



## **LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AND COMPETENCE OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS IN THE DIVISION OF CAGAYAN: BASIS FOR A COMPELLING-BASED ACTION PROGRAM**

**RIC D. AGANON, PhD**  
*Department of Education 02*  
*Division of Cagayan*  
*ric.aganon@deped.gov.ph*

**Abstract:** In the educational system, school administrators' leadership conduct and expertise are critical. Administrators have a significant impact on teachers, students, and the community. The research design used in this study was quantitative. It used descriptive correlational approaches in particular. It described the teacher and school principal profiles, as well as their assessments of the latter's leadership behaviors in strategic, instructional, managerial, human resource, cultural, micropolitical, and external development leadership, as well as the latter's leadership educational, supervisory, organizing, and administrative competence. The more the school's leadership conduct and competencies are visible and acknowledged by internal and external stakeholders, the more the school will succeed in meeting its goals and objectives. As a result, the purpose of this research was to determine the leadership behavior and competency of public secondary school administrators in the Division of Cagayan as a foundation for developing a compelling-based program.

**Keywords:** *Leadership Behavior, Leadership Competence, School Administrators, Competencies, Leadership*

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

It has been observed by the researcher that education at all levels are riddled with series of problems which include poor academic performance of schools, poor attitude of teachers to teaching and leadership behavior of school principals. The school principals are blamed for non-performance of their duties and their failure to exhibit appropriate leadership behavior to solve problems in the school system.

It is noted by the researcher that school managers communicate the school's mission to outside forces and to work successfully for adequate resources to support the school's educational program. Others are those organizational leaders' innovations and deal with such concern in ways which the concern subservient to the organization's goals. Some principals are effective in supervisory leadership. They work directly with teachers in a fashion, which identifies them with and commits them to agree upon objectives. The teachers are motivated to work, are sure of what where they are going, are confident in themselves and satisfied with their jobs because of the kind and quality of work they do. Still other principals are good administrative leaders, they are able to develop efficient ways of handling information and routine decision making and evaluating existing administrative procedures.

Leadership, therefore, is the key word. It is the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of a particular goal. The nature of the Philippine schools is such that the person

appointed by higher authority to act as the school manager is at the same time the leader in that school organization. The school principal is a leader. He requires leadership through interaction with the group in attaining its goals. A leader demonstrates his ability in assisting the group in attaining its goals. Leadership is moving, influencing and assisting the group to attain its goal. It is therefore the chief function of leadership to assist in the achievement of goals and the ability of developing and communicating a vision to a group of people that will make the vision true. However, the responsibilities of leadership do not end in simply giving assistance. Leadership is also designed to formulate, clarify, and evaluate goals or to discover those previously unrecognized. Therefore, the important role of the school principal is the clear formulation and understanding of goals and comprehensive development of effective strategies for their realization.

Propounded by Bangayan-Manera (2019), better education services for our Filipino children are found wanting, for the effort today are not enough to meet the challenges of tomorrow. There is a need of a dynamic and more relevant leader who can explore new horizons, initiate new ideas, and lead in the efforts of improving ideas, programs, strategies and consequently the quality of the educational product.

The principal is accepted as an expert in the fields of school organization and administration, and instructional leadership. As the leader of his faculty, he sets the tone for the entire education process.

The importance of the role of the principals on the school organization cannot therefore be over looked. Principals are very unique in school organizations. They are called school managers. The job of managing involves among other things, the provision of leadership for men and women coordinating both human and material resources to ensure the achievement of organizational goals. In the school system, the principal as an administrator influences his teachers to achieve the goals and objectives of the school. Carag (2020) asserted that the fundamental goal of the school is to enhance and learning process. Hence the school administrators should endeavor to influence the behavior of the teachers in order to achieve the goals of the school. School principals are expected to exhibit this leadership quality to enhance teaching and learning in the school. Ukeje, points out that the success of a leader depends on the readiness, the willingness, commitment and the ability of the followers as well the ability, style and skills of the leaders. Consequently the success of educational administrators depends on their effectiveness as well as the effectiveness of the classroom teachers.

With these observations, the researcher is motivated to make an analysis of leadership behavior and competence of public secondary individuals towards goal attainment. School administration holds the same concerns; hence it is an importance part of the educational system. It is a dynamic organ of the educational system which keeps on responding to the requirement of time.

The emphasis on principal as leaders may have added a new dimension to the traditional between the dual roles of principal as educator and principal as administrator. Early American schools had principle teachers, who were elected, but the position has now evolved towards greater attention to administrative matters.

A manager can be appointed. Leadership must be earned, even after appointment to a managerial position. Leadership is not a position in an organization, but an active influencing force. Leadership is not based on position or status, but on authority and prestige. Leadership may come from personal enthusiasm, personal authority, credibility, knowledge, skill, or charisma; it is derived from influence that the leader has on his followers. Accordingly, the principal holds the highest position in the school. The tone of the School is mainly influence by the behavior and personality of the principal and it affects the attitude, climate, progress, co-operation, and direct of efforts in the school. In fact, principal is the hub around which the educational activities revolve. There is no denying the fact that the school is essentially a co-operative enterprise, in which every member big or small, high or low has a vital role to play.

The school principal is expected to act as a leader in the school. The success of a school to accomplish the goals depends upon the ability of the head to lead staff members. Leadership is the one of the four functions that constitutes the administrative process. Planning sets the direction and objectives; organizing bring the resources together to turn plans into action; leadership builds the commitments and enthusiasm needed for people to apply their talents fully to help accomplish plans; and controlling make sure things turn out right. According to Kettor the primary function of a leader is to identify the essential purpose or mission of an organization and the strategy for attaining it. By contrast, the job of the manager is to implement that vision. The overriding function of management is to provide order and consistency to organizations, whereas the primary function of leadership is to produce change and movement. Management is about seeking adaptive and constructive change. Although, there are clear differences between management and leadership, there is also a considerable amount of overlap. When principals are involved in influencing a group to meet its goal, they are involved in leadership. When leaders are involved in planning, organizing, staffing, and controlling, they are involved in administration.

Education provides the foundation for skills development of the human resources needed to achieve the national goals, so it is imperative that education be at the forefront. The effectiveness of the school system depends to a large extent on those who are in the helm, or those who lead. The educational system will go only as far as where the leaders will take it. Good leader are made not born. If you have the desire and willpower, he can become an effective leader. Good leaders develop through a never ending process of self-study, education, training, and experience. This guide will help you through that process. To inspire your workers into higher levels of teamwork, there are certain things you must be, know, and do. These do not come naturally, but are acquired through continual work and study. Good leaders are continually working and studying to improve their leadership skills; they are not resting on their laurels.

## **RESEARCH QUESTIONS:**

This study aimed to determine the leadership behavior and competence of public secondary school administrators in the Division of Cagayan as a basis in designing a compelling-based action program.

Specifically, this study sought answer to the following questions;

1. What is the profile of the school head and classroom teachers in terms of:

1.1 Age

1.2 Sex

- 1.3 Highest educational attainment
- 1.4 Number of years as classroom teacher
- 1.5 Number of years as school head
- 1.6 Performance rating
2. What is the leadership behavior of the respondents as assessed by themselves and their teachers?
  - 2.1 Strategic Leadership
  - 2.2 Instructional Leadership
  - 2.3 Managerial Leadership
  - 2.4 Human Resources
  - 2.5 Cultural Leadership
  - 2.6 Micro Political Leadership
  - 2.7 External Development Leadership
3. Is there a significant difference on the perception of the administrator's leadership behavior when grouped by respondents?
4. What is the level of leadership competence of the respondents as assessed by themselves and their teachers?
5. Is there a significant difference on the competence of school administrators when group according to respondents?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of respondents and their:
  - 6.1 Leadership behavior
  - 6.2 Competence

## II. METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

This study utilized quantitative research design. Specifically, it employed descriptive correlational methods. It described the profile of the teachers and school heads and their assessment on the latter's leadership behaviors along strategic, instructional, managerial, human resource, cultural, micro-political and external development leadership and the latter's leadership educational, supervisory, organizing and administrative competence.

