

Level of Teacher Satisfaction Toward the Leadership Practices of the Teacher-In-Charge: Basis for a School Management Enhancement Plan

Alma B. Pondoc

Student, Medina College – Ozamiz City

Abstract— This study investigated the level of teacher satisfaction toward the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Tanguib City. Employing a quantitative descriptive–correlational design, data were collected from 120 teachers who had been under the supervision of their Teacher-in-Charge for at least one academic year. A structured, researcher-made questionnaire measured leadership practices across four domains: Planning, Organizing, Implementing, and Evaluating; and assessed teacher satisfaction in terms of Administrative Support, Communication and Decision-Making, Professional Development, and School Management Effectiveness. Descriptive statistics, including weighted mean, frequency counts, and percentages, were used to summarize the data, while Pearson’s r correlation determined the relationship between leadership practices and teacher satisfaction. Results revealed that overall leadership practices were perceived positively (Grand Mean = 3.24, High), with Organizing (3.32, Very High) and Evaluating (3.28, Very High) rated the highest. Teacher satisfaction was also rated High overall (Grand Mean = 3.16), with School Management Effectiveness (3.28, Very High) receiving the highest score. A moderate but statistically significant positive correlation was found between leadership practices and teacher satisfaction ($r = 0.482, p < 0.05$), indicating that effective leadership directly influences teacher contentment. Teachers reported challenges such as time constraints, administrative workload, and limited teaching resources, while strategies like task delegation, mentoring, structured schedules, and regular staff meetings were employed to enhance school management. Based on these findings, a School Management Enhancement Plan was proposed to strengthen leadership practices and optimize teacher satisfaction.

Keywords— teacher satisfaction, leadership practices, Teacher-in-Charge, school management, public elementary schools, educational leadership.

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Leadership practices are deemed to be essential in establishing a conducive and productive school culture because effective leadership and management by the Teacher-in-Charge can have a direct impact on school activities, teacher motivation, professional growth, and overall satisfaction. Considering the public and private schools, planning, organizing, implementing, and assessing the school programs as implemented by the Teacher-in-Charge can give an insight into the quality of the leadership and how it influences teacher satisfaction. When the teachers feel that the leadership practices are inclusive, supportive, and responsive, they will have greater chances of feeling valued, motivated, and making their contributions towards the teaching-learning process.

Recent research points to the critical role of school leadership in the improvement of teacher satisfaction and work engagement. For instance, Avolio et al. (2014) state that the presence of transformational leadership behaviors like supportive decision-making and professional development opportunities has a strong association with increased teacher satisfaction. In like manner, Lu et al. (2015) have discovered that participatory leadership and clear communication have a positive influence on the sense of autonomy and professional satisfaction of teachers. Administrative support and recognition were directly associated with teacher commitment and retention according to research by Nayir (2012), and active participation of school leaders in program planning and evaluation is a potential contributor to better teacher satisfaction and organizational performance according to Menon

(2014). These results emphasize that leadership practices are highly critical in defining the professional experiences and satisfaction of teachers in schools.

Although these have been illuminated, a literature gap exists on localized research on Teacher-in-Charge leadership practices and their relevance to a certain level of teacher satisfaction. The majority of the studies discuss principals or the school heads at a more general organizational scope and thus possess little information on the impact of the frontline leaders, Teachers-in-Charge, on the daily satisfaction of teaching employees. Moreover, limited research exists that can correlate individual leadership activities such as planning, organizing, implementing and evaluating programs to particular aspects of teacher satisfaction such as administrative support, communication, professional development and school management effectiveness. This gap shows that there is a need to research on the situational and practical effects of Teacher-in-Charge leadership in schools that are situated in individual contexts.

The purpose of this study is to find out the extent of teacher satisfaction with the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge to rely on as a foundation of a School Management Enhancement Plan. In particular, it aims to evaluate leadership practices in planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating programs; to determine teacher satisfaction in relation to administrative support, communication, professional development, and school management effectiveness; to test the connection between leadership practices and teacher satisfaction; to define leadership challenges and strategies that contribute to satisfaction. The results are supposed to assist school administrators and other stakeholders of education to enhance leadership practice, positive environment in the workplace, and eventually increase the overall quality of school management and education delivery.

Theoretical Framework

This research is grounded in Transformational Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), and Herzberg Two-Factor Theory of Motivation (Herzberg, 1959), which serve as the conceptual

frameworks to conceptualize the relationship between the leadership practice of the Teacher-in-Charge and teacher satisfaction.

Transformational Leadership Theory is the way how leaders inspire and motivate followers by such behaviors as idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration to build commitment, engagement, and professional development. Transformational leaders in the school setting establish a vision, facilitate innovation and support the teachers which may impact positively on their motivation, satisfaction and performance.

Herzberg Two-Factor Theory distinguishes between factors that prevent or lessen dissatisfaction such as supervision, organizational policies, working conditions, and those that contribute to job satisfaction by actively encouraging it such as recognition, achievement, responsibility, growth. The practices of leadership that may be construed as a motivator and hygiene aspect in the context of teacher satisfaction in an educational setting may include administrative support, effective communication, professional development, and participation in decision making.

