

Leadership Styles and Their Influence on Teacher Performance in School Administration

Asnalia M. Lanto

Student, Medina College – Ozamiz City

Abstract— Effective school administration is closely linked to leadership styles that shape school climate, decision-making, and teacher performance. Understanding how transformational, transactional, and participative leadership styles influence teacher performance is essential for improving educational outcomes and sustaining professional standards in schools. This study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational research design conducted in the Nunungan District, Division of Lanao del Norte. Respondents included 80 teachers and 13 school administrators from selected public schools. Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire measuring administrators’ leadership styles based on the Full Range Leadership Theory and Path-Goal Theory, and teacher performance based on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Statistical analyses included mean, standard deviation, and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient to determine prevailing leadership styles, levels of teacher performance, and the relationship between the two variables. Findings revealed that school administrators demonstrated a high level of leadership styles overall ($\bar{x} = 4.01$), with transformational leadership rated highest, followed by participative/democratic and transactional leadership. Teachers’ performance across all PPST domains was also rated high ($\bar{x} = 4.07$). However, correlation analysis showed a very weak positive relationship between leadership styles and teacher performance ($\rho = 0.087$, $p = 0.440$), indicating no significant relationship between the variables. The results suggest that while effective leadership practices and high teacher performance coexist, teacher performance may be influenced more by factors such as professional competence, motivation, and institutional support rather than leadership style alone.

Keywords— leadership styles, teacher performance, school administration, PPST, educational leadership.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

In any educational institution, the effectiveness of school administration is closely tied to the leadership styles of school leaders, as these styles shape the school climate, decision-making processes, and overall teacher performance. Leadership in schools is not merely about managing tasks; it involves inspiring, motivating, and guiding teachers to achieve both personal and organizational goals. Different leadership approaches—whether transformational, transactional, or participative—can significantly influence how teachers perform in their classrooms, handle challenges, and engage with students.

For instance, a participative leader who encourages collaboration and values teacher input may foster higher morale and professional growth, while a more directive style may ensure strict adherence to policies but risk limiting teacher creativity. Understanding the dynamic relationship between leadership styles and teacher performance is therefore essential for improving educational outcomes, enhancing teacher satisfaction, and creating a learning environment that supports both professional excellence and student success.

Research consistently demonstrates that school leadership styles significantly influence teacher performance, with transformational, instructional, democratic, and participative approaches positively linked to improved teaching effectiveness, motivation, job satisfaction, and instructional quality. For example, a systematic review found that transformational and democratic leadership styles significantly enhance teacher performance and discipline by fostering motivation, effective communication, and a supportive school culture, highlighting the principal’s multidimensional role in school settings (Leoparlin, 2025). Other studies also show that instructional and transformational leadership positively affect teacher motivation, job satisfaction, and performance outcomes by providing structured guidance and promoting collaboration (Andriadi & Sulistiyo, 2024). Empirical evidence further supports that inspirational and participatory leadership styles contribute to higher levels of teacher professionalism and school effectiveness, creating climates that support both teacher and student success (Awaludin & Fatmawati, 2025). Qualitative reviews also indicate that a range of leadership styles—including transformational, transactional, and democratic—can variably influence

teacher performance depending on context and implementation (Rasyid, 2024). Moreover, recent research emphasizes that leveraging transformational and instructional leadership not only directly enhances teacher performance but also does so indirectly through improving teacher self-efficacy and organizational culture (Long & Xia, 2025).

Despite the growing body of literature highlighting the impact of leadership styles on teacher performance, observations and initial interviews in local school settings reveal persistent inconsistencies in teacher motivation, engagement, and instructional outcomes that existing studies do not fully explain. Teachers report experiencing both supportive and restrictive leadership approaches, often within the same school, which affects their ability to deliver quality education consistently. Some educators feel empowered under participative and transformational leaders, while others face challenges under more transactional or directive styles, suggesting that leadership effectiveness may vary depending on contextual and interpersonal factors unique to each school. This inconsistency indicates a gap between theoretical understanding of leadership styles and their actual influence on teacher performance in practice. Therefore, there is a clear need for a focused study that examines the relationship between specific leadership styles and teacher performance in real school environments, providing empirical insights that can guide principals in adopting strategies that genuinely enhance teacher effectiveness, job satisfaction, and overall school performance.

