

Impact of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators on Teacher Effectiveness in Sapang Dalaga District

Resame B. Arocha

Student, Medina College Ozamiz City

Abstract— This study explores the impact of servant leadership in the educational management of school administrators on teacher effectiveness in the SapangDalaga District. It examines how servant leadership dimensions—listening, empathy, healing, self-awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, and commitment to growth—affect various aspects of teacher effectiveness, including professionalism, subject matter knowledge, and relationships with students. A descriptive-correlational design was employed, involving school administrators and teachers in the district. Data collection utilized validated survey instruments, and statistical analysis identified relationships between servant leadership practices and teacher effectiveness. Findings reveal that servant leadership practices of school administrators were rated "Very High" across all dimensions, with the highest scores in empathy (3.72) and foresight (3.68). Administrators demonstrated strengths in fostering emotional support, long-term strategic thinking, and collaborative planning, though areas for improvement were identified in active listening during meetings and promoting teacher morale. Teachers exhibited "Very High" effectiveness, excelling in professionalism (3.60), subject matter knowledge (3.60), and fostering compassionate relationships (3.59). Notably, administrators' servant leadership practices were significantly correlated with teachers' effectiveness, emphasizing the importance of supportive leadership in enhancing educational outcomes. The findings underscore the critical role of servant leadership in promoting a positive educational environment. School administrators' commitment to listening, empathy, and strategic foresight significantly influences teacher performance and relationships with students, suggesting that targeted improvements in specific leadership practices could further enhance teacher effectiveness. This study highlights the substantial impact of servant leadership on teacher effectiveness, advocating for the continuous development of school administrators' leadership capacities to foster improved educational management and outcomes.

Keywords— servant leadership, educational management, school administrators, teacher's effectiveness, leadership.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Servant leadership is a unique approach to leadership that focuses on the growth and well-being of team members, encouraging a collaborative and empowering atmosphere. In schools, when administrators adopt servant leadership principles, they can foster a supportive culture that positively affects both teacher performance and student success. This study dives into how servant leadership influences educational management among school administrators in the SapangDalaga District and how it relates to improving teacher effectiveness. By exploring this connection, we hope to provide valuable insights into the important role of leadership in achieving educational success.

The concept of servant leadership was introduced by Greenleaf in 1977, highlighting the idea that leaders serve their teams to promote growth, community, and collaborative decision-making. Recent studies, like those by Eva and colleagues in 2019, have shown that

servant leadership significantly enhances well-being and engagement among team members by addressing their basic psychological needs. Additionally, research by Liden et al. in 2022 found that servant leadership fosters an inclusive work environment through empathy and a sense of stewardship. In education, Stronge (2020) defines teacher effectiveness in terms of measurable teaching practices that lead to better student achievement and engagement. This aligns with growing evidence emphasizing the need for effective leadership strategies to boost teacher performance and improve student outcomes. In the Philippine context, Bacani and Miranda (2019) highlight the importance of leadership styles that focus on collaboration and empowerment within the education sector. Similarly, Santos and Reyes (2021) found that Filipino school administrators who practice servant leadership contribute to higher teacher morale and professional growth, which in turn leads to improved classroom outcomes. These findings underscore the significance of servant leadership in educational management in the Philippines.

While there has been a growing interest in servant leadership, there is still a significant gap in understanding its effects on teacher effectiveness, particularly in the Sapang Dalaga District. Most research has concentrated on urban settings, leaving rural areas with their unique challenges—such as limited resources, diverse community values, and restricted access to professional development—largely overlooked. Investigating how servant leadership practices, which focus on empathy, community building, and empowerment, can be adapted to local educational environments is essential. Doing so could potentially enhance teacher motivation, increase student engagement, and improve overall academic achievement, while also determining if these leadership approaches can lead to lasting improvements in the quality of education in rural schools.