Further, it tested differences on the assessment of the teachers on their school heads as compared to the self-assessment of the school heads. Finally, it tested correlation between these selected variables for this study, hence correlational.

### Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in the Division of Cagayan. Municipalities with Integrated, National and Vocational Schools was prioritized by the researcher. The Division of Cagayan is composed of three (3) Legislative District. There are only four municipalities with Integrated Schools such as Allacapan with 1 Vocational, 2 National HS, 3 Integrated, Baggao with 3 Integrated, 2 Vocational, 5 National HS, Lasam with 1 Integrated, 1 Vocational, 3 National HS and Sto. Niño with 2 Integrated, 3 National HS. The schools are Agaman NHS, Baggao NAS – Sta. Margarita Annex, Baggao NAs, Baggao NSAT, Baggao NHS, Hacienda Intal NHS, Imurung NHS, San Isidro IS, Taguing IS, Abariongan NHS, Dungao IS, Lubo NHS, Namuccayan IS, Sto.

Niño NHS, Alig Valley NHS, Allacapan VHS, Matucay NHS, Mapurao IS, Cataratan IS, Utan IS, Cabatacan NHS, Callao NHS, Nabannagan NHS, Sicalao IS, Western Cagayan SAT, with 23 School Heads and 460 Teachers.

### Respondents and Sampling Procedure

The respondents of the study were the school heads and classroom teachers of the selected integrated, national, and vocational secondary schools in Division of Cagayan for the school year 2018-2019. Systematic random sampling was used to select the respondents of the study.

### Statistical Tools

For the descriptive part of the study, frequency counts, means, standard deviations, weighted means and five- point Likert scale was be used. The school heads' leadership behaviors and competence were described as follows:

Scale	Statistical Limit	Descriptive Value for Leadership Behavior	Descriptive Value for Leadership Competence
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very Desirable	Very High
4	3.40 – 4.19	Desirable	High
3	2.60 – 3.39	Somewhat Desirable	Average
2	1.80 – 2.59	Undesirable	Low
1	1.00 – 1.79	Very Undesirable	Very Low

Test of differences were analyzed using independent samples t-test while bivariate correlation analysis using Point-biserial, Spearman rho and Pearson r were used (depending on its appropriateness) to quantify relationships between the variables covered in this study. All of which were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Age

Table 1 shows the teacher respondents personal characteristics that include their age. Among the teacher respondents there are 36 percent who are 21 to 28 years old, there are 34 percent who are 29 to 36 years old. Also, 17 percent are 37 to 44 and 10 percent 45 to 52 years old. Only three percent are 53 to 60 years old. The mean age of the teacher respondents is 33.15 with a standard deviation of 8.73.

On the distribution of the School Heads regarding their age, data reveal that 64 percent are of the age 45 to 52. There are 32 percent with the age of 53 to 60 and there is only one school head whose age range from 29 to 36. The mean age of school head respondents is 50.32 with a standard deviation of 5.81. Generally, the school heads are middle aged. Hence, they are very much matured, emotionally stable as well as energetic.

This finding implies that the teacher respondents are relatively younger with the mean 33.15 than their school heads with the mean of 50.32.

It is common perception that the old people fail to do certain tasks at the efficiency of the younger people (Belai et al., 2010). Leaders and styles of leadership may vary based upon age and age groups of the leader and the follows as well. It has been stated, “With an older leader, the team may be more open to a leader’s transformational behaviors, because the team members may be

more accepting of the leader's special status" (Kearney, 2008). Van Vugt (2006) claims that, "age relates to leadership in a complicated way, according to the psychological literature. Some researchers find a positive correlation between age and leadership, whereas others find a zero or negative correlation". In the present time, evidence for this link between age and leadership can still be found in professions that require a considerable amount of specialized knowledge and experience, such as in science, politics, and arts (Van Vugt, 2006).

*Table 1. Profile of the respondents in terms of age*

Age (in years)	Teachers		School Heads	
	Frequency (n=460)	Percentage	Frequency (n=25)	Percentage
53 to 60	12	3	8	32
45 to 52	48	10	16	64
37 to 44	76	17	0	0
29 to 36	160	34	1	4
21 to 28	164	36	0	0
<b>Mean</b>	<b>33.15</b>		<b>50.32</b>	
<b>S.D.</b>	<b>8.73</b>		<b>5.81</b>	

## Sex

Table 2 shows that among the teacher respondent majority or 72 percent are females and 28 percent are males. This means that female outnumbered male in the teaching profession. The table also shows that majority or 56 percent of the school heads are females, while the remaining 44 percent are males. This result pictures outnumbering of female over male secondary school principals. This finding conforms with findings of earlier studies that teaching is a female dominated profession. It is again a common observation that male and female differ in their leadership behavior in many ways. The studies (Winter et al., 2001) also say that there are certain differences in the functioning of the male and female employees.

It is possible that males and females might lead from different perspectives. Winter, Neal and Waner (2001) claim that "Current psychological research on leadership and team interaction suggests that men and women exhibit different leadership styles and interpersonal communication styles in a variety of small-group situations from student problem- solving situations to industry and community situations". According to Lantz "women executives are much more likely than males to be a department head or to fill some other staff position, whereas men are much more likely to be a chief executive officer (CEO), chief operating officer (COO), president, or vice president" (Lantz, 2008). Babcock (2008) states that "Rather than intentional acts of bias, second-generation gender biases reflect the continuing dominance of traditionally masculine values in the workplace". According to common perception, women are more emotional and less competitive than men. For example, some authors have written that "Women are significantly more risk averse, tend to be less overconfident and behave less competitively oriented" (Beckman and Menkhoff, 2008).



*Table 2. Profile of the respondents in terms of sex*

Sex	Teachers		School Heads	
	Frequency (n=460)	Percentage	Frequency (n=25)	Percentage
Female	332	72	14	56
Male	128	28	11	44

### Highest educational attainment

Table 3 shows the profile of the respondents in terms of highest educational attainment. The teacher respondents state that majority of them are graduate of Master's degree with 55 percent and 42 percent state that they are a graduate of Bachelor's degree. There are only three percent who are a graduates of Doctorate degree. Among the school heads there are 68 percent who are a graduate of Master's (MAEd/MST) and 32 percent whoe are a graduate of Doctorate degree. The input variables of these educational pathways suggest holders of masters' degrees include a larger proportion of leaders. This study reveals that the school heads have relatively higher educational qualifications than their teachers. This means that school heads opt to graduate for promotion and to elevate and improve their leadership skills and abilities. Many leadership qualities are part of the nature and personality of the individual.<sup>1</sup> However, leadership is also a skill learned through experience and education. This conforms with the statement of Professor Jacob Kaimenyi (Kenya), Cabinet Secretary for Education "*Some skills were acquired during education, for example analytical skills. But then other skills were acquired in the process of leadership. I learnt how to speak in public, talking to people with authority and confidence, and I also acquired problem solving skills.*"

*Table 3. Profile of the respondents in terms of highest educational attainment*

Highest Educational Attainment	Teachers		School Heads	
	Frequency (n=460)	Percentage	Frequency (n=25)	Percentage
Doctoral (Ph.D.)	16	3	8	32
Masteral (MAEd/ MST)	252	55	17	68
Bachelor	192	42	0	0

### Experience of Respondents

Table 4 shows the profile of respondents in terms of experience as classroom teacher. The general weighted mean of 14.64 shows that the school heads rendered services as classroom teachers. The study shows that the school heads had experienced being a classroom teacher before

becoming a school head in order for them to be well-equipped on how to manage their school-based management.

This finding conforms with the previous study that not only education, but even the work-experience of the leader should undoubtedly affect the leadership behavior (Cagle, 1988; Katozai, 2005) for this factor too, either directly or indirectly educates an individual to certain degree. Various studies, including the study of Kearney (2008) on leadership have investigated the influence of the leader's (boss's) - Education and Work-Experience – on the followers' behavior and performance.

