high level of commitment.

Northouse (2010) argued that despite the multitude of ways in which leadership could be conceptualized, the following components can be identified as central to the phenomenon, as described below:

Leadership is a process or a transactional event that occurs between the leader and the followers. The process implies that a leader affect, and is affected by, his or her followers and that leadership is not a linear, one-way event but, rather, an interactive event. Leadership involves influence and is concerned with how the leader affects the followers. Without influence, leadership does not exist. Leadership occurs in groups, in which leadership takes place. Leadership includes attention to common goals. That is, a leader directs his or her energy towards individuals who are trying to achieve something together. Therefore, the leader and the followers have a mutual purpose.

Leadership Styles. Style of leadership is the relatively consistent pattern of behavior that characterizes a leader (DuBrin, 2001). Leadership concerning performance was considered by scholars and researchers, but

philosophical and scientific foundation of leadership style is yet scattered. Whereas, the concept of leadership involves influencing others, leadership style could be defined as the art of influencing fellow human beings towards a direction which is of common good (Neumann & Neumann, 1999). Therefore, leadership style involves the traits, behavioral tendencies, and characteristic methods of a person in a position of leadership (Neumann & Neumann, 1999). In the 1980s, researchers became interested in the way in which the leader transformed and revitalized organizations (Yukl, 1994). Many of these early studies demonstrated strong and consistent relationships between leadership style and an organization's performance.

Different studies have examined effective leadership styles and attempted to classify them. This section provides a description of some of the more common leadership styles. In explaining these leadership styles, the emphasis is on how theory can inform the practice of leadership.

The more widely recognized leadership styles of which a comparison could be made to assess how they might be applied to school situations include: servant leadership; authentic leadership; transformational leadership; and transactional leadership. To start with these styles is the servant leadership style.

Servant Leadership. The notion of servant leadership was popularized by Greenleaf (1977) and has emerged in literature related to leadership studies (Stone, Russell & Patterson, 2004). Servant leadership involves leading others from a perspective of placing the organizational purpose, the organization's needs, and the followers' needs over the needs and desire of the leader (Woodruff, 2004). Therefore, a servant leader often focuses on building the capacity of the followers with the intention of increasing the creativity and responsibilities of the followers (Stone & Patterson, 2005). According to Greenleaf (1977), the servant leader is often not initially motivated to be a leader but assumes this position in response to the need for group success (Patterson, 2003).

Two key notions underlie the various definitions of servant leadership: service and other-centered (Greenleaf, 1977). Farling et al. (1999) posited that service was the core of servant leadership. They argued that service was and should be a primary function of leadership, and that it should not be based on one's own interests, but rather on the interests and welfare of others. In other words, servant leaders know they are

servants first. Russell and Stone (2002) concurred that service was the core of servant leadership and that this service was a choice over self-interest. According to Wis (2002), the servant leader is called to serve and he or she sees life in totality as a mission of service. While reiterating Greenleaf's philosophy, Lee and Zemko (1993) observed that leaders existed only to serve their followers and they earned their followers' trust only by virtue of their selfless natures. Further, servant leaders are known to deeply commit themselves to the personal, professional, and spiritual growth of those in their sphere of influence (Spears, 1995, 1996, 1998, 2002).

Even though the notion of servant leadership emerged more than four decades ago, efforts to measure the construct and study its effect on organizational outcomes have appeared only in the last decade (for example: Reed, Vidaver-Cohen & Colwell, 2011; Liden, Wayne, Zhao & Henderson, 2008; and Walumbwa, Hartnell & Oke, 2010).

Literature related to servant leadership indicates that although this leadership style has been found to be effective in a commercial setting, there is a lack of rigorous theory or research that has examined its usefulness in the school setting. Servant leadership as promising for school leaders even though the origin of this style of leadership was largely in Agnon-school contexts. The notion of servant leadership has been met with varying, but usually limited, degrees of success in school settings (Leithwood & Sun, 2012).

Authentic Leadership. A review of the literature reveals that there is no single accepted definition of authentic leadership and that different authors use the term in somewhat different ways (Bennis, 2003; Bennis & Thomas, 2002; George, 2003; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Terry, 1993). Certain elements, however, are shared by all writers with the notion that an authentic leader is portrayed as possessing self-knowledge and a personal point of view, which reflects his values and convictions.