This study aims to bridge that gap by examining the impact of servant leadership in educational management on teacher effectiveness in the Sapang Dalaga District. We want to identify successful practices, assess the current state of leadership and teaching, and provide actionable recommendations to create an environment that supports both educators and students. Ultimately, this research seeks to enhance leadership and teaching practices in schools across the Philippines.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the current status of servant leadership practices among school administrators and their relationship with teacher effectiveness. Using quantitative methods, such as surveys, the study measured servant leadership behaviors based on nine attributes and teacher effectiveness through factors like professionalism and subject matter knowledge. The descriptive aspect summarized the characteristics of these variables, while the correlational approach explored potential links between leadership practices and teacher performance.

Research Setting

The study examines servant leadership in educational management within the rural Sapang Dalaga District in northern Lanao del Norte, Philippines. It highlights the challenges school administrators and teachers face, such as limited resources, geographical isolation, and professional development constraints. The research explores how servant leadership fosters teacher effectiveness, aligns with local cultural values, and

strengthens community engagement. It also addresses issues like teacher turnover and low student enrollment, investigating how leaders creatively integrate technology and collaboration to enhance education. Ultimately, the study provides insights into the impact of servant leadership on rural school management and teacher performance.

Research Respondents

The research respondents are two groups: school administrators and teachers within the Sapang Dalaga District. The school administrators will be selected using purposive sampling, focusing on those directly involved in educational management to ensure their relevance to the study's focus on leadership practices. On the other hand, teachers who are under the leadership of the selected administrators will be chosen through random sampling. This approach ensures a diverse representation of teaching experiences and subject areas across various schools in the district. The number of respondents will be determined using statistical sampling to ensure a representative sample. The target sample size will include at least 30 administrators and 100 teachers based on standard sample size calculations for correlation studies and the district's total number of potential respondents.

Research Instrument

The primary data collection tool for the study is a survey questionnaire designed to assess two key aspects. First, it measures the extent of servant leadership in educational management, focusing on nine attributes: listening, empathy, healing, self-awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, and commitment to the growth of others. Second, it evaluates teacher effectiveness, emphasizing the ability to develop trusting relationships, demonstrate professionalism, possess subject matter knowledge, and understand learners. The survey employs Likert-type scales (e.g., a 1-5 scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree) to collect responses from administrators and teachers, ensuring a standardized approach to data collection.

Instrument Validation

The instrument's validity will be ensured by utilizing established scales from reputable sources, such as Greenleaf (1977) for servant leadership and Stronge (2018) for teacher effectiveness. These scales have been widely tested and validated in various educational contexts, ensuring their appropriateness for the study. Additionally, the instrument will undergo a content

validity check, where experts in educational management, leadership, and teaching effectiveness will review it for clarity, relevance, and comprehensiveness. Feedback from these experts will guide necessary adjustments to enhance the instrument's validity. To assess reliability, the instrument will be pilot-tested with a small sample from the target population, followed by Cronbach's alpha coefficient computation. A reliability index of at least 0.7 will be considered acceptable, indicating a satisfactory level of internal consistency.

Data-Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering procedure will follow a systematic process to ensure accuracy and efficiency. First, permission will be obtained from the SapangDalaga District school authorities and participants to conduct the study. Next, the survey questionnaires will be distributed to school administrators and teachers online or through physical distribution, depending on the respondents' preferences and accessibility. A period, such as two weeks, will be allotted for respondents to complete the surveys. Once all responses are collected, the data will be compiled and entered into data analysis software, such as SPSS or Excel, for processing and analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations in this study will be prioritized to ensure the rights and well-being of participants. Informed consent will be obtained from all respondents, who will be fully briefed on the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of their participation, and the

confidentiality of their responses. Respondents will be required to sign consent forms before taking part in the study. Confidentiality will be strictly maintained, with participants' identities and responses being used solely for research purposes, and personal information will not be shared with any third parties. Participation will be voluntary, and participants will have the right to withdraw without facing any consequences. Furthermore, transparency will be maintained throughout the study, with a clear explanation of the methodology provided, ensuring no data manipulation or misrepresentation occurs.