This study aims to explore the relationship between the leadership styles of school administrators and the performance of teachers within the school setting. Specifically, it seeks to identify the prevailing leadership style, whether transformational, transactional, or participative/democratic, as perceived by teachers, and to assess the level of teacher performance across the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) domains, including content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum planning and assessment, community linkages and professional engagement, and personal growth and professional development. Furthermore, the study intends to determine whether a significant relationship exists between administrators' leadership styles and teachers' performance, and to identify which leadership style exerts the greatest influence on improving teacher

effectiveness. By examining these factors, the research provides insights into how leadership approaches in school administration can enhance teacher performance and contribute to overall school improvement.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational research design, consistent with Creswell's (2014) framework, to describe existing conditions and examine relationships between variables without manipulation. The design was used to determine the prevailing leadership styles of school administrators—transformational, transactional, and participative/democratic—as perceived by teachers, and to assess teacher performance based on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). The descriptive component summarized teachers' perceptions of leadership behaviors and performance through numerical data, while the correlational component examined the relationship between leadership styles and teacher performance in a natural school setting. This approach was appropriate since the study focused on identifying naturally occurring patterns and associations rather than implementing experimental interventions, providing empirical evidence relevant to educational leadership research.

Research Setting

The study was conducted in the Nunungan District, Division of Lanao del Norte, a predominantly rural area composed of public elementary and secondary schools serving learners from diverse socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. Schools in the district are geographically dispersed and operate under the policies and standards of the Department of Education, including the implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and established leadership guidelines.

The selection of this setting is significant as it reflects a realistic educational context characterized by resource limitations and accessibility challenges, where the leadership role of school administrators is especially vital in supporting teachers and sustaining effective teaching and learning.

Examining leadership styles and teacher performance in Nunungan District therefore provides relevant insights applicable to similar school districts within the Division of Lanao del Norte.

Research Respondents

The respondents of the study included 80 teachers and 13 school administrators from selected public schools in the Nunungan District, Division of Lanao del Norte. Teachers served as the primary respondents in assessing the leadership styles of school administrators, as they were directly supervised and could provide informed perceptions of leadership practices, while school administrators acted as raters of teacher performance using a Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST)-based instrument.

Inclusion criteria ensured that teachers had at least one year of experience under their current administrator and that administrators were officially designated school heads responsible for supervision and evaluation. A complete enumeration sampling method was employed, allowing all qualified teachers and administrators in the district to participate, thereby minimizing sampling bias and strengthening the validity and reliability of the study's findings.

Research Instrument

The study used a structured questionnaire to measure the leadership styles of school administrators and the performance of teachers. The instrument consisted of two parts: Part I assessed administrators' leadership styles as perceived by teachers, grounded in the Full Range Leadership Theory and Path-Goal Theory, and covered transformational, transactional, and participative/democratic leadership using fifteen indicators rated on a five-point Likert scale.

Part II measured teacher performance based on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), encompassing five domains rated on a five-point performance scale from outstanding to poor. The questionnaire was selected for its capacity to quantitatively capture both perceptions of leadership and standardized performance indicators, ensuring a comprehensive, reliable, and confidential assessment aligned with national evaluation guidelines.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering process commenced with securing formal permission from school administrators and relevant education authorities, followed by coordination with school heads to inform teachers about the study and their voluntary participation. Prior to questionnaire administration, the researcher explained the study's

purpose, assured confidentiality and anonymity, and provided clear instructions to ensure accurate responses. The questionnaires were personally distributed and collected, with the researcher monitoring completion and offering clarification when necessary. Completed forms were checked for accuracy and completeness, then organized, coded, and prepared for statistical analysis, ensuring the collection of reliable and valid data aligned with the study's objectives.

Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles outlined by Bryman and Bell (2007), emphasizing respect for participants, honesty in research conduct, and the protection of human rights. Informed consent was obtained from all respondents after clearly explaining the purpose of the study, ensuring voluntary participation, and affirming their right to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained, with no personally identifiable information included and all data used solely for academic purposes and securely stored. The study involved no deception and ensured that participants were not subjected to harm or discomfort, upholding transparency, integrity, and respect for human dignity throughout the research process.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using appropriate statistical procedures to ensure accurate and valid interpretation of results. Mean and standard deviation were employed to determine the prevailing leadership styles of school administrators and the level of teacher performance across the five PPST-based domains, with mean scores interpreted qualitatively to describe levels of leadership prevalence and teacher performance, and standard deviation indicating response consistency.