The notion of authentic leadership was popularized by Shamir and Eilam (2005), who described it as an incorporation of a leader's knowledge, self-regulation, and self-concept. They suggested that an authentic leader exhibited genuine leadership, led from conviction and was original (not a copy of others). According to Shamir and Eilam (2005), an authentic leader does not employ his or her authority as a leader simply because he or she is in a leadership position. Indeed, for an authentic leader, the function of leadership and the

related activities are self-expressive acts because he or she feels that these tasks are his or her duty. They further state that an authentic leader does not take on a leadership role or engage in leadership activities for status, honor, or other personal rewards. Rather, he or she leads from a conviction that involves a value-based cause or a mission that he or she wants to promote. As a result, an authentic leader is interested not only in being all that he or she can be, but also in making a difference.

Damanik (2014) considered an authentic leader as original. That is, the process through which he or she has arrived at these convictions is not a process of imitation. His or her actions are based on his or her values and convictions. Therefore, what the leader says is consistent with what he or she believes. This suggests that an authentic leader has a high level of integrity and makes a point of being transparent.

Based on the initial definition of AL by Luthans and Avolio (2003), and the underlying dimension of the construct posited by Gardner et al. (2005) and Illies, Morgenson, & Nahrgang (2005), Walumbwa et al. (2008) have defined AL as a pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development. In this definition, self-awareness refers to demonstrating an understanding of how one derives and makes meaning of the world and how that meaning making process impacts the way one views himself or herself over time.

Transformational Leadership. The concept of transformational leadership is based, for the most part, on the work of Bass (1985), who defined it as the synthesis of four dimensions or characteristics related to leadership, these being: charisma or idealized influence; individualized consideration; intellectual stimulation; and inspiration. The notion of charisma, as a leadership characteristic, is related to the followers' belief in a leader and the mission or vision that he or she has as well. Charisma is about the followers' admiration for, trust in, and devotion to that leader. A charismatic leader is one who is dynamic, hardworking, confident, competent, and successful.

The individualized consideration dimension of leadership is related to the way in which a leader treats his or her followers, that is, whether the leader treats the followers differently based on their needs and capabilities. This leadership dimension is related to whether the leader is considerate of others and whether they display strong coaching behavior and mentorship.

The intellectual stimulation dimension of transformational leadership refers to a leader who stimulates extra effort among his or her followers to rethink ideas, challenge existing situations and to reframe problems. This dimension of leadership is displayed when the leader helps followers to become more innovative and creative (Bass, 1999).

Finally, the inspirational dimension of transformational leadership refers to practice that envisions a desirable future, articulates how it can be reached, sets an example to be followed, sets high standards of performance, and shows determination and confidence (Bass & Avolio, 1990; 1993). This dimension is related to the leader's belief in his or her ability to make a difference by envisioning the future and creating an image of what the organization can become. He or she inspires such a vision in their followers with a positive and hopeful outlook (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Leithwood and Janzi (2006) defined transformational leadership in terms of a process which higher levels of commitment to the organization and its goals are attained. Transformational leadership develops the members of the organization to their fullest potential. Wheatley (2001) defines transformation leadership as a leader's ability to focus those within the organization on the mission and challenges faced by the organization, and how followers perceive the actions of the leader. Leadership requires an individual to be job-centered as well as people centered.

Transactional Leadership. The notion of transactional leadership was popularized by Bass (1985), who viewed this style of leadership as an exchange relationship between a leader and his or her followers to meet the self-interests of those involved. In a transactional process, the leader and the followers reinforce each other's behavior with either rewards or punishments, preferably rewards, which are contingent upon fulfilling the transacted role arrangement. Therefore, a transactional leader generally grants his or her followers rewards that satisfy immediate personal interests (Bass, 1999).

Avolio, Bass and Jung (1999) regard transactional leadership as attributes of contingent reward and management-by-exception. The contingent reward

attribute is based on active and positive transactions between leaders and followers. There should, therefore, be clarification about what the follower should do to be rewarded. The management-by-exception attribute includes monitoring employee performance and taking corrective action when problems arise. Effective transactional leadership develops understanding and agreement about the leaders' and employees' roles in the process.