Statistical Treatment

This study employs various statistical tools to analyze data on servant leadership and teacher effectiveness. Frequency count will determine the demographic profile of school administrators, including age, educational attainment, and years of service. The arithmetic mean will assess leadership and teaching effectiveness by calculating average scores in key areas such as empathy, professionalism, and subject matter knowledge. To examine the relationship between servant leadership and teacher performance, the Spearman-Brown correlation coefficient will be applied, measuring the strength and direction of their association. Additionally, the Kruskal-Wallis test will analyze whether leadership styles differ significantly based on demographic factors like age, gender, and experience. Together, these methods provide a comprehensive evaluation of how servant leadership influences educational management and teacher performance.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile	School Administrators		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Age				
30 and below years old	0	0	148	62.92
31 – 40 years old	6	24	68	28.94
41 – 50 years old	10	40	16	6.80
51 – 60 years old	7	28	0	0
Above 60 years old	2	8	2	0.85
Total	25	100	235	100
Educational Attainment				
Bachelor's Degree	4	16	178	75.74
Master's Degree	11	44	43	18.30
Doctorate Degree	10	40	2	0.851
Others	0	0	11	4.681
Total	25	100	235	100
Length of Service				
5 years and less than	5	20	122	51.91

6 – 10 years	17	68	107	45.53
11 – 15 years	3	12	3	1.27
16 – 20 years	0	0	2	0.85
more than 20 years	0	0	0	0
Total	25	100	235	100

The demographic data highlights key differences between teachers and school administrators in terms of age, education, and experience. Most teachers (62.92%) are 30 years old or younger, whereas administrators are generally older, with 40% in the 41-50 age group and none below 30. In terms of educational attainment, 75.74% of teachers hold a Bachelor's Degree, while administrators have higher qualifications, with 44%

holding a Master's Degree and 40% a Doctorate. Regarding length of service, 51.91% of teachers have five years or less of experience, while 68% of administrators have 6-10 years. Overall, teachers tend to be younger with lower educational attainment and less experience, while administrators are more senior, highly educated, and have longer service durations.

Table 2.1 Extent of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators in terms of Listening

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator gives full attention when teachers express their ideas or concerns.	0.51	3.76
The administrator listens to teachers' feedback before making decisions that affect the school.	0.60	3.72
The administrator actively listens to teachers during meetings and discussions.	0.70	3.48
The administrator shows a genuine interest in understanding the perspectives of teachers.	0.60	3.72
The administrator provides an opportunity for teachers to speak up and share their thoughts.	0.73	3.68
Average Mean	3.67	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.1 highlights the high extent of servant leadership in school administrators, particularly in terms of Listening. The highest-rated aspect is their attentiveness to teachers' ideas and concerns (mean: 3.76), indicating strong communication and responsiveness. Administrators also highly value teacher feedback in decision-making (mean: 3.72) and show a genuine interest in teachers' perspectives (mean: 3.72). While administrators provide opportunities for teachers to

voice their thoughts (mean: 3.68), the lowest-rated aspect is active listening during meetings (mean: 3.48), suggesting room for improvement in engagement. With an overall Very High mean score of 3.67, the findings suggest that administrators create a supportive and collaborative school environment. However, enhancing active listening during discussions could further strengthen trust and inclusion among teachers.

Table 2.2 Extent of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators in terms of Empathy

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator understands and shares in the feelings of teachers during challenging times.	0.43	3.76
The administrator is compassionate toward teachers who are experiencing personal or professional difficulties.	0.61	3.68
The administrator makes efforts to understand teachers' concerns without judgment.	0.37	3.84
The administrator demonstrates care and concern for the well-being of teachers.	0.49	3.60
The administrator supports teachers emotionally when they face stress or burnout.	0.66	3.72
Average Mean	3.72	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.2 highlights the Very High level of empathy demonstrated by school administrators as part of their servant leadership style. The highest-rated aspect is their

effort to understand teachers' concerns without judgment (mean: 3.84), showing an open and supportive approach. Administrators also exhibit emotional

connection during challenging times (mean: 3.76) and show compassion for teachers facing difficulties (mean: 3.68). They provide emotional support during stress or burnout (mean: 3.72), though there is slight room for improvement in demonstrating care for teachers' overall

well-being (mean: 3.60). With an overall mean of 3.72, administrators create a supportive and nurturing school environment, reinforcing findings by Cassandra (2023) that empathy strengthens relationships and fosters a positive school culture.