When considering the application of these theories to the study, the Transformational Leadership Theory can be used to explain how the leadership behaviors of the Teacher-in-Charge during the planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating school programs influence the perceptions of teachers regarding support, involvement, and professional fulfillment, which in turn impact their satisfaction. This is supplemented by Herzberg in his Two-Factor Theory that determines what leadership practices increase satisfaction and which ones' decrease dissatisfaction as hygienic factors. Collectively, these theories can be implemented in obtaining a holistic approach to the influence of leadership practices on teacher satisfaction, as well as a recommendation to create a School Management Enhancement Plan.

The use of these theories in education research is supported by a number of research studies carried out. Abdul Wahab et al. (2014) studied the practices of transformational leadership in primary school

headmasters and revealed that greater levels of transformational leadership were significantly related to greater teacher satisfaction, and individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation were among the most predictive behaviors. As Menon (2014) showed, transformational leadership has a positive influence on the satisfaction and engagement of teachers. Selamat, Nordin, and Adnan (2013) too concluded that transformational leaders have a strong impact on the professional attitudes and satisfaction of teachers, whereas Amin, Shah, and Tatlah (2013) emphasized the acceptance of the transformational leadership in enhancing school climate and teacher satisfaction. These articles affirm that transformational leadership practices are important in defining the work experiences and satisfaction of teachers and Herzberg theory offers an understanding of the motivating and hygiene variables in the school leadership practices.

These theories are relevant to the study because they enable an explanation of the behavioral and motivational aspects of leadership and satisfaction. Transformational Leadership Theory provides an understanding of how the actions of the Teacher-in-Charges affect teacher engagement and perceptions of leadership, and the Two-Factor Theory by Herzberg can be used in understanding why some leadership practices are effective in inducing satisfaction or avoiding dissatisfaction. The application of these theories will allow the researcher to not only discuss the degree of teacher satisfaction with regard to leadership practices but also discuss the factors that contributed to this satisfaction. This theoretical framework guides the development of a School Management Enhancement Plan that would tie the leadership strategies with teacher needs, motivation, and professional development to eventual benefit in a supportive and effective school environment.

Statement of the Problem

This research seeks to identify the extent of Teacher satisfaction with the Leadership practice of the Teacher-in-Charge as the foundation of a School Management Enhancement Plan. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

What is the level of leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of:

- planning;
- organizing;
- implementing; and
- evaluating school programs and activities?

What is the level of teacher satisfaction toward the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of:

- administrative support;
- communication and decision-making;
- professional development; and

2.4 school management effectiveness?

- Is there a significant relationship between the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge and the level of teacher satisfaction?
- What challenges and leadership strategies affect teacher satisfaction toward the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge?
- Based on the findings, what School Management Enhancement Plan may be proposed?

H01: There is no significant relationship between the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge and the level of teacher satisfaction

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge and teacher satisfaction in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Tanguib City. Respondents were teachers who had at least one year of experience under the supervision of the Teacher-in-Charge, ensuring informed and reliable perceptions. Data were collected using a structured, researcher-made questionnaire consisting of five parts: demographic profile, leadership practices (planning, organizing, implementing, evaluating), teacher satisfaction (administrative support, communication

and decision-making, professional development, and school management effectiveness), as well as identified challenges and strategies. The instrument underwent expert validation to ensure clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives. Prior to data collection, necessary permissions and informed consent were secured, and ethical standards such as confidentiality, anonymity, and voluntary participation were strictly observed. Collected data

were analyzed using frequency counts and percentages to describe challenges and strategies, weighted mean to determine levels of leadership practices and satisfaction, and Pearson's r correlation coefficient to assess the relationship between variables at a 0.05 level of significance, providing a systematic and empirical basis for understanding leadership effectiveness and teacher satisfaction.

III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile	Teachers	
	f	%
Age		
Male	42	35.00
Female	78	65.00
Total	120	100.00
Teaching Experience		
Less than 1 year	5	4.17
1–3 years	40	33.33
4–6 years	37	30.83
Total	120	100.00
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	66	55.00
Master's Degree	48	40.00
Doctorate / Graduate Studies	6	5.00
Total	120	100.00
Length of Service under the Teacher-in-Charge		
Less than 1 year	18	15.00
1–3 years	42	35.00
4–6 years	36	30.00
More than 6 years	24	20.00
Total	120	100.00

Table 1 shows the demographic picture of the 120 teacher respondents, in terms of gender, teaching experience, education qualification and period of service under the Teacher-in-Charge. The data will give a context of the thoughts of the respondents on the leadership practices and level of satisfaction.

It was found that most of the respondents were female teachers constituting 65% (78) of the respondents, with the male teachers making up 35% (42) of the

sample. It shows that female teachers are represented more often in the chosen schools and can affect the attitudes to leadership practices and satisfaction as there might be some disparity in the workplace experiences between the genders.