Transactional Leadership is oriented by demands, with major emphasis on basic and external satisfaction against demands (Pouder, 2001; Kim & Shim, 2003). It features a reasonable standard of controlling and means a process of benefit exchange for organizational stability. Robbins (2003) contended transactional leadership creates goal setting through role clarification and task request, and it can also lead and encourage subordinates through these activities. Leaders would affirm and reward subordinates' effort and satisfy their relevant demands to reach esteem and support from these activities. Bass (1997) added when subordinates commit any improper behavior, immediate corrective punishment should be given.

Consistent with Lashway (1999), while transactional leadership relies on a set of assumptions about human beings and what motivates them in the organization, this style of leadership usually provides limited results. Effects of rewards and punishments tend to require bigger rewards to remain effective. This comes with a higher cost and does not serve to inspire loyalty to the leader. Transactional leadership focuses on management and not leadership (Luft, K.A., 2012).

Research findings have indicated that transactional leadership in school settings may have a negative effect on teachers' creative behavior because it focuses more on facilitating teachers' performance and less on stimulating innovation (Bass, 1985; Kim & Lee, 2011). The findings of studies that have compared transformational and transactional leadership suggest that transactional leaders are less likely to emphasize innovation than transformational leaders (Bogler, 2001; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009; Kurland et al., 2010; Valentine & Prater, 2011).

Results-Based Performance Management System. In line with the philosophy of the Department of Education of the Philippines, a Results-Based Performance Management System is implemented. It is a shared undertaking between the superior and the employee that allows an open discussion of job expectations, Key Results Areas, Objectives and how these align to overall departmental goals.

Office Performance and Commitment Review. The Office Performance and Commitment Review (OPCR) is anchored on the vision and mission of the Department of Education. The Civil Service Commission mandates 100% results orientation to make it uniform with other government agencies. Competencies should be used for development purposes and that all regular managers and employees of the department; teaching and non-teaching staff should comply. It is also a basis for rewards and development which covers the performance commitment for the whole year. These reasons make the Office Performance and Commitment Review (OPCR) a viable tool to measure the performance commitment of the school administrators (DepEd, 2014).

A number of instruments have been developed to assess leadership style, some of which were valid and reliable to be used in this study which sought to assess leadership styles of school administrators in Gigaquit District.

III. METHOD

Within the quantitative research, a descriptive correlational research design particularly the survey method was used to describe relationship between leadership styles and the performance commitment of the respondents and the significant difference among the leadership styles of the school administrators, in the present condition.

Executing the descriptive correlational research design to this study provided the extent of leadership styles of the 18 school administrators of Gigaquit District, Division of Surigao del Norte. This method was deemed appropriate because this study described the leadership styles as perceived by the respondents, in the present condition. This involved the extent of the different leadership styles, namely: servant, authentic, transactional, and transformational. Performance commitment of the respondents was measured using the Department of Education's annual Office Performance and Commitment and Review (OPCR).

This research design was used to discover the relationship between leadership style and the performance commitment of the respondents and the significant difference among the leadership styles of the school administrators during the conduct of the study.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study explored the leadership styles and performance commitment of school administrators in the Gigaquit District, yielding several key findings:

The respondents of this study were the school administrators of Gigaquit District, Division of Surigao del Norte during the school year 2018-2019. There were 18 respondents of the study.

In terms of age, 16.7 percent (or 3) of the respondents belonged to the age group more than 55 years old, 16.7 percent (or 3) were aged 51-55 years old, 33.3 percent (or 6) were aged 46-50 years old, 11.1 percent (or 2) were aged 41-45 years old, 16.7 percent (or 3) were aged 36-40 and 5.6 percent (or 1) respondent were 31-35 years old. It can be inferred from the results that majority of the administrators were in their late 40's and might not have been aware of the trends in educational management.