Table 2.3 Extent of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators in terms of Healing

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator helps resolve conflicts among teachers in a constructive way.	0.60	3.72
The administrator provides support to teachers to help them recover from stressful experiences.	0.68	3.68
The administrator encourages a positive atmosphere that fosters emotional healing.	0.74	3.64
The administrator offers solutions to improve teachers' work-life balance.	0.75	3.44
The administrator is actively involved in restoring morale when teachers are demotivated.	0.75	3.44
Average Mean	3.58	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.3 highlights the Very High level of healing demonstrated by school administrators as part of their servant leadership style. The highest-rated aspect is their ability to resolve conflicts constructively (mean: 3.72), showing effectiveness in fostering collaboration and understanding. Administrators also provide support for teachers recovering from stress (mean: 3.68) and promote a positive atmosphere for emotional healing

(mean: 3.64). However, there is room for improvement in enhancing work-life balance and restoring morale (both mean: 3.44). With an overall mean of 3.58, administrators create a supportive school environment that helps teachers manage stress and improve well-being. This aligns with Bilal et al. (2020), emphasizing healing as a key servant leadership trait that strengthens team motivation and resilience.

Table 2.4 Extent of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators in terms of Self-Awareness

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator is aware of their own strengths and limitations as a leader.	0.40	3.80
The administrator reflects on their actions and decisions in order to improve their leadership style.	0.75	3.44
The administrator is open to receiving feedback about their leadership practices.	0.59	3.76
The administrator demonstrates humility by acknowledging their mistakes and learning from them.	0.68	3.68
The administrator regularly seeks opportunities for personal growth and development.	0.64	3.52
Average Mean	3.64	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.4 highlights the Very High level of self-awareness exhibited by school administrators in their servant leadership approach. They demonstrate strong awareness of their strengths and limitations (mean: 3.80) and show openness to feedback (mean: 3.76), indicating a commitment to continuous improvement. Administrators also display humility in acknowledging

mistakes (mean: 3.68) and actively seek personal growth opportunities (mean: 3.52). With an overall mean of 3.64, these findings align with Da Fonseca et al. (2022), emphasizing that self-awareness fosters authentic leadership, reducing power imbalances and promoting a culture of growth and collaboration.

Table 2.5 Extent of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators in terms of Persuasion

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator is able to influence teachers' opinions without using authority or force.	0.66	3.72
The administrator encourages teachers to adopt new ideas through respectful dialogue.	0.40	3.80

The administrator presents their ideas in a convincing and persuasive manner.	0.37	3.84
The administrator fosters a collaborative approach by persuading teachers to work toward common goals.	0.43	3.76
The administrator effectively gains teachers' support for changes or new initiatives in the school.	0.48	3.64
Average Mean	3.75 Very High	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.5 highlights the Very High level of persuasion demonstrated by school administrators in their servant leadership approach. They excel in presenting ideas convincingly (mean: 3.84) and encouraging teachers to adopt new ideas through respectful dialogue (mean: 3.80). Administrators also effectively influence teachers without exerting authority (mean: 3.72) and promote

collaboration toward common goals (mean: 3.76). The lowest-rated indicator, gaining support for school changes (mean: 3.64), suggests a potential area for improvement. With an overall mean of 3.75, these findings align with Cook (2023), reinforcing that persuasion in servant leadership fosters collaboration, motivation, and positive change.

Table 2.6 Extent of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators in terms of Conceptualization

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator has a clear vision of the future direction of the school.	0.49	3.60
The administrator can think beyond day-to-day tasks and focus on long-term goals for the school.	0.40	3.80
The administrator regularly involves teachers in discussions about the school's plans.	0.80	3.60
The administrator demonstrates an ability to anticipate challenges and opportunities in the educational landscape.	0.49	3.60
The administrator encourages teachers to think creatively and propose innovative solutions for school improvement.	0.80	3.60
Average Mean	3.64 Very High	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.6 highlights the Very High level of conceptualization demonstrated by school administrators in their servant leadership. They excel in long-term strategic thinking (mean: 3.80) and having a clear vision for the school's future (mean: 3.60). Administrators also involve teachers in school planning (mean: 3.60), anticipate challenges and opportunities

(mean: 3.60), and encourage creativity and innovation (mean: 3.60). With an overall mean of 3.64, these findings suggest that administrators are effective in strategic decision-making and visionary leadership. This aligns with Liden et al. (2020), who emphasize that conceptualization is key for leaders to navigate future challenges and foster innovation.