*Table 4. Profile of the respondents in terms of experience*

Length of Service as Classroom Teacher (in years)	Teachers		School Heads	
	Frequency (n=460)	Percentage	Frequency (n=25)	Percentage
28 to 36	16	3	3	12
19 to 27	24	5	2	8
10 to 18	72	16	13	52
1 to 9	348	76	7	28
<b>Mean</b>	<b>7.22</b>		<b>14.64</b>	
<b>S.D.</b>	<b>7.48</b>		<b>8.25</b>	

### Number of years as school head

Table 5 shows the profile of the respondents in the length of service as school heads. Majority or 56 percent among the respondents state that they were assigned as school heads with a range of 5 to 7 years. There are 40 percent with a range of 8 to 10 years. This study shows that majority or 56 percent of the school heads already exercised their abilities as a head. This implies that the school heads are more aggressive in innovations for the betterment of the school where they were assigned. Generally, the school heads are fully equipped and flexible to the assignments given by the Department of Education.

This conforms with the previous study by (Mujtaba and Kaifi, 2008), shows that Afghan leaders have higher scores on the relationship orientation which relates to better performance. This indicates that the leaders with some specialized knowledge or skills in psychology can perform better as leaders. On his study on the school principals, Nusbuga (2009) claims that education and experience brings about a change in the leadership attitudes. Cagle (1988) has regarded experience and education as factor that determine the leadership style. Katozai (2005) argued that knowledge is a chief weapon that makes a leader effective and therefore a leader should be educated, experienced and qualified. Nsubuga (2009) has recommended that a continuous professional development (CPD) system for principals be established and institutionalized so that their leadership will become effective. Nsubuga (2009) concluded that unless principals are well equipped with knowledge and skills in management and leadership, they would not be effective leaders.



*Table 5. Length of service as school head*

In years	Frequency (n=25)	Percentage
8 to 10	10	40
5 to 7	14	56
2 to 4	1	4
<b>Mean</b>	<b>7.00</b>	
<b>S.D.</b>	<b>2.56</b>	

### Performance rating

Table 6 reveals that most of the teachers (95 percent) have a very satisfactory performance while most of the school heads (100 percent) have outstanding performance. From the informal interview made school heads have presented their IPCRF to the Division of Cagayan personnel. On the other hand, teachers lacked documents to support their paper as outstanding. This is the reason why teachers have a performance rating of very satisfactory.

This finding reveals that the school heads outperformed their teachers in the performance of their duties and functions. This conforms with the findings of Cameron, Bright, and Caza (2004) found that members possessed more character dimensions outperformed those whose members possessed fewer character dimensions. Furthermore, the character strengths of integrity, bravery, and social intelligence were each found to account for variance in executive performance above and beyond direct reports' ratings of executives'/leaders' developing and empowering behaviors and other control variables (Sosik, Gentry, & Chun, 2012).

Character dimensions have also been associated with performance on creative tasks (Avey, Luthans, Hannah, Sweetman, & Peterson, 2012), outstanding leadership (Sosik, 2006), and executive selection criteria for top-level positions (Hollenbeck, 2009). Following Mitchell and James' (2001) Configuration 8 ("X causes Z, but the strength of the relationship varies as a function of the level of Y"), we recognize a dynamic relationship between entanglement and performance. In the case of low entanglement, considering that its duration is more temporary, this may lead to an amplifying effect on performance but this effect may erode. The expectation of character to enhance the effect that competence has on performance, even though this moderating effect may only be temporary—the level of performance will eventually go back to its baseline level, if/when character is not continually activated alongside competence.

*Table 6. Profile of the respondents in terms of performance rating*

Performance Rating (from IPCRF rating)	Teachers		School Heads	
	Frequency (n=460)	Percentage	Frequency (n=25)	Percentage
Outstanding	16	3	25	100
Very satisfactory	436	95	-	-
Satisfactory	8	2	-	-

## Assessment of the Leadership Behaviors of the School Heads

### Strategic Leadership

Table 7 presents the assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to strategic leadership. It is evident that the teachers and school heads perceive that the latter have somewhat desirable strategic leadership as suggested by the general weighted mean of 3.19. The study reveals that the school heads have only developed a considerable degree of strategic leadership which is somewhat desirable to their subordinates. This findings conforms to findings of earlier studies that principals have discovered that engaging the entire school staff in making decisions results in more commitment to school reform initiatives; Aguon 2012 cited.

The findings is stressed by Woodrow (2008) in his book entitled "Nobody owns Leadership Qualities" and cited that effective leaders have many common qualities. Good group leaders make an effort to learn and practice skills so they can: listen openly to others, offer and accept constructive suggestions, give clear directions, set and meet deadlines, give formal and informal presentations, helps members identify and solve problems, set an example of desired behavior, show appreciation of others' contributions, show understanding, encourage members to exchange ideas, handle conflict guide the group in goal setting and decision making, delegate responsibilities, ask questions of the group to prompt responses and create a productive atmosphere.

*Table 7. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to strategic leadership*

Behaviors reflecting Strategic Leadership	As assessed by:		Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
<i>The principal...</i>								
1. *...expect works to be done	1.37	VU	1.00	VU	<b>1.35</b>	<b>VU</b>		
2. ...delegates responsibility	4.23	VD	4.36	VD	<b>4.23</b>	<b>VD</b>		
3. ...assigns duty during planning period	4.21	VD	5.00	VD	<b>4.25</b>	<b>VD</b>		
4. *...over emphasize control	2.77	SD	2.32	U	<b>2.75</b>	<b>SD</b>		
5. *...is rigid and inflexible	3.10	SD	2.68	SD	<b>3.08</b>	<b>SD</b>		
6. *...assigns too much paperwork	3.17	SD	3.64	D	<b>3.19</b>	<b>SD</b>		
7. *...uses the word I and me too frequently	3.44	D	3.32	SD	<b>3.44</b>	<b>D</b>		
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>SD</b>		

**Legend:**

\*Negative statements are scored in reversed order

Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Value (DV)
4.20 – 5.00	Very Desirable (VD)
3.40 – 4.19	Desirable (D)
2.60 – 3.39	Somewhat Desirable (SD)
1.80 – 2.59	Undesirable (U)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Undesirable (VU)

## Instructional Leadership

Table 8 presents the assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to Instructional leadership. It is evident that the teachers and school heads themselves perceive that the latter have desirable strategic leadership as suggested by the overall general weighted mean of 3.87. This finding means that the school heads have developed a desirable degree of strategic leadership which is somewhat desirable to their subordinates.

The findings are stressed by Dr. Precy Aguon, Vice President Administrative Affairs of MCNAP? ISAF in her speech during the 2012 International Seminar on Continuing Education, "The duties of the school principal to monitor instruction increased along with their responsibility to help teachers improve their teaching. With this change in responsibilities, principals discovered the need to effectively evaluate instruction and assist teachers as they work to improve their instructional technique. Teachers share responsibility for staff development, curriculum development, and instructional supervision with the school head, who serves as a leader of leaders rather than the sole leader in the school. Marks and Printy (2003).

*Table 8. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to instructional leadership*

Behaviors reflecting Instructional Leadership	As assessed by:		Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
<i>The principal...</i>								
1. *...frequently interrupts my teaching	4.30	VD	3.96	D	<b>4.28</b>	<b>VD</b>		
2. *...demonstrates a lack of wisdom	4.17	D	3.96	D	<b>4.16</b>	<b>D</b>		
3. ...has knowledge about instructional strategies	4.31	VD	4.04	D	<b>4.30</b>	<b>VD</b>		
4. ...has rules but does not always enforce them	2.82	SD	3.36	SD	<b>2.85</b>	<b>SD</b>		
5. ...help people accountable	3.71	D	4.64	VD	<b>3.76</b>	<b>D</b>		
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>D</b>		
<b>Legend:</b> *Negative statements are scored in reversed order <b>Weighted Mean (WM)</b> <b>Descriptive Value (DV)</b> 4.20 – 5.00                Very Desirable (VD) 3.40 – 4.19                Desirable (D) 2.60 – 3.39                Somewhat Desirable (SD) 1.80 – 2.59                Undesirable (U) 1.00 – 1.79                Very Undesirable (VU)								

## Managerial Leadership

Table 9 presents the assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to managerial leadership. It is evident that the teachers and school heads themselves perceive that the latter have desirable strategic leadership as suggested by the overall

general weighted mean of 3.66. The study reveals that the school heads have only developed a considerable degree of managerial leadership which is somewhat desirable to their subordinates.