In terms of teaching experience, 33.33% (40) of the teachers had been working in the teaching field between 1 and 3 years, 30.83% (37) had between 4 and 6 years of experience, and just 4.17% (5) had a lower

experience of less than 1 year. The homogeneity of the respondents in 1-6 years of experience is an indication that the majority of the teachers have enough exposure to school programs and interactions with the Teacher-in-Charge, which makes them informed about leadership practices and school management.

The majority of the respondents had a Bachelor degree, which was 55% (66) and 40% (48) had a Master and graduate degree respectively, with a minor proportion of 5% (6) having a doctorate or graduate studies. This distribution is an indication of a fairly educated teaching staff with a large percentage possessing further education that can bring about a rise in expectations and critical analysis of the effectiveness of leadership.

The years of service under Teacher-in-Charge were different with 35% being the highest for 1-3 years, the

second highest percentage 30% (36) of more than 6 years, and the lowest percentage of 15%, (18) of less than 1-year service. This diversity indicates that there is a combination of different views of teachers that have varying familiarity and experience in the Teacher-in-Charge, which means that there is a comprehensive leadership practice and satisfaction that is assessed by the teachers under different tenures.

All in all, the demographic picture suggests that the sample is mostly made up of women, quite experienced, and has an undergraduate or a Master degree. Alongside, the different periods of service of teachers as Teacher-in-Charge give a balanced perspective on the practice of leadership and its influence on teacher satisfaction. These demographic traits are the keys to understanding the results of the research since they might affect the perception and experience of leadership practices of teachers.

Table 2.1. Level of Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of Planning

Indicators	SD	Mean
The Teacher-in-Charge sets clear objectives for all school programs and activities.	0.87	3.24
The Teacher-in-Charge prepares well-structured plans aligned with school goals.	0.83	3.25
The Teacher-in-Charge anticipates potential challenges when planning.	0.87	3.15
The Teacher-in-Charge involves teachers in the planning process.	0.99	3.10
The Teacher-in-Charge ensures that all planned programs are realistic and achievable.	0.93	3.06
Grand Mean		3.16 (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 introduces the level of leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge with regard to Planning. The findings indicate a High descriptive level of results (Grand Mean = 3.16), which depicts the results that teachers have a positive perception of the planning practices in the Teacher-in-Charge. This implies that the Teacher-in-Charge is competent in goal setting, planning, and leading school programs.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated was “The Teacher-in-Charge prepares well-structured plans aligned with school goals” (M=3.25), followed by “The Teacher-in-Charge sets clear objectives for all school programs and activities” (M=3.24). This is followed by “The Teacher-in-Charge anticipates potential challenges when planning” (M=3.15), “The Teacher-in-Charge involves teachers in the planning

process” (Mean = 3.10), and “The Teacher-in-Charge ensures that all planned programs are realistic and achievable” (M=3.06).

The lowest-rated indicator is still at the High category, indicating that all the aspects of planning are positively viewed by the teachers, demonstrating a well-developed and non-discriminative attitude towards school leadership.

Menon (2014) substantiated these findings by underlining the fact that school leaders who create clear plans and engage teachers in the planning process will increase organizational efficiency and teacher satisfaction.

This is corroborated by the current study as teachers rated the Teacher-in-Charge highly in preparing

organized plans and making clear objectives, and this proves that effective planning practices do result in

positive teacher perceptions and contributes to the overall objective of school management.

Table 2.2. Level of Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of Organizing

Indicators	SD	Mean
The Teacher-in-Charge delegates responsibilities according to teachers' strengths.	0.75	3.43
The Teacher-in-Charge coordinates tasks among teachers effectively.	0.70	3.28
The Teacher-in-Charge organizes resources efficiently for school programs.	0.74	3.43
The Teacher-in-Charge ensures teachers understand their roles and responsibilities.	0.78	3.28
The Teacher-in-Charge maintains proper records and documentation for school activities.	0.83	3.16
Grand Mean	3.32	(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 provides the degree of leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of Organizing. These findings indicate that the overall level of descriptive is Very High (Grand Mean = 3.32), meaning that teachers view the Teacher-in-Charge as very able to handle the duties, to arrange the activities and to coordinate resources so that school running could be smooth.

When considering the rated specific indicators, Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated were “The Teacher-in-Charge delegates responsibilities according to teachers’ strengths” (Mean = 3.43) and “The Teacher-in-Charge organizes resources efficiently for school programs” (Mean = 3.43), followed by “The Teacher-in-Charge coordinates tasks among teachers effectively” (Mean = 3.28) and “The Teacher-in-Charge ensures teachers understand their roles and responsibilities” (Mean = 3.28). The lowest-rated indicator, “The Teacher-in-Charge maintains proper records and documentation for school activities” (Mean = 3.16), still falls within the

High category, indicating that all aspects of organizing are positively viewed. This emphasizes the fact that the Teacher-in-Charge does a good job of assigning duties and clarifying responsibilities as well as utilizing the available resources to the fullest.