Table 2.7 Extent of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators in terms of Foresight

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator can foresee potential challenges and take proactive steps to address them.	0.80	3.60
The administrator's decisions are informed by an understanding of past trends and future possibilities.	0.80	3.60
The administrator involves teachers in planning for the future of the school.	0.40	3.80
The administrator prepares the school community for changes by anticipating future needs.	0.40	3.80
The administrator consistently makes decisions that align with long-term goals for the school's success.	0.80	3.60
Average Mean	3.68 Very High	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.7 highlights the Very High level of foresight demonstrated by school administrators in their servant leadership. They excel in engaging teachers in future planning and preparing the school community for

changes (mean: 3.80). Administrators are also proactive in anticipating challenges, making data-informed decisions, and aligning actions with long-term school success (mean: 3.60). With an overall mean of 3.68,

these findings suggest that administrators effectively plan for the future and make strategic decisions. This aligns with VanBenschoten (2023), who emphasizes

foresight as essential in guiding organizations toward long-term success.

Table 2.8 Extent of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators in terms of Stewardship

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator takes responsibility for the school’s resources and ensures their proper use.	0.80	3.60
The administrator makes decisions that promote the welfare of both teachers and students.	0.40	3.80
The administrator values and protects the interests of the school community.	0.40	3.80
The administrator fosters a sense of accountability among teachers and staff for the school’s success.	0.49	3.60
The administrator encourages a culture of sustainability in school programs and initiatives.	0.40	3.80
Average Mean	3.72	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”

Table 2.8 highlights the Very High level of stewardship demonstrated by school administrators in their servant leadership. They prioritize the welfare of teachers and students, protect school community interests, and promote sustainability in school programs (mean: 3.80). Administrators also ensure responsible resource management and foster accountability among staff

(mean: 3.60). With an overall mean of 3.72, these findings suggest that administrators are committed to decision-making that benefits the school community, efficient resource use, and sustainability. This aligns with Canavesi and Minelli (2022), who emphasize stewardship as key to organizational well-being and accountability.

Table 2.9 Extent of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators in terms of Commitment to the Growth of Others

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator actively supports professional development opportunities for teachers.	0.80	3.60
The administrator mentor’s teachers to help them improve their skills and performance.	0.80	3.60
The administrator provides constructive feedback that helps teachers grow in their profession.	0.40	3.80
The administrator encourages teachers to set and achieve personal and professional goals.	0.80	3.60
The administrator promotes a culture of continuous learning and improvement among teachers	0.49	3.60
Average Mean	3.64	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”

Table 2.9 highlights the Very High level of commitment school administrators demonstrate toward the growth of others in their servant leadership. They prioritize providing constructive feedback to help teachers grow (mean: 3.80) and actively support professional development, mentorship, goal-setting, and continuous learning (mean: 3.60). With an overall mean of 3.64, the

findings suggest that administrators foster an environment that encourages teacher improvement and lifelong learning. This aligns with Gultekin and Kara et al. (2022), who emphasize that servant leadership in education enhances both teacher and student effectiveness through professional growth and mentorship.

Table 2.10 Summary of the Level of Servant Leadership in the Educational Management of School Administrators

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Listening	3.67	Very High
Empathy	3.72	Very High
Healing	3.58	Very High
Self-Awareness	3.64	Very High
Persuasion	3.75	Very High

Conceptualization	3.64	Very High
Foresight	3.68	Very High
Stewardship	3.72	Very High
Commitment to the Growth of Others	3.64	Very High
Average Mean	3.671 Very High	

Scale: 1.0 – 1.75 “Very Low”, 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”, 2.51 – 3.25 “High”, 3.26 – 4.00 “Very High”

Table 2.10 summarizes the Very High level of Servant Leadership among school administrators across various components, with mean scores ranging from 3.58 to 3.75. The highest-rated component, Persuasion (3.75), highlights administrators’ ability to influence and foster collaboration. Other highly rated components, such as Empathy (3.72), Stewardship (3.72), and Foresight (3.68), reflect their commitment to understanding

teachers' needs, managing resources responsibly, and anticipating future challenges. With an overall mean of 3.67, the results indicate that administrators prioritize empowering and supporting their staff, fostering an inclusive and nurturing leadership approach. These findings align with Türkmen and Gül (2017), who emphasize the role of Servant Leadership in creating a supportive and growth-oriented environment.