This conforms with the findings of Liz Melson, a school head at Jefferson High School in San Antonio, models ‘expected behavior’ for teachers; communicates a willingness to be open, nonjudgmental, yet focused; The findings are stressed by Dr. Precy Aguon, Vice President Administrative Affairs of MCNAP? ISAF in her speech during the 2012 International Seminar on Continuing Education, “The duties of the school principal to monitor instruction increased along with their responsibility to help teachers improve their teaching. With this change in responsibilities, principals discovered the need to effectively evaluate instruction and assist teachers as they work to improve their instructional technique. creates a vision and confidence that there are no insurmountable obstacles to dreams, wishes and potentials; and advocates for their rights and needs the value of a nurturing relationship between school head and teacher is explored: “One teacher explained, ‘The school head strongly encourages the teacher to identify and try new things that they feel might be beneficial to the pupils.

*Table 9. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter’s leadership behavior with respect to managerial leadership*

Behaviors reflecting Managerial Leadership	As assessed by:		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
<i>The principal...</i>						
1. ...is able to keep confidence	3.97	D	3.96	D	<b>3.97</b>	<b>D</b>
2. *...is afraid to questions/his/her/superior	3.43	D	2.04	U	<b>3.35</b>	<b>SD</b>
3. *...passes the buck rather than dealing with a situation	3.83	D	3.00	SD	<b>3.78</b>	<b>D</b>
4. *...has double standard	3.11	SD	3.32	SD	<b>3.12</b>	<b>SD</b>
5. *...is partial to influential parent	3.79	D	3.32	SD	<b>3.77</b>	<b>D</b>
6. *...shows favoritism to some teachers	3.83	D	4.00	D	<b>3.84</b>	<b>D</b>
7. *...supports me even if I am wrong	3.85	D	2.28	U	<b>3.77</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>D</b>

<b>Legend:</b>	
*Negative statements are scored in reversed order	
<b>Weighted Mean (WM)</b>	<b>Descriptive Value (DV)</b>
4.20 – 5.00	Very Desirable (VD)
3.40 – 4.19	Desirable (D)
2.60 – 3.39	Somewhat Desirable (SD)
1.80 – 2.59	Undesirable (U)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Undesirable (VU)

## Human Resource Management

Table 10 presents the assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter’s leadership behavior with respect to human resource management. It is evident that the teachers and school heads themselves perceive that the latter have desirable human resource management as suggested by the overall general weighted mean of 3.97. The study reveals that school heads have smooth

interpersonal relationship with their subordinates. It is often said that “learner’s performance reflects teachers’ performance as teachers’ performance administrators’ performance. Lewin 2001, cited that smooth interpersonal relationship is a very essential in the attainment of a shared goal.

This conforms with the findings of Lynch (2002) utilizing a socio-linguistic approach, has classified the desire for “smooth interpersonal relations” (SIR) as a dominant value of Philippine society. He defines it as:

*“... .. facility at getting along with others in such a way as to avoid outward signs of conflicts; gloom or sour look, harsh words, open disagreement, or physical violence. It connotes the smile the friendly lift of the eyebrow, the pat on the back, the squeeze on the arm, even under difficult circumstances, and of keeping sensitivity of what other people feel.*

Leadership at work in education institution is thus a dynamic process where an individual is not only responsible for the group’s task, but also actively seeks the collaboration and commitment of all the group members in achieving group goals in a particular context (Cole, 2002) cited.

David (2008) in his article Achieving Effective Leadership observed that over the past fifty years, leadership development and training has focused primarily on equipping individuals with skills to manage their external environment – skills such as effective communication, team building, decision-making, negotiation and conflict management. These will continue to be important leadership skills. However, such skills comprised only half of the leadership role. There is another vital half that largely has been ignored.

*Table 10. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter’s leadership behavior with respect to human resource management*

Behaviors reflecting Human Resources Management	As assessed by:		Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
<i>The principal...</i>								
1. ...calls me by name	3.97	D	2.72	SD	<b>3.91</b>	<b>D</b>		
2. ...uses eye contact	4.17	D	3.32	SD	<b>4.12</b>	<b>D</b>		
3. ...demonstrates caring attitude	4.09	D	4.36	VD	<b>4.10</b>	<b>D</b>		
4. ...involves me in decision making	3.65	D	4.36	VD	<b>3.69</b>	<b>D</b>		
5. *...does not listen	3.71	D	4.28	VD	<b>3.74</b>	<b>D</b>		
6. ...models good communication skills	4.11	D	4.68	VD	<b>4.14</b>	<b>D</b>		
7. ...provides positive reinforcement	4.09	D	4.68	VD	<b>4.12</b>	<b>D</b>		
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>D</b>		

**Legend:**

\*Negative statements are scored in reversed order

Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Value (DV)
4.20 – 5.00	Very Desirable (VD)
3.40 – 4.19	Desirable (D)
2.60 – 3.39	Somewhat Desirable (SD)
1.80 – 2.59	Undesirable (U)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Undesirable (VU)

## Cultural Leadership

Table 11 presents the assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to cultural leadership. It is evident that the teachers and school heads themselves perceived that the latter have very desirable cultural leadership as suggested by the overall general weighted mean of 4.29. The study shows that the school heads have excellent degree of cultural leadership which is somewhat very desirable to their subordinates. This means that school heads really developed their sense of belongingness.

This finding conforms with the study of Sergiovanni, Thomas J, 2001 cited that school heads are also responsible for facilitating their school's interactions with parents and others in the school community. This responsibility includes working the parents when disciplinary issues arise, when pupils are not succeeding academically, and when parents have concerns. School heads also interact with parents who serve on school advisory boards, parent /teacher organizations, and booster clubs. School heads report that they spent a significant part of their time working with parents of pupils who have been identified as needing special services through the individuals with Disabilities.

*Table 11. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to cultural leadership*

Behaviors reflecting Cultural Leadership	As assessed by:		Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
<i>The principal...</i>								
1. ...promotes cooperation among staff	4.17	D	5.00	VD	<b>4.22</b>	<b>VD</b>		
2. ...respects the culture of the residents/students.	4.33	VD	5.00	VD	<b>4.36</b>	<b>VD</b>		
3. ...promotes gender equality	4.38	VD	5.00	VD	<b>4.41</b>	<b>VD</b>		
4. ...promotes culture stability	4.37	VD	5.00	VD	<b>4.40</b>	<b>VD</b>		
5. ...promotes sense of well-being	4.25	VD	5.00	VD	<b>4.29</b>	<b>VD</b>		
6. ...develops an understanding of purpose	4.22	VD	5.00	VD	<b>4.26</b>	<b>VD</b>		
7. ...develops a shared vision of what the school could be like on a short evaluation	4.03	D	4.68	VD	<b>4.06</b>	<b>D</b>		
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>VD</b>	<b>4.95</b>	<b>VD</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>VD</b>		

**Legend:**

\*Negative statements are scored in reversed order

Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Value (DV)
4.20 – 5.00	Very Desirable (VD)
3.40 – 4.19	Desirable (D)
2.60 – 3.39	Somewhat Desirable (SD)
1.80 – 2.59	Undesirable (U)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Undesirable (VU)

## Micro-Political Leadership

Table 12 presents the assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to micro-political leadership. It is evident that the teachers and school heads themselves perceive that the latter have very desirable micro-political leadership as suggested by



the overall general weighted mean of 4.12. The study shows that the school heads have developed a considerable degree of strategic leadership which is somewhat desirable to their subordinates.