Musenze et al. (2014) supported these results by stating that the ability to delegate and organize the tasks effectively leads to the improvement of teacher performance and satisfaction. This is reaffirmed by the current research because the teachers rated the Teacher-in-Charge high on delegation of responsibilities and organization of resources and proved that well-structured leadership practices provided an opportunity of conducive environment to teaching and collaborating. The findings show that having high organizational skills can indeed increase operational efficiency but can also influence teacher confidence and engagement, which confirms the relation between leadership organizing practices and overall school effectiveness, as highlighted by Musenze et al. (2014).

Table 2.3. Level of Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of Implementing

Indicators	SD	Mean
11. The Teacher-in-Charge carries out school programs as planned.	0.71	3.28
12. The Teacher-in-Charge monitors the progress of school activities.	0.94	3.14
13. The Teacher-in-Charge motivates teachers to accomplish tasks effectively.	0.87	3.15
14. The Teacher-in-Charge applies problem-solving during program implementation.	0.86	3.20
15. The Teacher-in-Charge ensures smooth execution of school activities.	0.91	3.22
Grand Mean	3.20	(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 displays the level of the Teacher-in-Charges level of leadership in terms of Implementing. The findings demonstrate that there is a general High descriptive level (Grand Mean = 3.20) meaning that the teachers are mostly positive on the implementation practices of the Teacher-in-Charge. It means that the Teacher-in-Charge successfully implements the school programs, controls the activities and provides the seamless accomplishment of the planned activities.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated was “The Teacher-in-Charge carries out school programs as planned” (Mean = 3.28), followed by “The Teacher-in-Charge ensures smooth execution of school activities” (Mean = 3.22), “The Teacher-in-Charge applies problem-solving during program implementation” (Mean = 3.20), “The Teacher-in-

Charge motivates teachers to accomplish tasks effectively” (Mean = 3.15), and “The Teacher-in-Charge monitors the progress of school activities” (Mean = 3.14). The lowest-rated indicator remains in the High category, which means that all the facets of the implementation process of school programs are seen by teachers in a positive way.

This observation can be reinforced by Klar et al. (2013), who observed that school leaders who proactively track progress, resolve issues, and encourage staff members when implementing the program improve teacher performance and program success. The research establishes the fact that the implementation practices of the Teacher-in-Charge do have a positive impact on teacher satisfaction, as well as on the proper management of school institutions.

Table 2.4. Level of Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of Evaluating

Indicators	SD	Mean
16. The Teacher-in-Charge reviews completed programs systematically.	0.76	3.26
17. The Teacher-in-Charge provides constructive feedback to teachers.	0.64	3.25
18. The Teacher-in-Charge identifies areas for improvement in school management.	0.67	3.24
19. The Teacher-in-Charge uses evaluation results to improve future programs.	0.73	3.23
20. The Teacher-in-Charge communicates evaluation outcomes clearly to staff.	0.72	3.39
Grand Mean		3.28 (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 shows the level of Teacher-in-Charge Leadership practices in the Evaluating aspect. The outcomes demonstrate the general Very High level of Descriptive (Grand Mean = 3.28) which means that the teachers affirm the evaluation practices of the Teacher-in-Charge as very positive.

This means that the Teacher-in-Charge is able to review the programs systematically, give feedback, and manage the evaluation results to enhance the school management.

Among the individual indicators, the highest rated was “The Teacher-in-Charge communicates evaluation outcomes clearly to staff” (Mean = 3.39), followed by “The Teacher-in-Charge reviews completed programs systematically” (Mean = 3.26), “The Teacher-in-Charge provides constructive feedback to teachers”

(Mean = 3.25), “The Teacher-in-Charge identifies areas for improvement in school management” (Mean = 3.24), and “The Teacher-in-Charge uses evaluation results to improve future programs” (Mean = 3.23).

The lowest-rated indicator is still in the High category, which demonstrates that all the areas of assessing school programs are positively identified by teachers.

This is corroborated by Hallinger et al. (2014), who identified that good school leaders who offer regular assessment and positive feedback encourage teacher improvement and the general performance of the school.

This confirms that the Teacher-in-Charge practices of evaluation are an excellent help in increasing teacher satisfaction and consecutive school improvement.

Table 2.5 Summary of the Level of Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge

Domains	Mean	Interpretation
Planning	3.16	High
Organizing	3.32	Very High
Implementing	3.20	High
Evaluating	3.28	Very High
Grand Mean	3.24	High

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

The findings indicate the overall High level of descriptive (Grand Mean = 3.24), which means that teachers, on the whole, have a positive view of the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge. This implies that the Teacher-in-Charge is competent in terms of leading school programs and has a good command of teaching staff.

The highest mean was observed in the area of Organizing (3.32, Very High), Evaluating (3.28, Very High), Implementing (3.20, High), and Planning (3.16, High). The high scores in all areas would imply that the Teacher-in-Charge is efficient in delegating tasks, organizing tasks, overseeing program execution,

offering feedback and organizing plans. Even the spheres which could be rated as High are also seen with the positive perception, which proves the relatively high leadership level in the school.