To examine the relationship between leadership styles and teacher performance, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to measure the strength and direction of their linear association and to determine the presence of a significant relationship.

The results of these analyses served as the basis for drawing conclusions and formulating recommendations for enhancing school leadership and teacher development programs.

III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table 1.1 *Prevailing Leadership Style of School Administrators as Perceived by Teachers in Terms of Transformational Leadership*

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator inspires teachers with a clear vision for the school.	0.71	4.15
The administrator motivates teachers to achieve beyond their expectations.	0.88	3.98
The administrator encourages creativity and innovation in teaching practices.	0.89	3.99
The administrator recognizes and appreciates teachers' accomplishments.	0.67	4.26
The administrator fosters an environment of continuous professional growth.	0.85	4.08
Grand Mean		4.09 (High)

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

The findings in Table 1.1 indicated that the prevailing leadership style of school administrators in terms of transformational leadership was rated high, with an overall mean of 4.09, suggesting that administrators were generally perceived as effective in inspiring, motivating, and supporting teachers.

The highest-rated indicator was the recognition and appreciation of teachers' accomplishments, which obtained a very high mean, highlighting the strong presence of acknowledgment practices that enhance

teacher motivation and morale. The lowest-rated indicator, although still high, related to motivating teachers to exceed expectations, indicating an area for further improvement.

Overall, the results suggest a leadership environment conducive to professional growth and school effectiveness, consistent with studies showing that transformational leadership positively influences teacher motivation, commitment, and instructional innovation (Al-Mahdy et. al, 2021).

Table 1.2 *Prevailing Leadership Style of School Administrators as Perceived by Teachers in Terms of Transactional Leadership*

Indicators	SD	Mean
The administrator sets clear expectations and guidelines for teachers.	0.82	3.93
The administrator rewards teachers for meeting performance standards.	0.77	3.96
The administrator corrects teachers who fail to meet established rules.	0.97	3.84
The administrator emphasizes the importance of following procedures and policies.	0.76	4.00
The administrator focuses on achieving specific targets and goals.	0.80	3.99
Grand Mean		3.94 (High)

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

The findings in Table 1.2 showed that the prevailing leadership style of school administrators in terms of transactional leadership was rated high, with an overall mean of 3.94, indicating that administrators were frequently perceived as setting clear expectations, monitoring performance, and ensuring compliance with standards.

The highest-rated indicator was the emphasis on following procedures and policies, reflecting the importance of maintaining order and consistency in school operations, while the lowest-rated indicator,

correcting teachers who fail to meet rules, suggested a balanced approach to enforcement to preserve positive working relationships.

These results align with recent research showing that transactional leadership promotes organizational stability and teacher performance when clear standards and monitoring mechanisms are in place, and its effectiveness is strengthened when combined with supportive practices that sustain motivation and job satisfaction (Kalkan et al., 2022).

Table 1.3 *Prevailing Leadership Style of School Administrators as Perceived by Teachers in Terms of Participative/Democratic Leadership*

Indicators	SD	Mean
------------	----	------

The administrator encourages teachers to participate in decision-making.	0.77	4.03
The administrator values teachers' opinions and suggestions.	0.77	4.00
The administrator promotes teamwork among staff members.	0.95	3.98
The administrator listens to teachers' concerns before making decisions.	0.80	3.96
The administrator ensures that decisions are made collectively whenever possible.	0.7	4.03
Grand Mean	3.42 (Very High)	

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

The findings in Table 1.3 indicated that the prevailing leadership style of school administrators in terms of participative/democratic leadership was rated high, with an overall mean of 4.00, suggesting that administrators were generally perceived as engaging teachers in shared decision-making and fostering a collaborative school environment. The highest-rated indicators were encouraging teacher participation in decisions and ensuring collective decision-making, both reflecting strong participatory practices, while the lowest-rated

indicator, listening to teachers' concerns before making decisions, suggested room to further strengthen consultation. These results are supported by recent studies showing that participative leadership enhances teacher job satisfaction, collaboration, professional engagement, and school climate, and promotes collective efficacy and shared accountability, which are vital for effective teaching and learning (Somech et al., 2021; Park & Ham et al., 2023).