This finding conforms with Trousdale (2004), who has had significant success in implementing the El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence reform model, feels that her role of providing PR for the school is a primary function of her position. She says that it does no good to do great things and keep it to oneself. Every opportunity opens the doors to visitors, and one must share the story of his success whenever he can.

*Table 12. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to micro-political leadership*

Behaviors reflecting Micro-Political Leadership	As assessed by:		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
<i>The principal...</i>						
1. ...provides and enforces clear structure, rules, and procedure	4.12	D	4.68	VD	<b>4.15</b>	<b>D</b>
2. ...establishes routines regarding the running of the school that staff understand and follow	4.09	D	5.00	VD	<b>4.13</b>	<b>D</b>
3. ...uses SEF in a very good way	4.15	D	4.36	VD	<b>4.16</b>	<b>D</b>
4. ...has a lenient relationship with the LGU Officials	4.15	D	4.68	VD	<b>4.18</b>	<b>D</b>
5. ...is transparent about MOOE	3.98	D	5.00	VD	<b>4.04</b>	<b>D</b>
6. ...lets staff members know what is expected to them	4.03	D	4.68	VD	<b>4.07</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.09</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>4.73</b>	<b>VD</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Legend:</b>						
*Negative statements are scored in reversed order						
<b>Weighted Mean (WM)</b>	<b>Descriptive Value (DV)</b>					
4.20 – 5.00	Very Desirable (VD)					
3.40 – 4.19	Desirable (D)					
2.60 – 3.39	Somewhat Desirable (SD)					
1.80 – 2.59	Undesirable (U)					
1.00 – 1.79	Very Undesirable (VU)					

### External Development Leadership

Table 13 presents the assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to external development leadership. It is evident that the teachers rate their school heads themselves perceive that the latter have desirable external development leadership as suggested by the general weighted mean of 4.02. The teachers consider their principals provide opportunity input on all important decision with the community (3.97) and have a good relationship with the parents as desirable. On the part of school head's self-assessment, they also rated themselves as having very desirable external development leadership (4.66) where they establish a set of standard operating procedure (5.00). The study shows that the school heads have excellent external development leadership which is somewhat desirable to their subordinates.

Besides, his major roles, the school head has more in store for him to perform which brings the school head closer to parents and students as noted by Exforsys Inc. (2006).

*Table 13. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behavior with respect to external development leadership*

Behaviors reflecting External Development Leadership	As assessed by:		Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
<i>The principal...</i>								
1. ...has a good relationship with the parents	4.16	D	4.32	VD	<b>4.16</b>	<b>D</b>		
2. ...has lenient relationship with the barangay officials	4.05	D	4.68	VD	<b>4.08</b>	<b>D</b>		
3. ...is charismatic in student's welfare	3.95	D	4.64	VD	<b>3.98</b>	<b>D</b>		
4. ...has a good impression with the community	3.95	D	4.64	VD	<b>3.98</b>	<b>D</b>		
5. ...establishes a set of standard operating procedure	4.07	D	5.00	VD	<b>4.12</b>	<b>D</b>		
6. ...provides opportunity input on all important decision with the community	3.97	D	4.68	VD	<b>4.00</b>	<b>D</b>		
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>4.66</b>	<b>VD</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>D</b>		

**Legend:**

\*Negative statements are scored in reversed order

Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Value (DV)
4.20 – 5.00	Very Desirable (VD)
3.40 – 4.19	Desirable (D)
2.60 – 3.39	Somewhat Desirable (SD)
1.80 – 2.59	Undesirable (U)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Undesirable (VU)

### Summary of Assessment on the Leadership Behaviors of the School Heads

Table 14 summarizes the aforementioned leadership behaviors of the school heads. For the teachers, their school heads' cultural leadership is the most desirable behavior they have while their strategic leadership is the least desirable. Same is true for the school heads where cultural leadership is their best but rated the least their behavior on managerial leadership. Based on an informal interview made with the school heads about their leadership behavior, *they promote cooperation, they respect the culture of the residents/students, they promote gender equality and culture stability, they develop a shared vision of what the school could be like on a short evaluation and promote sense of well-being* which is according to them it really helped in the leadership. The study shows that school heads should improve their strategic leadership and continue to use their cultural leadership to make the school a better place for learning.

This conforms with the findings of Steich (2011) stated that the characteristic of the school heads often determine the dynamics of school community and the economic outcomes of school policies and procedures. When a school lacks effective leadership, minimal learning takes places. School leaders, beginning with the school head, must provide strong leadership that sets a tone for daily operations of the school community. In the absence of such leadership, discipline breaks down, academics falter, and a sense of organized chaos reigns. Schools leadership in not just about walking the halls and the telling pupils to "tuck in their shirts." Rather, it is about dynamic

modelling that encourages collegiality and promotes excellence in every aspect of the school community.

*Table 14. Summary of the assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership behaviors*

Aspects of Leadership Behaviors	As assessed by:		Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
Strategic Leadership	3.19	SD	3.19	SD	<b>3.19</b>	<b>D</b>		
Instructional Leadership	3.86	D	3.99	D	<b>3.87</b>	<b>D</b>		
Managerial Leadership	3.69	D	3.13	SD	<b>3.66</b>	<b>D</b>		
Human Resources	3.97	D	4.06	D	<b>3.97</b>	<b>D</b>		
Cultural Leadership	4.25	VD	4.95	VD	<b>4.29</b>	<b>VD</b>		
Micro Political Leadership	4.09	D	4.73	VD	<b>4.12</b>	<b>D</b>		
External Development Leadership	4.02	D	4.66	VD	<b>4.06</b>	<b>D</b>		
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>D</b>		

**Legend:**

\*Negative statements are scored in reversed order

Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Value (DV)
4.20 – 5.00	Very Desirable (VD)
3.40 – 4.19	Desirable (D)
2.60 – 3.39	Somewhat Desirable (SD)
1.80 – 2.59	Undesirable (U)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Undesirable (VU)

### Differences between the Assessments of the Teachers and School Heads On school heads' leadership behaviors

This study hypothesizes that there is no relationship between leadership behavior and competence of school administrators, however, table 15 reveals that managerial leadership, cultural leadership, micro-political leadership and external leadership is associated with the assessment on the latter's leadership behavior, thus making the hypothesis is null or rejected.

The difference tests between the teachers' and school heads' on the assessment on the latter's leadership behaviors was analyzed. There is a significant relationship of the teachers' and school heads assessment of the managerial leadership, cultural leadership, micro-political leadership, and external development leadership. The study shows that the leadership abilities of the school heads should be more revealed and exercised.

These findings conform with the study of Marks and Printy (2003) One of the primary challenges confronted by school head in the ever-expanding number of duties that require a tremendous investment of time and effort (Porlin, Shen, & Willans; Sergiovanni, 2001). A part from dealing with managerial and administrative task, school heads in recent years are also being trained to take on the position of instructional leaders (Interstake School Leadership Licensure Consortium [ISLLC], 1996). Even more pertinent to this discussion, Rayfield and Diamantes (2004) have utilize the focus group discussion to identify the 25 duties of a school head. The most important duties of a school head have been extracted from this list: 1) Assign teachers to specific

courses; 2) Determine and set up professional development opportunities; 3) Develop a harmonious and cooperative work environment; 4) Deal with pupils' discipline problems; 4) interact with parents with regard to pupils ; 5) ensure the overall safety of pupils; 6) Create and modify the curriculum as needed; 7) take responsibility for instructional courses; 8) Develop and implement the budget; and each of these task is central to the day-to-day and long-term operations and the school. As the primary leader who is ultimately responsible for the work of the instructional and support staff, along with the well-being of the pupils, the school head must also ensure the availability of all.