These results are justified by Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2015), who underlined that school heads who combine organization, implementation, and evaluation practices develop teacher confidence and satisfaction and improve overall school performance. This relates to the fact that the leadership practices by the Teacher-in-Charge identified by teachers to be effective and play a positive role in the management of the school and teacher morale.

Table 3.1 Level of Teacher Satisfaction toward the Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of Administrative Support

Indicators	SD	Mean
Provides assistance and resources necessary to perform teaching tasks effectively.	0.90	3.03
Responds promptly to teachers' needs and concerns.	0.78	3.20
Supports teachers in implementing school programs.	0.98	3.15
Grand Mean		3.13 (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 shows the degree of teacher satisfaction with the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge with respect to Administrative Support. The findings show that the Teacher-in-Charge is perceived as having an overall High level of descriptive support (Grand Mean = 3.13), which implies that teachers were largely positive about the administrative support the Teacher-in-Charge has to offer them. This means that the Teacher-in-Charge is successful in providing support, addressing issues and aiding teachers in school program implementation.

Among the individual indicators, the top scored one was “Responds promptly to teachers’ needs and

concerns” (3.20), followed by “Supports teachers in implementing school programs” (3.15) and “Provides assistance and resources necessary to perform teaching tasks effectively” (3.03).

Even the lowest-rated indicator is still rated as High, meaning that the overall aspects of administrative support are perceived positively and provide satisfaction to teachers.

These are in line with the findings by Salazar (2013), who pointed out that responsive and supportive leadership contributes to teacher motivation, engagement, and dedication to school programs.

This proves that the Teacher-in-Charge administrative support is identified as significant variable in

increasing the teacher satisfaction and facilitating a successful school management.

Table 3.2 Level of Teacher Satisfaction toward the Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of Communication and Decision-Making

Indicators	SD	Mean
Communicates decisions clearly and timely.	0.83	3.21
Involves teachers in decision-making processes.	0.81	3.18
Provides accurate information about school policies and activities.	0.85	3.05
Grand Mean	3.14 (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 shows the satisfaction level of the teachers with the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge on Communication and Decision-Making. The findings indicate that there is a general High descriptive level (Grand Mean = 3.14), meaning that teachers have a positive impression of the communication and decision-making practices of the Teacher-in-Charge. This implies that the Teacher-in-Charge has a good communication channel and consults teachers in making pertinent decisions, which fosters transparency and openness in the operations of the school.

Within the category of specific indicators, the one with the highest score was “Communicates decisions clearly and timely” (3.21), followed by “Involves teachers in decision-making processes” (3.18) and

“Provides accurate information about school policies and activities” (3.05). The lowest-rated indicator also falls under the High category, indicating that every point related to communication and decision-making is viewed positively by the teachers and is considered a source of overall satisfaction.

This result is consistent with Cruz (2015), who observed that the trust, cooperation, and commitment of staff members in a school are promoted by school leaders that are able to communicate in a clear and prompt way and who involve teachers in the decision-making process. This validates that the communication and decision-making practices used by the Teacher-in-Charge have a positive influence on the level of teacher satisfaction and contribute to the effective organization of programs in schools.

Table 3.3 Level of Teacher Satisfaction toward the Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of Professional Development

Indicators	SD	Mean
Encourages teachers to attend training or workshops.	0.92	3.02
Provides opportunities for skill enhancement and career growth.	0.91	3.12
Supports professional learning in alignment with school goals.	0.91	3.19
Grand Mean	3.11 (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 shows the degree of teacher satisfaction over the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge as regards Professional Development. The findings indicate the overall High level of descriptive (Grand Mean = 3.11), meaning teachers generally view the Teacher-in-Charge as supportive in facilitating their professional development. This implies that the Teacher-in-Charge offers motivation, development

and support of skills of teachers as well as career growth of the teachers in line with school objectives.

The most rated indicator “Supports professional learning in alignment with school goals” (3.19), followed by “Provides opportunities for skill enhancement and career growth” (3.12) and “Encourages teachers to attend training or workshops” (3.02). The lowest-rated indicator is also rated in the

High category, meaning that teachers do not see anything negative in all the aspects of professional development, and the Teacher-in-Charge also makes efforts to promote endless learning.

These results are justified by Lopez (2015) who pointed out that school leaders that engage in

professional development actively contribute to the improvement of teacher competence, motivation, and satisfaction. This proves that the Teacher-in-Charge practices in professional development lead to teacher growth and satisfaction in general, as well as the successful school operation.