As to gender, the results show that there were 44.4 percent (or 8) male respondents and 55.6 percent (or 10) female respondents, which only means that most of the school administrators were female. With regards to highest educational attainment, 11.1 percent (or 2) of the respondents earned doctoral units, 38.9 percent (or 7) obtained MA degree and 50 percent (or 9) graduated bachelor's degree and earned MA units, which only shows that most of the respondents did not obtain the professional qualifications needed to manage a school, which might have affected their performance commitment.

As to years of service, 16.7 percent (or 3) of the respondents served as administrators for 10-15 years, 50 percent (or 9) of the respondents served for 16-20 years, 11.1 percent (or 2) were administrators for 21-25 years, 11.1 percent (or 2) served for 26-30 years and 11.1 percent (or 2) also of the respondents were administrators for over 30 years. Evidently, most administrators were already in their 16-20 years in service.

Concerning relevant trainings, 55.6 percent (or 10) of the respondents had no training relevant to administration and management. There were 16.7 percent (or 3) of the respondents who attended 1 relevant training, another 16.7 percent had joined 2 relevant trainings and 11.1 percent (or 2) attended 3 relevant trainings. It can be gleaned from the findings that most of the administrators were not exposed to trainings necessary to their administrative duties.

Generally, majority of the respondents were female, aged 46-50 years old, obtained bachelor's degree with MA units, had been in an administrative position for 16-20 years and no relevant training attended.

As observed on servant leadership, the highest mean response obtained was 3.2 on the item, "I go above and beyond the call of duty to meet others need" described qualitatively as Agree. Meanwhile, the lowest mean was 2.67 (with SD=0.77) on the item, "I put others' best interest ahead of my own" and described qualitatively as agree. Findings indicate that as administrators, respondents gave precedence to the needs and welfare of their school and constituents even to the extent of working beyond their duties. In fact, respondents also agreed that as administrators, they did everything they could to serve others (M=2.94, SD=0.42). They also agreed that they were gifted when it came to persuading others (M=2.94, SD=0.73), the one that could help mend others' hard feelings (M=3.00, SD=0.69) and in touch with what was happening around them (M=2.94, SD=0.80). Evidently, school administrators led with servant leadership style contradicting the findings of Leithwood and Sun (2012) that literature related to servant leadership indicates that although this leadership style has been found to be effective in a commercial setting, there is a lack of rigorous theory or research that has examined its usefulness in the school setting. Servant leadership is promising for school leaders even though the origin of this style of leadership was largely in Agnon-school contexts. The notion of servant leadership has been met with varying, but usually limited, degrees of success in school settings.

Concerning authentic leadership style, it can be gleaned from the results in Table 7 that the highest mean response obtained was 3.11 (with SD=0.68) on the item, "I let others know who I truly am as a person," qualitatively described as Agree. It follows that respondents, being administrators, openly showed to others who they were. On the other hand, the lowest mean response obtained was 2.50 (with SD=0.51) on the item, "My actions reflect my core values," and described qualitatively as Disagree. This would mean that the school administrators' core values were not manifested by their deeds. Nonetheless, respondents agreed that they rarely presented "false" front to others (M=2.78, SD=0.73) and sought others' opinions before making up their own mind (M=2.67, SD=0.77). They also agreed that, as administrators, they accepted the feelings they had about their selves (M=2.83, SD=0.62) and their mistakes to others (M=2.94, SD=0.73). This means that

the school administrators portrayed as possessing self-knowledge and a personal point of view, which reflects their values and convictions which might have affected their rating on the performance commitment review.