*Table 15. Result of the difference tests between the teachers' and school heads' assessment on the latter's leadership behaviors*

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Prob.*	Statistical Inference
<i>Strategic leadership</i>					
School heads	3.19	0.18	0.062	0.951	Not significant
Teachers	3.18	0.73			
<i>Instructional Leadership</i>					
School heads	3.99	0.43	1.236	0.217	Not significant
Teachers	3.86	0.51			
<i>Managerial Leadership</i>					
School heads	2.99	0.24	-10.809	0.000	Significant
Teachers	3.64	0.79			
<i>Human Resources</i>					
School heads	4.06	0.34	1.162	0.252	Not significant
Teachers	3.97	0.78			
<i>Cultural Leadership</i>					
School heads	4.96	0.07	17.083	0.000	Significant
Teachers	4.25	0.84			
<i>Micro Political Leadership</i>					
School heads	4.73	0.40	7.203	0.000	Significant
Teachers	4.09	0.92			
<i>External Development Leadership</i>					
School heads	4.66	0.24	9.914	0.000	Significant
Teachers	4.02	0.92			

## Level of Leadership Competence of the School Heads

### Educational competence

The educational competence of the school heads as assessed by the teachers and the school heads themselves is presented in table 16. The table clearly shows that school heads are highly competent in terms of educational competency with an overall weighted mean of 3.98. The study implies that the school heads are very much capable because of their high competency level.

The findings, however, seem to point out that the Department of Education had hired school administrators who are highly competent. This is stressed by Dep.Ed order 1, Guidelines on the Hiring of School Head, mandating the hiring of school administrators be based on merit and competence.

This conforms with the findings of Schmoker (2011) the combination of three concepts constitutes the foundation for positive improvement results: meaningful teamwork; clear, measurable goals; and the regular collection and analysis of performance data. School Heads must lead their school through the goal-setting process in which pupil achievement data is analyzed, improvement areas are identified and actions for change are initiated. This process involves working collaboratively with staff and school community to identify discrepancies between current and desired outcomes, to set and prioritize goals to help close the gap, to develop improvement and monitoring strategies aimed at accomplishing the goals, and to communicate goals and change efforts to the entire school community. School heads must also ensure that staff development needs are identified in alignment with school improvement priorities and that these needs are addressed with appropriate professional learning opportunities.

Principals are responsible for the overall operation of the schools. Some of their duties and responsibilities are delineated in statutes. States and school districts have also set expectations for principals through their principal evaluation criteria and procedures. During the latter part of the twentieth century, as schools began to be held more accountable for the performance of their students on national and state assessments, the duties and responsibilities of principals changed. Principals became more responsible for teaching and learning in their schools. In particular, their duty to monitor instruction increased along with their responsibility to help teachers improve their teaching. With this change in responsibilities, principals discovered the need to more effectively evaluate instruction and assist teachers as they worked to improve their instructional techniques.

*Table 16. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's level of leadership competence with respect to educational competence*

Educational Competence Indicators	As assessed by:		Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
1. Setting instructional goals	4.06	H	3.68	H	<b>4.04</b>	<b>H</b>		
2. Designing instructional units	3.98	H	3.68	H	<b>3.97</b>	<b>H</b>		
3. Developing and adapting curricula	4.06	H	3.68	H	<b>4.04</b>	<b>H</b>		
4. Evaluating & selecting learning resources	4.10	H	4.00	H	<b>4.10</b>	<b>H</b>		

5. Evaluating the utilization of learning resources	3.97	H	4.00	H	<b>3.97</b>	<b>H</b>
6. Producing learning materials	3.94	H	3.64	H	<b>3.92</b>	<b>H</b>
7. Supervision in clerical model	3.90	H	4.00	H	<b>3.90</b>	<b>H</b>
8. Planning for individual	3.90	H	3.68	H	<b>3.88</b>	<b>H</b>
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>H</b>

  

<b>Legend:</b>	
<b>Weighted Mean (WM)</b>	<b>Descriptive Value (DV)</b>
4.20 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
3.40 – 4.19	High (H)
2.60 – 3.39	Average (A)
1.80 – 2.59	Low (L)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Low (VL)

### Supervisory competence

In terms of supervisory competence exhibited by the school head, the overall weighted mean is 3.83 or highly competent as shown in table 17. The study reveals that the school heads are highly knowledgeable in line with supervisory functions.

The finding is consistent to a study by the SEAMEO INNOTECH Philippine Based (2003) entitled “*Making Sense of Leading Schools: A Study of the School headship*,” which claimed that expert school administrators are; - promoting vision, mission and goals – and developing a means to reach them; - ensuring quality of instruction, modeling teaching practice, supervising curriculum, and ensuring quality of teaching resources; - overseeing the operations of the school (its budget, schedule, facilities, safety and security, and transportation); - recruiting, hiring, firing, inducting, and mentoring teachers and administrators; developing leadership capacity and professional development opportunities and representing the school in the community, developing capital, tending to public relations, recruiting pupils, buffering and mediating external interests, and advocating for the school’s interests.

The findings is supported by Villaruel (2012) when he stressed that supervision is one of the means whereby the teachers are actually seen in the performance of their tasks during the supervisory visit. Better and improved ways of teaching is suggested by the school officials during the visit. In other words, person - to – person contact happens during the supervisory visit.

*Table 17. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter’s level of leadership competence with respect to supervisory competence*

Supervisory Competence Indicators	As assessed by:		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
1. Building a healthy climate	3.75	H	4.32	VH	<b>3.78</b>	<b>H</b>
2. Team building	3.66	H	4.00	H	<b>3.68</b>	<b>H</b>
3. Resolving conflict	3.70	H	4.00	H	<b>3.72</b>	<b>H</b>
4. Making decisions	3.86	H	4.32	VH	<b>3.88</b>	<b>H</b>



5. Planning & organizing meetings	3.89	H	4.00	H	<b>3.89</b>	<b>H</b>
6. Recruiting and selecting personnel	3.83	H	4.32	VH	<b>3.85</b>	<b>H</b>
7. Assigning personnel	3.93	H	4.32	VH	<b>3.95</b>	<b>H</b>
8. Bringing about change	3.91	H	4.00	H	<b>3.92</b>	<b>H</b>
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>H</b>

<b>Legend:</b>	
<b>Weighted Mean (WM)</b>	<b>Descriptive Value (DV)</b>
4.20 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
3.40 – 4.19	High (H)
2.60 – 3.39	Average (A)
1.80 – 2.59	Low (L)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Low (VL)

## Organizing competence

The level of competency of the school heads on organization competence as revealed in the study with the overall weighted mean of 3.91 which indicates that the school heads are very much skillful and expert in student discipline. The study recognizes that in large multidisciplinary schools it is not always possible for a Head of School to have a detailed knowledge of the work of every staff member. In such instances the Head of School would be expected to consult confidentially with the Discipline Head and other senior colleagues in the School who would be familiar with the work of the candidate. The candidate must be briefed on those consultations and given an opportunity to nominate other senior colleagues to comment as required.

It could be gleaned from the data that the administrators perform their role in organizational matters with utmost and high performance. As reflected in the guidelines of the Department of Education a staff development is created and its provision of scholarship and retraining which allow every school administrator to become fully equipped with the necessary traits of a leader of organization competence is one, this is consistent to the findings of (Drake and Roe, (2002). Additionally, school heads are supposed to interact with teachers, parents, community members, and pupils. Strong collaboration and instructional skills have replaced strong bureaucratic skills as important attributes of effective school head. In many respects, the demands on school head's mirror those on teachers who are attempting to become facilitators of children's learning and are rethinking their notions of content, pedagogy, and assessment. School heads need continuous professional development opportunities to support their efforts toward school improvement and revitalize their commitment to creating and sustaining positive learning communities.

In today's schools, effective school heads are accessible to every teacher and pupil, acting as a sounding board for both ideas and emotions. In contrast with the stereotypical school head of past generations who was a stern disciplinarian, school heads today are more often than not providing supports and praise or guiding staff through the inevitable bumps and bruises that come with implementing change in a school. By truly listening to what teachers and pupils are saying, a school head can continuously take stock of the school culture and use feedback to make reform efforts more effective.