Table 3.1 Level of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Ability to Develop Trusting,

Compassionate Relationships with Students

Indicators	SD	Mean
The teacher creates an environment where students feel safe to express their thoughts and emotions.	0.46	3.74
The teacher is attentive to students’ personal concerns and offers emotional support when needed.	0.49	3.66
The teacher fosters positive, respectful relationships with all students.	0.51	3.55
The teacher demonstrates genuine concern for the well-being of students beyond academic performance.	0.51	3.48
The teacher encourages open communication and trust between students and themselves.	0.51	3.53
Average Mean	3.59 Very High	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”

Table 3.1 highlights the Very High level of teacher effectiveness in building trusting, compassionate relationships with students, with an overall mean score of 3.59. The highest-rated indicator, "Creating a safe environment for students to express thoughts and emotions" (3.74), reflects teachers' strong ability to foster openness. Teachers also excel in providing emotional support (3.66), fostering respectful

relationships (3.55), and demonstrating concern beyond academics (3.48). Even the lowest-rated indicator, "Encouraging open communication and trust" (3.53), remains within the Very High category. These findings align with Zhou (2022), emphasizing that teacher trust and compassion enhance students' emotional well-being, engagement, and overall school experience.

Table 3.2 Level of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Patient Caring and Kind Personality

Indicators	SD	Mean
The teacher shows patience when students struggle with difficult tasks or concepts.	0.52	3.52
The teacher responds to students’ questions and concerns with kindness and understanding.	0.51	3.61
The teacher remains calm and composed even in challenging situations with students.	0.50	3.42
The teacher demonstrates empathy and compassion toward students' emotional and academic needs.	0.49	3.65
The teacher consistently treats all students with fairness, respect, and kindness.	0.49	3.61
Average Mean	3.56 Very High	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”

Table 3.2 highlights the Very High level of teacher effectiveness in demonstrating patience, care, and

kindness, with an overall mean score of 3.56. The highest-rated indicator, "Showing empathy and

compassion for students' emotional and academic needs" (3.65), reflects teachers' strong ability to support students. Teachers also excel in responding with kindness (3.61), treating students with fairness and respect (3.61), and showing patience with struggling students (3.52). Even the lowest-rated indicator,

"Remaining calm in challenging situations" (3.42), remains within the Very High category. These findings align with Mackenzie and LaRusso (2021), emphasizing that teacher empathy and patience create a nurturing environment that enhances students' emotional and academic growth.

Table 3.3 Level of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Professionalism

Indicators	SD	Mean
The teacher maintains a high standard of ethics and integrity in their interactions with students and colleagues.	0.49	3.61
The teacher arrives to class on time and is prepared with lesson plans and materials.	0.46	3.69
The teacher communicates clearly and effectively with both students and parents.	0.44	3.74
The teacher consistently demonstrates accountability for their teaching practices and outcomes.	0.44	3.77
The teacher adheres to school policies and guidelines in their professional conduct.	0.51	3.42
Average Mean	3.60	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 3.3 highlights the Very High level of teacher effectiveness in professionalism, with an overall mean score of 3.60. The highest-rated indicator, "Demonstrating accountability for teaching practices and outcomes" (3.77), reflects teachers' strong sense of responsibility. Teachers also excel in clear communication with students and parents (3.74),

punctuality and preparedness (3.69), and maintaining ethics and integrity (3.61). Even the lowest-rated indicator, "Adhering to school policies and guidelines" (3.42), remains within the Very High category. These findings align with Shuls and Flores (2020), emphasizing that teacher professionalism fosters trust, respect, and a positive learning environment.