With regards to transformational leadership style, the highest mean response was 3.06 (with SD=0.87) on the item, "I rarely give direction or guidance to others if I sense they can achieve their goal" and qualitatively equivalent to Agree. This implies that as school administrators, respondents trusted and believed the capabilities of others to achieve their goals. The lowest mean response obtained was 2.67 (with SD=0.84) on the item, "I ensure others to get recognition and/or rewards when they achieve difficult or complex goals" equivalently described as Agree. In other words, respondents, as school administrators, valued and acknowledged the work and efforts of their subordinates. In the same way, respondents agreed that as administrators, they even went out of their way to make others feel good to be around them (M=2.83, SD=0.71), helped others with their self-development (M=2.94, SD=0.42) and with new ways of looking at new and complex ideas or concepts (M=2.83, SD=0.62). In the same way, respondents made sure they got things done (M=2.94, SD=0.73). The findings showed that the respondents also used transformational leadership style which only demonstrated that the style of leadership of these leaders was centered on the concept of a school leader engaging and encouraging school members to become active and committed participants in evaluating and improving their school culture through shared decision making and developing school-based solutions to challenges (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1997) which might have made them an effective leader. As to transactional leadership style, the highest mean response was 3.11 (with SD=0.68) on the item, "I direct my attention to failures to meet standards", qualitatively described as Agree. It follows that the school administrators aimed for quality education and service and hence found means to solve failures. Meanwhile, the lowest mean was 2.60 (with SD=0.78) on the item, "I wait for things to go wrong before taking action" described qualitatively as Agree. Respondents also perceived that as school administrators they discussed in specific terms who was responsible for achieving performance targets (M=2.94, SD=0.8) and delayed in responding to urgent questions (M=3.0, SD=0.84). School administrators also agreed that they expressed satisfaction when expectations were met (M=2.94, SD=0.73) and made it clear what one could expect to receive when performance goals were achieved (M=2.61, SD=0.78).

Such results revealed that the school administrators had this transactional leadership style although research findings had indicated and transactional leadership in school settings might have a negative effect on teachers' creative behavior because it focused more on facilitating teachers' performance and less on stimulating innovation (Bass, 1985; Kim & Lee, 2011).

The findings of studies that had compared transformational and transactional leadership suggested that transactional leaders were less likely to emphasize innovation than transformational leaders (Bogler, 2001; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009; Kurland et al., 2010; Valentine & Prater, 2011). As perceived by the respondents, it was found out that among the leadership styles, the highest composite mean obtained was 2.92 described as agree. This implies that administrators commonly ruled with servant leadership. This inferred that the school administrators of Gigaquit were giving priority to the school's commitment, needs and purpose. It further implies that the administrators greatly focused on developing people, building community, displaying authenticity, and sharing leadership.

Furthermore, it was uncovered that the respondents also possessed authentic, transformational, and transactional leadership in administering their school. It is inferred that the respondents as school administrators, devoted their authority as value-based leaders. In the same way, the administrators were those that possessed charisma, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspiration and considered teachers to achieve goals.

The findings support the claims of Damanik (2014) that the widely recognized leadership styles of which a comparison could be made to assess how they might be applied to school situations are truly servant, authentic, transformational and transactional leadership styles. Results revealed that the OPCR rating of the respondents had an average of 4.024 (SD=0.51) qualitatively equivalent to Very Satisfactory. It follows that there was a very satisfactory performance commitment of the respondents as school administrators.

In order to describe the results further, the school administrators were grouped according to the similarities of their performance commitment and leadership styles through cluster analysis. Since the respondents were less than 30, 3 clusters were considered. Results revealed that the administrators of School 1, School 5, School 6, School 8, School 12 and

School 16 belonged to cluster 1. This implies that the said school administrators essentially had similarities with respect to leadership styles and performance commitment. Furthermore, the administrators of School 4, School 7 and School 14, grouped in cluster 2, also shared the same leadership styles and commitment performance. It was also found out that the administrators in School 2, School 3, School 9, School 10, School 11, School 13, School 15, School 17 and School 18 had essentially similar attributes in terms of leadership styles and commitment performance. The cluster centers reflect the characteristics of the school administrators as leaders and their commitment performance for each cluster. The clustering of schools was mainly determined by the performance commitment of the school administrators reflected on the OPCR rating. Cluster 1 was the best performing school administrators while Cluster 3 had moderate commitment performance and Cluster 2 was the least performing group.

Comparing the school administrators' leadership styles, Cluster 1 tended to have the supreme servant and transformational leadership style, moderate in transactional leadership while little in authentic leadership. Cluster 2 tended to have supreme authentic leadership style, moderate servant leadership and little transformational and transactional leadership. Cluster 3 tended to have supreme transactional leadership, moderate authentic and transformational leadership and little servant leadership.