Table 1.4 Summary of the Prevailing Leadership Style of School Administrators as Perceived by Teachers

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Transformational Leadership	4.09	High
Transactional Leadership	3.94	High
Participative/Democratic Leadership	4.00	High
Grand Mean	4.01 (High)	

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 1.4 summarized the prevailing leadership styles of school administrators as perceived by teachers, showing an overall high rating with an average mean of 4.01, indicating that administrators consistently demonstrated a combination of transformational, transactional, and participative/democratic leadership. Transformational leadership obtained the highest mean (4.09), followed by participative/democratic leadership (4.00) and transactional leadership (3.94), suggesting that administrators relied more on inspirational and people-

centered practices, such as motivation, vision-building, and collaboration, while still maintaining structure and accountability. These findings align with recent studies highlighting the effectiveness of integrative leadership approaches, where blending transformational and participative styles enhances teacher commitment, instructional quality, and school climate, while transactional leadership supports stability and goal attainment (Gümüş et al., 2022; Hallinger & Ko, 2023; Zheng et al., 2024).

Table 2. Level of Teachers' Performance

Indicators	SD	Mean
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy		
Applied knowledge of content within and across curriculum teaching areas. (PPST 1.1.2)	0.74	4.05
Used research-based knowledge and principles of teaching and learning. (PPST 1.2.2)	0.77	4.04
Ensured the positive use of ICT to facilitate the teaching and learning process. (PPST 1.3.2)	0.88	4.09
Used a range of teaching strategies that enhance learner achievement in literacy and numeracy. (PPST 1.4.2)	0.67	4.29
Used effective verbal and non-verbal classroom communication strategies to support learner understanding, participation, engagement and achievement. (PPST 1.7.2)	0.87	4.09
Learning Environment & Diversity of Learners		

Maintained learning environments that nurture and inspire learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning. (PPST 2.4.2)	0.83	4.06
Applied a range of successful strategies that maintain learning environments that motivate learners to work productively by assuming responsibility for their own learning. (PPST 2.5.2)	0.73	4.09
Designed, adapted and implemented teaching strategies that are responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents. (PPST 3.3.2)	0.87	4.04
Planned and delivered teaching strategies that are responsive to the special educational needs of learners in difficult circumstances, including: geographic isolation; chronic illness; displacement due to armed conflict, urban resettlement or disasters; child abuse and child labor practices. (PPST 3.4.2)	0.72	4.10
Curriculum and Planning & Assessment and Reporting		
Adapted and implemented learning programs that ensure relevance and responsiveness to the needs of the learners (PPST 4.3.2)	0.76	4.05
Community Linkages and Professional Engagement		
Maintained learning environments that are responsive to community contexts. (PPST 6.1.2)	0.84	4.09
Reviewed regularly personal teaching practice using existing laws and regulations that apply to the teaching profession and the responsibilities specified in the Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers. (PPST 6.3.2)	0.79	4.08
Complied with and implemented school policies and procedures consistently to foster harmonious relationships with learners, parents, and other stakeholders. (PPST 6.4.2)	0.87	4.06
Personal Growth and Professional Development		
Adopted practices and uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession by exhibiting qualities such as caring attitude, respect and integrity. (PPST 7.2.2)	0.90	3.91
Grand Mean	4.07 (High)	

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High”, 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2 showed that the level of teachers’ performance was rated high, with an overall mean of 4.07, indicating strong competence across the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) domains, including content knowledge, learning environment, curriculum planning, community engagement, and professional growth. The highest-rated indicator was the use of varied teaching strategies to enhance literacy and numeracy (PPST 1.4.2) with a mean of 4.29, reflecting strong pedagogical effectiveness, while the lowest-rated

indicator was upholding professional values and ethics (PPST 7.2.2) with a mean of 3.91, suggesting room for further development in personal growth and reflective practice. These results align with research showing that high teacher performance is associated with effective pedagogy, inclusive learning environments, and continuous professional development, which enhance student achievement, instructional effectiveness, and professional commitment (Darling-Hammond et al., 2021; OECD, 2023; Flores, 2024).