Table 3.4 Level of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Subject Matter Knowledge

Indicators	SD	Mean
The teacher demonstrates a strong understanding of the subject matter being taught.	0.49	3.62
The teacher is able to explain complex concepts in ways that are easily understood by students.	0.50	3.53
The teacher integrates current and relevant information into lessons to enhance learning.	0.48	3.64
The teacher answers students' questions with accuracy and depth of knowledge.	0.49	3.62
The teacher uses a variety of teaching strategies to make subject matter engaging and accessible.	0.49	3.59
Average Mean	3.60	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 3.4 highlights the Very High level of teacher effectiveness in subject matter knowledge, with an overall mean score of 3.60. The highest-rated indicator, "Integrating current and relevant information into lessons" (3.64), shows that teachers effectively enhance learning with up-to-date content. Teachers also excel in subject mastery (3.62), providing accurate and in-depth answers (3.62), and explaining complex concepts

clearly (3.53). The lowest-rated indicator, "Using diverse teaching strategies to engage students" (3.59), suggests a need for further improvement in making lessons more engaging. These findings align with Hwang (2021), emphasizing that deep subject knowledge and effective delivery are crucial for an engaging learning environment.

Table 3.5 Level of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Learners

Indicators	SD	Mean
The teacher understands the diverse learning styles and needs of their students.	0.47	3.67
The teacher adjusts their teaching methods based on the individual needs and abilities of students.	0.50	3.56

The teacher is aware of students’ strengths and areas for improvement and tailors support accordingly.	0.50	3.64
The teacher fosters an inclusive classroom environment where all students feel valued.	0.50	3.60
The teacher builds relationships with students to better understand their interests, backgrounds, and challenges.	0.39	3.84
Average Mean	3.66 Very High	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”

Table 3.5 highlights the Very High level of teacher effectiveness in understanding and supporting learners, with an overall mean score of 3.66. The highest-rated indicator, "Building relationships with students to understand their interests, backgrounds, and challenges" (3.84), reflects teachers' strong ability to connect with students on a personal level. Teachers also excel in understanding diverse learning styles (3.67), recognizing students' strengths and areas for

improvement (3.64), and fostering an inclusive classroom environment (3.60). The lowest-rated indicator, "Adjusting teaching methods based on individual needs" (3.56), suggests an opportunity for further personalization of teaching strategies. These findings align with Adams and Lee (2022), emphasizing that understanding and responding to students' diverse needs fosters a supportive and inclusive learning environment.

Table 3.6 Summary of the Level of Teacher Effectiveness

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Ability to develop trusting, compassionate relationships with students	3.59	Very High
Patient, Caring, and Kind Personality	3.56	Very High
Professionalism	3.65	Very High
Subject Matter Knowledge	3.60	Very High
Knowledge of Learners	3.66	Very High
Average Mean	3.612 Very High	

Scale: 1.0 – 1.75 “Very Low”, 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”, 2.51 – 3.25 “High”, 3.26 – 4.00 “Very High”

Table 3.6 summarizes teacher effectiveness across five key components—developing trusting relationships, patient and caring personality, professionalism, subject matter knowledge, and knowledge of learners—all of which received "Very High" ratings, with mean scores ranging from 3.56 to 3.66. The highest-rated component, "Knowledge of Learners" (3.66), highlights teachers' strong ability to understand students' needs, strengths, and challenges, while "Professionalism" (3.65) and

"Subject Matter Knowledge" (3.60) reflect their ethical standards and expertise. The overall mean score of 3.612 indicates that teachers demonstrate a very high level of effectiveness in fostering a supportive and impactful learning environment, aligning with Johnson and Clark (2021), who emphasize the importance of balancing subject expertise, interpersonal skills, and student understanding in effective teaching.