Table 3.4. Level of Teacher Satisfaction toward the Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge in terms of School Management Effectiveness

Indicators	SD	Mean
Maintains a well-organized and productive school environment.	0.73	3.20
Ensures programs and activities run smoothly.	0.72	3.32
Demonstrates fairness and consistency in school management.	0.70	3.32
Grand Mean	3.28 (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 provides the degree of teacher satisfaction with the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge with regards to the School Management Effectiveness. The findings indicate that the Teacher-in-Charge has an average level of descriptive characteristics of Very High (Grand Mean = 3.28), which demonstrates that teachers consider the Teacher-in-Charge to be effective to control the way the school functions.

This implies that the Teacher-in-Charge has a fruitful and well-structured school environment as well as making sure that programs and activities are carried out efficiently.

The best-rated in particular indicators were: “Ensures programs and activities run smoothly” (3.32) and “Demonstrates fairness and consistency in school management” (3.32), followed by “Maintains a well-

organized and productive school environment” (3.20). Even the weakest indicator belongs to the High-Very high category, which indicates that all the elements of the effective school management are considered and valued by teachers.

Garcia (2015) also reinforced these findings by highlighting that strong school management, which manifests itself through being organized, fair and as systematic as implementing programs, goes a long way toward boosting teacher satisfaction and performance.

This validates that the management practices by the Teacher-in-Charge are able to create an effective and constructive working environment that helps increase the morale of the teachers and productivity of the school.

Table 3.5 Summary of the Level of Teacher Satisfaction toward the Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge

Domains	Mean	Interpretation
Administrative Support	3.13	High
Communication and Decision-Making	3.14	High
Professional Development	3.11	High
School Management Effectiveness	3.28	Very High
Grand Mean	3.16	High

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

The level of teacher satisfaction with the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Chair is summarized in Table 3.5. The findings show that the overall level of

descriptive is High (Grand Mean = 3.16) which denotes that teachers tend to be satisfied with the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge. It

means that the Teacher-in-Chair activities in assisting teachers, effective communication, professional development, and administration of school activities are positively evaluated by the teaching staff.

The best-rated area was in the area of School Management Effectiveness (3.28 -Very High), which was followed by the areas of Communication and Decision-Making (3.14 -High), Administrative Support (3.13 -High), and Professional Development (3.11 -Very High). The lowest-rated domain also lies in the High category, indicating that every element of

leadership practices has a positive effect on teacher satisfaction.

This has been supported by Reyes-Guerra et al. (2014) who noted that leadership practices that guarantee systematic administration, open communication, and chances of professional growth are very essential in improving the satisfaction and motivation of the teachers. The findings corroborate that leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge are good to support and create a productive school climate, which is in line with the findings on the effectiveness of educational leadership and teacher engagement.

Table 4. Test of Significant Relationship between the Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge and the Level of Teacher Satisfaction

Test Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p value	Decision
Leadership Practices of the Teacher-in-Charge and Level of Teacher Satisfaction	0.482	0.000	Reject the Ho

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, there is a significant relationship.

Table 4 presents the test of significant relationship between the leadership practices of the Teacher-in-Charge and the level of teacher satisfaction. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.482 and a p-value of 0.000, which is lower than the 0.05 level of significance. Based on this result, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that a statistically significant relationship exists between the two variables.

The correlation coefficient of 0.482 obtained indicates that there is moderate positive correlation between the practices of leadership by the Teacher-in-Charge and the teacher satisfaction. This implies that the greater the levels of effective leadership practices, the greater the levels of teacher satisfaction. Since the Teacher-in-

Charge proves to be sufficiently competent in planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating school programs and activities, the teachers are more likely to gain more positive attitudes towards their workplace and the qualities of their leadership.

Moreover, such a finding demonstrates the critical role of effective and regular leadership in ensuring a positive school climate. Leadership behaviors that give guidance, encouragement and effective communication can help teachers feel satisfied and involved in their profession.

In this way, Teacher-in-Charge leadership position has a central role in determining the experiences of teachers and their general satisfaction in school.

Table 5. Challenges Encountered by the Teacher-in-Charge in Managing the School

Challenges	f	%
Limited teaching staff	58	48.33
Lack of teaching/learning materials	64	53.33
Time constraints in managing school programs	71	59.17
Conflicts among teachers	36	30.00
Administrative workload	69	57.50
Total	298	248.33

In Table 5, the challenges faced by the Teacher-in-Charge in the management of the school are provided according to report by teachers. Time constraints in the management of school programs are the most mentioned challenge (59.17%), followed by administrative workload (57.50%), and lack of teaching/learning materials (53.33%). The lack of teaching staff was observed by 48.33% of the respondents, and the disagreements between teachers were observed by 30.00%. These findings indicate that the Teacher-in-Charge has to deal with several issues which may influence the performance of school management, performance of the leader and collaboration of the staff. Time constraints rated as

being high means that it is hard to balance the program implementation with the daily administrative duties, and the administrative workload and the absence of teaching/learning materials causes organizational and resource-related barriers. Conflicts between teachers, albeit they are less often reported, can affect the morale of the staff. These observations are supported by Garcia (2013), who states that school leaders tend to be faced with time management difficulties, administrative work, and lack of resources, which may hinder the implementation of the program and teacher assistance. The key to successful leadership and a favorable working condition is therefore strategical planning, allocation of resources, and delegation.