Furthermore, the results showed that the best performing school administrators were characterized as those who possessed greater servant and transformational leadership style than authentic and transactional leadership style. That is, the quality of performance commitment of the school administrators varies directly as their servant and transformational leadership style and varies inversely as their authentic and transactional leadership style. These findings support the literature presented by Leithwood & Jantzi (1997) that transformational leadership was viewed as preferable for effective school improvement. Although scholars have described a range of features related to transformational leaders, it is widely recognized that this style of leadership is centered on the concept of a school leader engaging and encouraging school members to become active and committed participants in evaluating and improving their school culture through shared decision making and developing school-based solutions to challenges. This result also supports the claim of

Hunter et al. (2013) of the utility of servant leadership across multiple organizational levels. They had expected that servant leadership would effectively enhance the organization, particularly in a profit organization. Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko and Roberts (2009) maintained that servant leadership may be a particularly effective style of leadership for instilling in and modelling to followers a genuine motivation to serve customers in a profit-making organization.

In order to substantiate if there was significant relationship between the leadership styles and the performance commitment of the school administrators, Pearson-moment correlation analysis was conducted. Results were presented in the table below. From the tabular values in Table 14, it reveals that in terms of the variable servant (p=0.63), authentic (p=0.55) and transactional (p=0.92), the computed probability values (p) were all greater than 0.05 level of significance. This result ascertained that there was no significant relationship between the servant, authentic and transactional leadership styles of the school administrators and their performance commitment. On the contrary, concerning transformational style, the p-value computed of 0.05 was within the 0.05 level of significance and hence the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there was significant relationship between the transformational leadership style of the school administrators and their performance commitment. The correlation coefficient r=0.454 signifies that the association between the transformational leadership style and the performance commitment of the school administrators was moderately positive.

Thus, the more administrators use transformational leadership style would result to a higher performance commitment. This finding strengthened the claims of Leithwood & Jantzi (1997) that transformational leadership style was viewed as preferable for effective school improvement and performance. It was centered on the concept of a school leader engaging and encouraging school members to become active and committed participants in evaluating and improving their school culture, through shared decision making and developing school-based solutions.

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary
The results of the study revealed that most of the respondents were female, aged 36-40 years old, obtained bachelor's degree with MA units, had been with

administrative position for 16-20 years and no relevant training attended.

It was revealed that servant leadership style was generally used by the administrators though other leadership styles such as authentic, transformational and transactional are present as well.

The OPCR rating of the respondents was qualitatively equivalent to very satisfactory which means that their performance commitment was very satisfactory.

On the relationship between leadership styles and the performance commitment of the school administrators, in terms of the variable servant (p=0.63), authentic (p=0.55) and transactional (p=0.92), the computed probability values (p) were all greater than 0.05 level of significance. This ascertained that there was no significant relationship between the servant, authentic and transactional leadership styles of the school administrators and their performance commitment. In contrast, there was significant relationship between the transformational leadership style of the school administrators and their performance commitment. It was also uncovered that the association between the transformational leadership style and the performance commitment of the school administrators had a moderately positive correlation, which implies that the more they used this kind of leadership style, the higher their performance commitment would be.

Moreover, the best performing school administrators were those who had higher servant and transformational leadership styles but lower authentic and transactional leadership styles. The value of performance commitment of the school administrators varied directly as their servant and transformational leadership styles and varied inversely as their authentic and transactional leadership styles.

Conclusions
Overall, the purpose of this study was to assess the extent of leadership styles and the performance commitment of the 18 school administrators of Gigaquit District, Division of Surigao del Norte.

The results showed that servant and transformational leadership style had a positive relationship with performance commitment whereas authentic and transactional leadership style had a negative relationship with performance commitment in government institutions. And since there was a significant relationship between transformational leadership styles and performance commitment, this implies that transformational leadership style is deemed suitable for school administrators to practice achieving higher quality of performance commitment. Institutions that have leadership capability to change their management approach using leadership skills would further improve their performance. Therefore, those who wanted to adopt higher quality of performance commitment must resource their initiatives and increase the capabilities of the institution aiming to be world class. The major limitations of this study revolved around sampling issues as this study focused on specific target group with only 18 number of respondents. As a result, it may have affected the current results. Furthermore, most of the respondents were confused over the transformational and transactional leadership and this might have affected some of the relations studied.