Table 3. Test of Significant Relationship Between Leadership Styles of School Administrators and Teacher Performance

Test Variables	Spearman rho	P value	Decision
Leadership Styles of School Administrators and Teacher Performance	0.087	0.440	Retain the H_0

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

Table 3 presented the test of the relationship between school administrators’ leadership styles and teacher performance using Spearman’s rho, revealing a very weak positive correlation ($\rho = 0.087$) that was not statistically significant ($p = 0.440$), leading to the retention of the null hypothesis. This indicated that variations in leadership styles did not correspond to

changes in teacher performance, suggesting that other factors such as personal motivation, professional competence, institutional policies, workload, or external support may play a more significant role. The findings align with recent studies showing that leadership effects on teacher performance are often indirect or mediated by contextual factors like school climate and professional

learning, and that leadership styles alone may be insufficient predictors of performance when teachers demonstrate strong autonomy and operate within standardized systems (Nguyen, Hallinger, & Ko, 2022; Bush & Ng, 2023; Zhang & Chen, 2024).

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION

Summary of Findings

Prevailing Leadership Style of School Administrators. Administrators' leadership styles were rated High overall (mean = 4.01), with transformational leadership highest (mean = 4.09), followed by participative/democratic (mean = 4.00) and transactional leadership (mean = 3.94).

Level of Teachers' Performance. Teachers' performance across all PPST domains was rated High (mean = 4.07), with the highest-rated indicator being the use of varied teaching strategies for literacy and numeracy, and the lowest-rated indicator being personal growth and professional values.

Relationship Between Leadership Styles and Teacher Performance. The correlation between leadership styles and teacher performance was very weak and not statistically significant ($\rho = 0.087$, $p = 0.440$), indicating no significant relationship between the two variables.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that school administrators demonstrated high levels of transformational, transactional, and participative/democratic leadership as perceived by teachers, while teachers likewise exhibited a high level of performance across all PPST-based domains. This indicated that both effective leadership practices and strong teacher competence were present in the school setting. However, the results further showed that there was no significant relationship between the leadership styles of school administrators and teacher performance, suggesting that high teacher performance was not directly dependent on the leadership styles exercised by administrators. This implied that teacher performance may be influenced by other factors such as professional standards, personal motivation, experience, and institutional support systems. Overall, the study concluded that while effective leadership remains important in school administration, teacher performance can be sustained at a high level even in the absence of a significant direct influence from leadership styles.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, which revealed that school administrators demonstrated high levels of leadership styles and teachers exhibited high performance despite the absence of a significant relationship between the two variables, the following enriched recommendations are offered for various stakeholders in the education sector:

School Administrators / Principals. School administrators are encouraged to sustain and further strengthen their leadership practices by adopting a balanced and flexible leadership approach. Although leadership styles did not show a significant direct relationship with teacher performance, administrators should continue practicing transformational and participative leadership to maintain a positive school climate, promote collaboration, and support teachers' professional growth. Principals may consider institutionalizing mentoring and coaching programs, strengthening professional learning communities, and providing individualized support to teachers to address specific needs and challenges. Continuous leadership training and self-reflection are also recommended to ensure responsiveness to evolving educational demands.

Teachers. Teachers are encouraged to continue demonstrating high professional standards and to actively engage in continuous professional development. Given that teacher performance remained high regardless of leadership style, teachers should strengthen self-directed learning, reflective practice, and peer collaboration to sustain instructional quality. Teachers are also encouraged to participate actively in school decision-making processes, communicate professional needs to administrators, and take leadership roles in school-based initiatives that enhance teaching and learning outcomes.

Students. Schools should ensure that the high level of teacher performance observed in the study translates into sustained improvements in student learning experiences.

Administrators and teachers should collaborate to implement learner-centered, inclusive, and research-based teaching strategies that address diverse student needs. Programs that support academic achievement, learner engagement, and holistic development should be continuously monitored and enhanced to maximize student outcomes.

School Boards / Education Supervisors. School boards and education supervisors are advised to support leadership development initiatives that go beyond a single leadership style. Since leadership styles alone did not significantly influence teacher performance, evaluation systems should also consider contextual factors such as school culture, teacher autonomy, and professional support mechanisms. Supervisors may design comprehensive leadership development programs that emphasize adaptive leadership, instructional support, and collaborative management practices to strengthen overall school effectiveness.