*Table 18. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's level of leadership competence with respect to organizing competence*

As assessed by:	Teachers	School Heads	Overall
-----------------	----------	--------------	---------

Organizing Competence Indicators	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV
1. Revising existing structures	3.90	H	4.04	H	<b>3.91</b>	<b>H</b>
2. Assimilating programs	3.92	H	3.68	H	<b>3.91</b>	<b>H</b>
3. Monitoring new arrangements	3.87	H	3.68	H	<b>3.86</b>	<b>H</b>
4. Developing a staffing plan	3.82	H	3.68	H	<b>3.81</b>	<b>H</b>
5. Informing the public	3.93	H	4.00	H	<b>3.93</b>	<b>H</b>
6. Student discipline	4.01	H	4.00	H	<b>4.01</b>	<b>H</b>
7. Policies and producers	3.97	H	4.00	H	<b>3.97</b>	<b>H</b>
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>H</b>

<b>Legend:</b>	
<b>Weighted Mean (WM)</b>	<b>Descriptive Value (DV)</b>
4.20 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
3.40 – 4.19	High (H)
2.60 – 3.39	Average (A)
1.80 – 2.59	Low (L)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Low (VL)

### Administrative competence

The administrative competence of the school heads as assessed by the teachers and the school heads themselves is presented in table 19. The teachers rated their school heads as highly competent with respect to educational aspect as reckoned by the overall general weighted mean of 3.99. The study shows that the school heads are knowledgeable about their duties and responsibilities of being an administrator. This finding implies primary duty of a Head of School is to manage the well-being and ongoing development of staff in the school. Consistent with this duty and in the context of the Performance Management Program and especially the Academic Promotions Policy the Head of School is expected to: Advise staff on planning for and preferred timing of their application for promotion as an integral part of the regular Performance Management review; Identify any possible conflicts of interest between the Head of School and the staff member such as different approaches to research/theory; Provide guidance and counselling to the staff member prior to the lodging of an application; Discuss with the staff in a constructive, open and frank manner the relative strengths and weaknesses of the application; Provide a detailed report to the Academic Promotions Committee evaluating the application against the criteria for promotion, and clearly stating the perceived level of performance ; Be available to discuss the application with the Academic Promotions Committee or, where this is not possible, nominate a senior colleague to undertake this task; and be able collaborate the veracity of the material in the application.

This conforms with the study of Covey, 2009 that the first thing that followers are inspired by a leader is the trust. The trust consists of two dimensions namely; character and competency. Character includes integrity, motive, and intent of individuals, while competency includes capabilities, skills, results, and track record which are important for a good leader (Covey, 2009).

*Table 19. Assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's level of leadership competence with respect to administrative competence*

Administrative Competence Indicators	As assessed by:		School Heads		Overall	
	WM	DV	WM	DV	WM	DV

1. Able to employ managerial planning tools	3.94	H	4.00	H	<b>3.94</b>	<b>H</b>
2. Organize, supervise and manage financial affairs of the school	3.90	H	4.00	H	<b>3.90</b>	<b>H</b>
3. Familiar with the budgetary needs of the school such as operation & maintenance costs	3.99	H	4.36	VH	<b>4.01</b>	<b>H</b>
4. Awareness of the student profile as to enrolment promotion, drop-out & repeaters	4.08	H	4.36	VH	<b>4.09</b>	<b>H</b>
5. Plans for the facilities and equipment of the school	3.97	H	4.36	VH	<b>3.99</b>	<b>H</b>
6. Apply rational decision-making models and procedures in the administration of department programs	3.97	H	4.00	H	<b>3.98</b>	<b>H</b>
7. Able to keep accurate records of purchasing needs, inventories, expenditure and other business functions	4.02	H	4.36	VH	<b>4.04</b>	<b>H</b>
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>VH</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>H</b>

<b>Legend:</b>	
<b>Weighted Mean (WM)</b>	<b>Descriptive Value (DV)</b>
4.20 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
3.40 – 4.19	High (H)
2.60 – 3.39	Average (A)
1.80 – 2.59	Low (L)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Low (VL)

### Summary of assessment on the leadership competence of the school heads

Table 20 summarizes the aforementioned leadership competence of the school heads. As perceived by the teachers and the school heads themselves, the leadership competence of the latter have as over all mean of 3.93 with a descriptive rating of High. This finding may be an indication that there is still more room for improvement on the leadership competence of the school head.

For effectiveness in leadership, competency represents an attempt to capture the experience, lessons learned, and knowledge of experienced leaders to provide a guiding framework for the benefit of others and organizations (Doris, 2013). Thus, leaders need to improve on competencies in organizations to survive and continue to nurture. These competencies include such skills in leadership styles, effective communication, convincing other and professionalism.

*Table 20. Summary of the assessment of the teachers and school heads on the latter's leadership competence*

<b>Aspects of Leadership Competence</b>	<b>As assessed by:</b>		<b>Teachers</b>		<b>School Heads</b>		<b>Overall</b>	
	<b>WM</b>	<b>DV</b>	<b>WM</b>	<b>DV</b>	<b>WM</b>	<b>DV</b>	<b>WM</b>	<b>DV</b>
Educational competence	3.99	H	3.80	H	<b>3.98</b>	<b>H</b>		
Supervisory competence	3.82	H	4.16	H	<b>3.83</b>	<b>H</b>		
Organizing competence	3.92	H	3.87	H	<b>3.91</b>	<b>H</b>		
Administrative competence	3.98	H	4.21	VH	<b>3.99</b>	<b>H</b>		
<b>General Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>4.01</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>H</b>		

Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Value (DV)
4.20 – 5.00	Very High (VH)
3.40 – 4.19	High (H)
2.60 – 3.39	Average (A)
1.80 – 2.59	Low (L)
1.00 – 1.79	Very Low (VL)

### Differences between the Assessments of the Teachers and School Heads On school heads' leadership competence

The table indicates that there is a significant relationship between the assessment of teachers and school heads in educational competence and supervisory competence. This means that the more the school heads demonstrate good attitude towards their subordinates and the more they model good communication skills they can better set contemporary models of school reform acknowledge the school head or manager as the passport to school success and pupils achievement. The modern school head is no longer the “school head” teacher, but rather the manager of an increasingly complex organization. School heads today are expected to create a team relationship among staff members, acquire and allocate resources, promote teacher development, improve pupil's performance on standardized tests, and build effective community linkages Fenwick and Pierce (2002) said.

*Table 21. Result of the difference tests between the teachers' and school heads' assessment on the latter's leadership competence*

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Prob.*	Statistical Inference
<i>Educational competence</i>					
School heads	3.80	0.31	-2.678	0.011	Significant
Teachers	3.99	0.72			
<i>Supervisory competence</i>					
School heads	4.16	0.33	4.294	0.000	Significant
Teachers	3.82	0.98			
<i>Organizing competence</i>					
School heads	3.87	0.62	-0.378	0.708	Not significant
Teachers	3.92	0.85			
<i>Administrative competence</i>					
School heads	4.21	0.86	1.167	0.244	Not significant
Teachers	3.98	0.94			

*\*tested at 0.05 level of significance*

### Correlation Analyses between the Variables of the Study

### Profile of the respondents and their assessment on their school heads' leadership behavior and competence

The study hypothesizes that there is no significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and their assessment on their school heads' leadership behavior and competence. Table 22 shows that there is significant relationship of the teachers' and school heads' on the latter's leadership behavior and competence with their profile variables especially in the variables number of years as classroom teachers. The null hypothesis therefore is rejected.

It could be gleaned from the data that the administrators are performing their role in organizational matters with utmost and high performance. As reflected in the guidelines of the Department of Education a staff development is created and its provision of scholarship and retraining which allow every school administrator to become fully equipped with the necessary traits of a leader of organization competence is one, this is consistent to the findings of Drake and Roe, (2002). Additionally, school heads are supposed to interact with teachers, parents, community members, and pupils. Strong collaboration and instructional skills have replaced strong bureaucratic skills as important attributes of effective school head. In many respects, the demands on school head's mirror those on teachers who are attempting to become facilitators of children's learning and are rethinking their notions of content, pedagogy, and assessment. School heads need continuous professional development opportunities to support their efforts toward school improvement and revitalize their commitment to creating and sustaining positive learning communities.