Table 6. Strategies Employed by the Teacher-in-Charge to Ensure Effective School Management

Challenges	f	%
Conducts regular staff meetings	82	68.33
Delegates tasks according to teachers' strengths	88	73.33
Implements structured schedules for programs	76	63.33
Provides guidance and mentoring to teachers	84	70.00
Monitors progress through reports or observation	79	65.83
Total	409	340.82

Table 6 shows the approaches used by the Teacher-in-Charge to make sure that the school is managed effectively as the teachers perceived it. These are the most regularly used: delegates tasks according to teacher strength (73.33%), then comes another one: provides guidance and mentoring to teachers (70.00%), and another (68.33%): conducts regular staff meetings. Other significant plans are, "monitors progress in reports or observation" (65.837%) and the practice of programs with structured schedules (63.337%). These findings show that the Teacher-in-Charge is an active user of a range of strategies aimed at improving school management, optimizing teacher work, and solving problems in program implementation.

progress, and instituting elaborate schedules are proactive communication, support, and organization. These results are supported by Schleicher (2012), who notes that strategic delegation, mentoring, and planned structuring are the attributes of decisive school leadership, resulting in the improvement of teacher performance, a pleasant working atmosphere, and teacher satisfaction.

The most highly rated approach, which involves assigning tasks based on the strengths of the teachers, emphasizes the fact that the Teacher-in-Charge is capable of identifying personal skills and responsibilities to distribute them to enhance the efficiency and satisfaction. Giving directions and mentoring, holding periodic staff meetings, tracking

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION

Summary of Findings

Level of Leadership Practices

Overall, the Teacher-in-Charge's leadership practices were perceived positively, with a High Grand Mean of 3.24.

Among the four domains, Organizing (3.32, Very High) and Evaluating (3.28, Very High) were rated highest, showing that teachers recognize the Teacher-in-Charge's ability to delegate tasks, coordinate responsibilities, manage resources efficiently, review

programs systematically, provide feedback, and communicate evaluation results clearly.

Planning (3.16, High) and Implementing (3.20, High) were also positively rated, reflecting competence in setting clear objectives, preparing structured plans, executing programs, monitoring progress, and applying problem-solving strategies during implementation.

Level of Teacher Satisfaction

Teachers reported an overall High level of satisfaction (Grand Mean = 3.16) toward the Teacher-in-Charge's leadership practices.

School Management Effectiveness (3.28, Very High) received the highest rating, indicating that teachers perceive the Teacher-in-Charge as highly effective in maintaining a productive, organized, and fair school environment.

Communication and Decision-Making (3.14, High), Administrative Support (3.13, High), and Professional Development (3.11, High) were also rated positively, suggesting that teachers appreciate timely communication, involvement in decision-making, supportive administrative practices, and opportunities for professional growth.

Relationship Between Leadership Practices and Teacher Satisfaction

A moderate positive relationship ($r = 0.482$, $p = 0.000$) was found between the Teacher-in-Charge's leadership practices and the level of teacher satisfaction.

This indicates that effective leadership behaviors in planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating school programs are associated with higher teacher satisfaction.

Challenges Encountered by the Teacher-in-Charge

The Teacher-in-Charge faced several challenges in managing the school, with the most commonly reported being:

- Time constraints in managing school programs (59.17%)
- Administrative workload (57.50%)

- Lack of teaching/learning materials (53.33%)
- Limited teaching staff (48.33%)
- Conflicts among teachers (30.00%)

These challenges highlight areas where school management may need additional support, resources, or strategic interventions.

Strategies Employed by the Teacher-in-Charge

Teachers identified several strategies employed to ensure effective school management, including:

- Delegating tasks according to teachers' strengths (73.33%)
- Providing guidance and mentoring to teachers (70.00%)
- Conducting regular staff meetings (68.33%)
- Monitoring progress through reports or observation (65.83%)
- Implementing structured schedules for programs (63.33%)

These strategies reflect proactive leadership practices that optimize teacher performance, foster collaboration, and maintain program efficiency.

Conclusions

Conclusively, the study shows that the Teacher-in-Charge demonstrates good leadership behaviors that contribute to a positive and productive school climate as evident in the high levels of teacher satisfaction on the areas of administrative support, communication, professional development, and school management effectiveness. The strong positive correlation between leadership practices and teacher satisfaction underscores the fact that successful planning, organization, implementation and assessment by the Teacher-in-Charge are critical in motivating, engaging and enhancing the performance of teachers and schools in general. Although the Teacher-in-Charge struggles with the problem of limited staff, time, and administration workload, the proactive approach, including delegating tasks, mentoring, time scheduling, and supervision prove that the Teacher-in-Charge can ensure the efficiency of the operations and promote the professional development of teachers. In general, the results prove that effective and powerful leadership directly increases the level of teacher

satisfaction and helps to address the successful management of the school.