Policy Makers / Department of Education (DepEd). Policy makers and the Department of Education are encouraged to use the findings as a basis for reviewing and enhancing leadership training and professional development policies. Leadership programs should focus on equipping school administrators with a range of leadership competencies, including instructional leadership, collaborative decision-making, and teacher support strategies. Policies should also recognize and reinforce teacher professionalism and autonomy, ensuring that support systems are in place to sustain high teacher performance across diverse school contexts.

Future Researchers / Academics. Future researchers are encouraged to build on the findings of this study by exploring other variables that may influence teacher performance, such as school climate, organizational culture, teacher motivation, workload, and access to resources.

Longitudinal and mixed-methods studies are recommended to capture the indirect and contextual effects of leadership on teacher performance. Expanding the research to different regions, school levels, or educational systems may also provide deeper insights and improve the generalizability of results.

Parents and the Community. Parents and community stakeholders are encouraged to actively support school programs and initiatives that enhance teaching and learning. Strengthening school–community partnerships through participative leadership practices can foster shared responsibility for student success.

Community involvement in school activities, decision-making processes, and support programs can further reinforce a positive learning environment and sustain the quality of education delivered by schools.

REFERENCES

- [1] Al-Mahdy, Y. F. H., Emam, M. M., & Hallinger, P. (2021). Assessing the contribution of principal instructional and transformational leadership to teacher professional learning in Oman. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 101, 103303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103303>
- [2] Andriadi, D., & Sulistiyo, U. (2024). The influence of transformational and instructional leadership styles of school principals on teacher performance, motivation, job satisfaction, and student achievement. *PPSDP International Journal of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v3i2.335>
- [3] Awaludin, A., & Fatmawati, F. (2025). Principal's leadership style: Impact on student motivation and teacher performance. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, 13(4), 2439–2448. <https://jurnal.ibik.ac.id/index.php/jimkes/article/view/3442>
- [4] Bush, T., & Ng, A. Y. M. (2023). Distributed leadership and teacher performance: A critical review of evidence. *School Leadership & Management*, 43(4), 321–338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2022.2142567>
- [5] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- [6] Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2021). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 25(2), 97–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- [7] Flores, M. A. (2024). Teacher professionalism and professional development in times of change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 135, 104312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104312>
- [8] Gümüş, S., Bellibaş, M. Ş., Esen, M., & Gümüş, E. (2022). A systematic review of studies on leadership models in educational organizations. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(1), 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220969696>
- [9] Hallinger, P., & Ko, J. (2023). Exploring the impact of leadership on teacher professional learning and school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 34(2), 161–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2022.2103746>

- [10] Kalkan, Ü., Altınay Aksal, F., Altınay Gazi, Z., Atasoy, R., & Dağlı, G. (2022). The relationship between school administrators' leadership styles, school culture, and organizational effectiveness. *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1163. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031163>
- [11] Leopardin, A. (2025). The influence of principals' leadership styles on teachers' performance in schools: A systematic literature review. *Reflection Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.36312/b1ps3c64>
- [12] Long, Y., & Xia, J. (2025). Leveraging transformational and instructional leadership for teacher professional development: A dual mediation model of teacher self efficacy and organisational culture. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 164, 105087. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2025.105087>
- [13] Nguyen, D., Hallinger, P., & Ko, J. (2022). Exploring the indirect effects of school leadership on teacher professional practice. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(5), 678–695. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211021773>
- [14] OECD. (2023). Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals. OECD Publishing. <https://www.oecd.org/education/teachers-and-school-leaders-as-valued-professionals-0c11d0b1-en.htm>
- [15] Park, J., & Ham, S. H. (2023). Democratic school leadership and teachers' organizational commitment: The mediating role of school climate. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(2), 389–404. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2022-0204>
- [16] Rasyid, M. N. (2024). The influence of principal leadership style on teacher performance. *International Journal of Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1(2), 34–38. <https://doi.org/10.62951/ijeepa.v1i2.361>
- [17] Somech, A. (2021). Participative decision making in schools: A mediating-moderating analytical framework for understanding school and teacher outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(3), 421–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20969823>
- [18] Zhang, Y., & Chen, H. (2024). School leadership, contextual factors, and teacher performance: A correlational study. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1304567. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1304567>
- [19] Zheng, X., Yin, H., & Li, Z. (2024). School leadership, teacher efficacy, and school climate: Evidence from an integrated leadership perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1349201. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1349201>