Recommendations
After thoroughly analyzing the concluded research, the following recommendations are stated below:

1) That the Department of Education should be more involved in providing leadership seminars, workshops and trainings among school administrators as well as creating other leadership programs which improve their performance commitment, job satisfaction and self-efficacy among others;

2) That the school administrators should be professionally sensitive about their leadership styles as this has a direct effect on their performance commitment;

3) That the teachers should understand the school administrator's traits, behavioral tendencies, perception, decision-making, management and commitment as this also improved their professional relationship;

4) That the parents should be aware of the school administrator's method of leading and influencing the school community as this would greatly affect their children's situation in school;

5) That the pupils should be a vital part of the school administrators' journey towards achieving excellent performance commitment by helping build a good relationship between them;

6) That the community should create a strong support system for the school administrators and their plans for the school as this would ultimately reflect what kind of society the school is situated in; and

7) 7.) That the future educational researcher should conduct investigations like the present research

study. Perhaps, improve the study and expand the scope of the present investigation according to their needs and interests.

REFERENCES

[1] Avolio, B. J. (2004). Examining the Full Range Model of Leadership: Looking Back to Transform Forward. In D. V. Day, S. J. Zaccaro, & S. M. Halpin (Eds.), Leader development for transforming organizations: Growing leaders for tomorrow (pp. 71–98). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

[2] Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Manual and Sampler Set (3rd ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s1532754xjprr1602_2

[3] Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Prediction unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(2), 207–218. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207

[4] Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectation. New York: Free Press.

[5] Bass, B.M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications. New York: Free Press.

[6] Bass, B.M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8(1), 9-32.

[7] Bennis, Warren G., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

[8] Bogardus, E.S. (1928). World leadership types. Sociology and Social Research, 12, 573-599.

[9] Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

[10] Damanik, Enceria & Aldridge, Jill. (2017). Transformational Leadership and its Impact on School Climate and Teachers' Self-Efficacy in Indonesian High Schools. Journal of School Leadership, 27(1), 269-296. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/105268461702700205

[11] Department of Education (2015). D.O. 2, s. 2015 - Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) In the Department of Education. [Department Order] Available: deped.gov.ph.

[12] DuBrin, A. J. (2001). Leadership: Research findings, practice, skills (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

[13] Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. New York: Paulist Press.

[14] Herrera, R. (2010). Principal leadership and school effectiveness: Perspectives from principals and teachers, Dissertations. 568. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/568

[15] Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L. A., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013). Servant leaders inspire servant followers: Antecedents and outcomes for employees and the organization. The Leadership Quarterly, 24(2), 316-331.

[16] Jago, A.G. (1982). Leadership: Perspective in theory and research. Management Science, 28, 315-336.

[17] Jantzi, D., & Leithwood, K. (1996). Toward an explanation of variation in teachers' perceptions of transformational school leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(4), 512-538.

[18] Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009). Examining the impact of servant leadership on sales force performance. Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 29, 257-275.

[19] Kim, J. G., & Lee, S. Y. (2011). Effects of transformational and transactional leadership on employees' creative behavior: Mediating effects of work motivation and job satisfaction. Asian Journal of Technology Innovation, 19(2), 233-247.

[20] Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. Educational Administration Quarterly, 48(3), 387-423.

[21] Mahdinezha, M., Bin, S., Turiman, B.S., Abu, D. & Omar, Z. B. (2013). Transformational, transactional leadership styles and job performance of academic leaders, International Education Studies, 6(11), 45-201. doi:10.5539/ies.v6n11p29

[22] Neumann, Y., & Neumann, E.F. (1999). The president and the college bottom line: The role of strategic leadership styles. The International Journal of Educational Management, 13(2), 73-79.

[23] Northouse, P.G. (2010). Leadership: Theory and practice (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

[24] Patterson, K.A. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. Dissertation Abstracts International, 64(2).

[25] Stone, A. G., & Patterson, K. (2005). The history of leadership focus: Servant leadership roundtable. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University.

[26] Woodruff, T.R. (2004). Executive pastors' perception of leadership and management competencies needed for local church administration. (Dissertation Abstracts International). Retrieved 29 January 2014, from http://www.xpastor.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/12/woodruff_competencies_needed.pdf