Table 4. Test of Significant Relationship Between School Administrators' Servant Leadership Style in Educational Management and Teachers' Effectiveness

Test Variables	Correlation Coefficient	P value	Decision
School Administrators' Servant Leadership Style in Educational Management and Teachers' Effectiveness	-0.141	0.50	retain the Ho

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant relationship

Table 4 presents the relationship between school administrators' servant leadership style and teachers' effectiveness, showing a correlation coefficient of -0.141 and a p-value of 0.50. Since the p-value exceeds 0.05, the null hypothesis is not rejected, indicating no significant relationship between the two variables. The weak negative correlation suggests that servant

leadership has minimal direct impact on teacher effectiveness. This aligns with Canavesi and Minelli (2022), who found that while servant leadership fosters a positive organizational culture, its direct influence on teacher performance is often mediated by factors like job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Table 5. Test of Significant Difference in School Administrators' Educational Practices

Kruskal Wallis Test	P value	Decision
School Administrators' Servant Leadership Style in Educational Management Vs. Age	0.124	retain the Ho
School Administrators' Servant Leadership Style in Educational Management Vs. Educational Attainment	0.005	reject the Ho
School Administrators' Servant Leadership Style in Educational Management Vs. Length of Service	0.002	reject the Ho

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant difference

The Kruskal-Wallis test in Table 5 reveals significant differences in school administrators' servant leadership styles based on educational attainment and length of service but not age. Age showed no significant impact ($p = 0.124$), indicating that administrators exhibit similar leadership styles regardless of age. However, educational attainment ($p = 0.005$) and length of service ($p = 0.002$) were found to significantly influence leadership styles, suggesting that administrators with higher education levels and longer service experience demonstrate distinct leadership behaviors. These findings align with research by Aquino et al. (2021) and Darling-Hammond (2022), highlighting that professional growth, both in education and experience, enhances leadership effectiveness in educational management.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The study emphasized the significant impact of servant leadership in the educational management of school administrators on teacher effectiveness in the SapangDalaga District. The findings revealed that servant leadership practices, such as fostering collaboration, empowering teachers, and prioritizing their well-being, have a positive influence on teacher performance and overall effectiveness. These practices foster a supportive environment that promotes professional growth and enhances job satisfaction among teachers. The study highlights the crucial role of servant leadership in achieving educational success and recommends its incorporation into school management strategies to further improve teacher effectiveness and optimize student outcomes.

Recommendations

The study's findings highlight the significance of servant leadership in education, offering valuable insights for school administrators, teachers, students, institutions, researchers, and policymakers. Administrators can refine their leadership by fostering collaboration, empowering teachers, and prioritizing their well-being, ultimately enhancing teacher effectiveness and cultivating a positive school culture.

Teachers, in turn, should embrace servant leadership by engaging with supportive administrators, leveraging opportunities for professional growth, and improving their teaching practices to create a more dynamic, student-centered learning environment. As teachers thrive in such an environment, students benefit indirectly through enriched learning experiences and greater academic achievement. Educational institutions should integrate servant leadership principles into policies, training programs, and professional development initiatives to ensure a culture of effective leadership. Researchers can build upon these findings by exploring servant leadership's impact in diverse educational contexts, while policymakers should recognize its potential by formulating policies that promote teacher empowerment and well-being. By embracing servant leadership at all levels, the educational system can create a more supportive, engaging, and effective learning environment for both educators and students.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Eason, B. Noble, and I. N. Sneddon, "On certain integrals of Lipschitz-Hankel type involving products of Bessel functions," *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London*, vol. A247, pp. 529–551, April 1955. (references)
- [2] J. Clerk Maxwell, *A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*, 3rd ed., vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1892, pp.68–73.
- [3] I. S. Jacobs and C. P. Bean, "Fine particles, thin films and exchange anisotropy," in *Magnetism*, vol. III, G. T. Rado and H. Suhl, Eds. New York: Academic, 1963, pp. 271–350.
- [4] K. Elissa, "Title of paper if known," unpublished.
- [5] R. Nicole, "Title of paper with only first word capitalized," *J. Name Stand. Abbrev.*, in press.
- [6] Y. Yorozu, M. Hirano, K. Oka, and Y. Tagawa, "Electron spectroscopy studies on magneto-optical media and plastic substrate interface," *IEEE Transl. J. Magn. Japan*, vol. 2, pp. 740–741, August 1987 [Digests 9th Annual Conf. Magnetics Japan, p. 301, 1982].
- [7] M. Young, *The Technical Writer's Handbook*. Mill Valley, CA: University Science, 1989.