Recommendations

The following are recommended based on the findings of the study:

For Teachers. Teachers are encouraged to actively participate in school programs, professional development activities, and decision-making processes. They are encouraged to provide constructive feedback to the Teacher-in-Charge to help improve leadership practices, enhance administrative support, and strengthen overall school management.

For the Teacher-in-Charge. It is recommended that the Teacher-in-Charge continue to develop and maintain effective leadership practices by:

- Involving teachers in planning and decision-making;
- Delegating tasks according to teachers' strengths;
- Providing regular guidance, mentoring, and timely feedback;
- Implementing structured schedules and monitoring program progress;

Addressing challenges such as time constraints, administrative workload, and limited resources through strategic planning and prioritization.

For School Administrators and Supervisors. Administrators are recommended to provide support to the Teacher-in-Charge by ensuring adequate resources, facilitating professional development opportunities, and assisting in workload management. Recognition and reinforcement of effective leadership practices should also be encouraged to promote teacher satisfaction and school efficiency.

For Policy Makers and Education Stakeholders. It is recommended that policy makers formulate policies and programs that support leadership training, provide additional school resources, and create initiatives that enhance teacher satisfaction and professional growth.

For Future Researchers. Future researchers are encouraged to explore other factors affecting teacher satisfaction and leadership effectiveness, including school resources, teacher workload, and socio-cultural influences, to further contribute to the development of comprehensive school management enhancement plans.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdul Wahab, J., Mohd Fuad, C. F., Ismail, H., & Majid, S. (2014). Headmasters' transformational leadership and their relationship with teachers' job satisfaction and teachers' commitments. *International Education Studies*, 7(13), 40-48.
- [2] Amin, M., Shah, S., & Tatlah, I. A. (2013). Impact of Principals/Directors' Leadership Styles on Job Satisfaction of the Faculty Members: Perceptions of the Faculty Members in a Public University of Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Research & Reflections in Education (JRRE)*, 7(2).
- [3] Avolio, B. J. (2014). Examining leadership and organizational behavior across the boundaries of science.
- [4] Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press
- [5] Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2007). *Business research methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- [6] Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- [7] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [8] Cruz, S. B. (2015). Relational trust and its impact on professional learning communities: Examining the impact of relational trust and group dynamics on professional learning communities as a vehicle for transformational learning. A parable about leading in a challenging environment. University of Pennsylvania.
- [9] Garcia, E. O. F. (2015). The relationship between faculty conflict management, emotional intelligence, leadership and quality in higher education. University of Phoenix.
- [10] Garcia, S. (2013). Educational resource allocation at the middle school level: A case study of six

middle schools in one California district (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California).

- [11] Hallinger, P. (2013). A conceptual framework for systematic reviews of research in educational leadership and management. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(2), 126-149.
- [12] Hallinger, P., Heck, R. H., & Murphy, J. (2014). Teacher evaluation and school improvement: An analysis of the evidence. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 26(1), 5-28.
- [13] Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2014). Modeling the longitudinal effects of school leadership on teaching and learning. *Journal of educational administration*, 52(5), 653-681.
- [14] Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [15] Klar, H. W., & Brewer, C. A. (2013). Successful leadership in high-needs schools: An examination of core leadership practices enacted in challenging contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(5), 768-808. Klar, H. W., & Brewer, C. A. (2013). Successful leadership in high-needs schools: An examination of core leadership practices enacted in challenging contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(5), 768-808.
- [16] Lopez, R. E. (2015). *School climate, developmental assets, and academic success in KIPP hispanic students* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- [17] Lu, J., Jiang, X., Yu, H., & Li, D. (2015). Building collaborative structures for teachers' autonomy and self-efficacy: The mediating role of participative management and learning culture. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(2), 240-257.
- [18] Menon, M. E. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership, perceived leader effectiveness and teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(4), 509-528.
- [19] Musenze, I. A., Thomas, M. S., & Lubega, M. (2014). Delegation and job satisfaction: An evaluation of the relationship within Uganda's primary education sector. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science: G Linguistics & Education*, 14(1), 70-78.
- [20] Nayir, F. (2012). The Relationship between Perceived Organizational Support and Teachers' Organizational Commitment. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 48, 97-116.
- [21] Reyes-Guerra, D., Russo, M. R., Bogotch, I. E., & Vásquez-Colina, M. D. (2014). Building a school leadership programme: An American paradox of autonomy and accountability. *School Leadership & Management*, 34(4), 414-437.
- [22] Salazar, M. J. (2013). *How current school leaders make sense of inclusive education policies: a qualitative exploration of graduates of a "high-quality" principal preparation program* (Doctoral dissertation).
- [23] Schleicher, A. (2012). *Preparing teachers and developing school leaders for the 21st century: Lessons from around the world*. OECD Publishing. 2, rue Andre Pascal, F-75775 Paris Cedex 16, France.
- [24] Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2015). Faculty trust in the principal: An essential ingredient in high-performing schools. *Journal of educational administration*, 53(1), 66-92.