*Table 22. Result of the correlation analysis of the teachers' and school heads' assessment on the latter's leadership behavior and competence with their profile variables*

Variables	Teachers' Profile		School Heads' Profile	
	Correlation Coefficient	Prob.*	Correlation Coefficient	Prob.*
<b><i>School head's leadership behavior and ...</i></b>				
Age	<b>-0.180<sup>s</sup></b>	<b>0.000</b>	0.388 <sup>ns</sup>	0.055
Sex	-0.073 <sup>ns</sup>	0.118	0.101 <sup>ns</sup>	0.632
Highest educational attainment	-0.018 <sup>ns</sup>	0.704	0.000 <sup>ns</sup>	1.000
Number of years as classroom teacher	<b>-0.174<sup>s</sup></b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.452<sup>s</sup></b>	<b>0.023</b>
Number of years as school head	-	-	0.238 <sup>ns</sup>	0.253
Performance rating	-0.069 <sup>ns</sup>	0.139	-	-
<b><i>School head's leadership competence and ...</i></b>				
Age	<b>-0.165<sup>s</sup></b>	<b>0.000</b>	0.388 <sup>ns</sup>	0.055
Sex	<b>-0.116<sup>s</sup></b>	<b>0.012</b>	0.101 <sup>ns</sup>	0.632
Highest educational attainment	-0.083 <sup>ns</sup>	0.075	0.000 <sup>ns</sup>	1.000
Number of years as classroom teacher	<b>-0.198<sup>s</sup></b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.452<sup>s</sup></b>	<b>0.023</b>
Number of years as school head	-	-	0.238 <sup>ns</sup>	0.253
Performance rating	-0.048 <sup>ns</sup>	0.302	-	-

*\*tested at 0.05 level of significance; s = significant; ns = not significant*

### Leadership behavior and leadership competence

The study hypothesizes that there is no significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and their assessment on their school heads' leadership behavior and competence. Table 23 reveals that there is a significant relationship between school head's assessment on the latter's leadership and their leadership competence. The null hypothesis therefore is rejected.

As shown in table 23, educational, supervisory, organizing and administrative competence of the school heads significantly influence their leadership behavior. This means that the more the school heads demonstrate caring attitude towards their subordinate and the more they model good communication skills they can better set instructional goals, adapt curricula, build more efficient teamwork and the like.

For effectiveness in leadership, competency represents an attempt to capture the experience, lessons learned, and knowledge of experienced leaders to provide a guiding framework for the benefit of others and organizations (Doris, 2013). Studies of Mozhgan, Parivash, Nadergholi & Bahram (2010) found that leadership competencies are significant to the leadership behavior. Thus, leaders need to improve on competencies in organizations to survive and continue to nurture. These competencies include such skills in leadership styles, effective communication, convincing other and professionalism.

Contemporary models of school reform acknowledge the school head or manager as the passport to school success and pupils achievement. The modern school head is no longer the “school head” teacher, but rather the manager of an increasingly complex organization. School heads today are expected to create a team relationship among staff members, acquire and allocate resources, promote teacher development, improve pupil’s performance on standardized tests, and build effective community linkages Fenwick and Pierce (2002) said.

*Table 23. Result of the correlation analysis between school heads’ assessment on the latter’s leadership and their leadership competence*

<b>Leadership Competence</b>	<b>Educational</b>		<b>Supervisory</b>		<b>Organizing</b>		<b>Administrative</b>	
	<b>Correl.</b>	<b>Prob.*</b>	<b>Correl.</b>	<b>Prob.*</b>	<b>Correl.</b>	<b>Prob.*</b>	<b>Correl.</b>	<b>Prob.*</b>
<b>Leadership Behavior</b>								
Strategic	0.554 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.596 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.577 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.560 <sup>s</sup>	0.000
Instructional	0.507 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.589 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.560 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.582 <sup>s</sup>	0.000
Managerial	0.564 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.658 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.652 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.642 <sup>s</sup>	0.000
Human resources	0.577 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.755 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.718 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.713 <sup>s</sup>	0.000
Cultural	0.601 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.788 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.722 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.745 <sup>s</sup>	0.000
Micro-political	0.740 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.868 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.845 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.849 <sup>s</sup>	0.000
External devt.	0.712 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.843 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.801 <sup>s</sup>	0.000	0.791 <sup>s</sup>	0.000

*\*tested at 0.05 level of significance; s = significant; ns = not significant*

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings the study concludes that:

1. The level of competence of the Secondary School administrator in the Division of Cagayan is highly competent in performing their roles.
2. The extend of leadership manifested by the School Administrators as perceived by the teachers along ; as very desirable in cultural leadership, desirable in instructional leadership, managerial



leadership, human resource management, micro-political leadership, external development leadership and somewhat desirable in strategic leadership.

3. There is a significant difference between the perceptions of the respondents as to the school administrators' leadership behavior and competence. This means that both of them agree that the school administrators should possess the needed competence and leadership behavior.

4. There is significant relationship between the leadership behavior and competencies of Secondary School Administrators as perceived by the respondents. It implies further that the level of competence of the school administrators affects their leadership behavior.

5. Project SOLEX (School Opera Learning Excellence), an action program proposed to improve the leadership behaviors of school Administrators in the Division of Cagayan.

### **Recommendations**

In the light of the findings and conclusions, the following are recommended:

1. Project SOLEX (School Opera Learning Excellence), should be implemented as stipulated.

2. School administrators should try to improve/ sustain their level of competence as school leaders by attending seminars and trainings.

3. Future school administrators and those in the position should continue to enhance their level of competence and leadership behavior for an improved performance.

4. The Department of Education should continue to conduct leadership trainings for school heads to improve and develop their leadership skills and abilities in management.

5. School administrators should do benchmarking in other schools and institutions as to how they would improve their leadership behaviors and leadership competence.

### **REFERENCES**

[1] Bangayan- Manera, A. (2019). *Textual Analysis of School Graffiti*. The Asian EFL Journal. Volume 21( 2.3), 273-285

[2] Bulach, Clete and Boothe, Diane (2010). *Analyzing the Leadership Behavior of School Heads*. [http://cnx.org/content/m13813/1.1/content\\_nfo-25k](http://cnx.org/content/m13813/1.1/content_nfo-25k)

[3] Carag, E. (2016). Correlates of morale of private tertiary schools. International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences. 5 (06), 643-650.

[4] DuFour, Rick. (2002). *The Learning-Centered School head. Beyond Instructional Leadership. Schools need leadership from school heads who focus on advancing pupil and staff* [http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational\\_leadership/may02/vol59/num08/The\\_Learning-Centered\\_School\\_head.aspx](http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational_leadership/may02/vol59/num08/The_Learning-Centered_School_head.aspx)

[5] Fenwick, Leslie T. – Pierce, Mildred C. (2002) ERIC Digest Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education Washington DC.

[6] Murphy, J., Vriesenga, M. (2006). *Research on school leadership preparation: An analysis. School leadership and management*, 26 (2), 183-195.



[7] Petrie, N. (2014). *Future trends in leadership development*. Colorado Springs: Centre For Creative Leadership.

[8] Tai, M. K., & Omar, A. K. (2018c). *The relationship between emotional intelligence of school principal in managing change and teacher attitudes towards change*. International Journal of Leadership in Education ---- Theory and Practice. doi:org/10.1080/13603124.2018.1481535

[9] Villareal, Ariston, Ph.D. 2012, project ARIS (Advocacy for Relevant Intensive Supervision), The Modern Teacher, January issue volume 60 #08

[10] Yarcia, Romeo A. 2001, *First Class School Head: Need of the Our*, The Philippine Journal of Education, November Issue