JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

LEADERSHIP STYLES OF A SELECTED SUC IN NCR: BASIS FOR A PROPOSED LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

Dr. Eugene S. Abdon
Instructor I
Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology
Metro Manila, Philippines
Email: euabdon@earist.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

Leadership style shapes institutional climate and faculty commitment in higher education, yet administrators and faculty members may perceive the same leadership practices differently. This study assessed the leadership styles of school administrators at Marikina Polytechnic College (MPC), a state college in the National Capital Region, as evaluated by two groups of respondents—50 teachers and 10 administrators—and proposed a leadership training program based on the findings. A descriptive-quantitative design with purposive sampling and an adopted survey instrument was used. Four leadership-style dimensions—shared vision, communication, collaborative decision-making, and support—were rated on a five-point effectiveness scale. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and paired t-test at $\alpha = 0.01$. Administrators rated their own leadership styles as Very Highly Effective across all four dimensions (grand weighted mean [WM] = 4.78), while teachers rated them as Highly Effective (grand WM = 4.03). Teachers rated shared vision highest (4.37) and support lowest (3.86); administrators rated collaborative decision-making highest (4.84) and shared vision lowest (4.70). The paired t-test revealed statistically significant differences between the two groups in all four dimensions ($t = 6.34$ to 20.02; critical $t = 4.60$), with administrators consistently evaluating their leadership more favorably than their teachers did. Despite these differences, both groups confirmed that MPC administrators demonstrate effective leadership; the disagreement is one of degree rather than direction. A four-module Leadership Training Program is proposed to bridge the perception gap, particularly in communication and individualized faculty support, and to sustain leadership excellence.

Keywords: *leadership styles, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, shared vision, communication, collaborative decision-making, support, higher education administration*

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

INTRODUCTION

Background

Leadership is a vital component of any educational organization. An institution may have sound systems and methods and ideal operating conditions, yet without effective leadership it cannot survive, function, or succeed. As Dubrin (2013) articulated, management produces orderly results while leadership creates useful change; both are essential for organizational effectiveness.

Leadership is not synonymous with holding a position of authority. As Zulueta (2010) explained, to manage means to direct, bring about, and accomplish, whereas to lead is to inspire, influence, and motivate. Managers are people who do things right; leaders are people who do the right things. Effective leaders inspire excellence, extend beyond their mandated responsibilities, and generate creative ideas. Ivancevich (2010) described leadership as involving four core elements: understanding and appropriately exercising power, understanding people, inspiring followers to apply their full capabilities, and developing a leadership style and organizational climate.

It is this fourth element—leadership style and the climate it creates—that motivated the present study. Leadership style varies significantly: some situations demand autocratic leadership, others paternalistic or participative approaches, and still others a laissez-faire orientation. Research in transformational and transactional leadership theory has moved beyond simple contingency frameworks to explore how these two complementary approaches, termed *bridging leadership*, interact to produce organizational outcomes (Diesta, 2015).

Theoretical Framework

In the transformational model, leaders exhibit charisma, inspire a shared vision, and facilitate followers' professional and personal growth (Kash, 2012; Kouzes & Posner, 2011). In the transactional model, leaders employ an exchange framework, offering rewards for goal achievement and applying corrective measures for underperformance (Bass, 2008; Odumero, 2013). The interplay between these approaches shapes faculty organizational commitment and the overall institutional climate, both of which are critical to achieving educational excellence (Lai, 2011; Nikezic & Puric, 2012). The four dimensions examined in this study—shared vision, communication, collaborative decision-making, and support—are drawn from this bridging-leadership perspective.

Research Context and Rationale

Marikina Polytechnic College (MPC) is a state technical college offering Bachelor of Technical Teacher's Education (BTTE) and Bachelor of Industrial Technology (BIT) programs in Marikina City. How administrators' leadership styles are perceived by their faculty, and whether these perceptions differ from the administrators' own assessments, has direct implications for institutional development and for the design of targeted leadership programs.

Research Objectives

This study aimed to: (1) describe the demographic profile of teacher-respondents and administrator-respondents; (2) assess the leadership styles of MPC school administrators in terms of shared vision, communication, collaborative decision-making, and support as evaluated by both groups; (3) determine whether significant differences exist in the two groups' assessments of administrator leadership styles; and (4) propose a Leadership Training Program based on the findings.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

Research Questions

The study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the teacher-respondents and administrator-respondents in terms of age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, and length of service?

2. What is the assessment of the two groups of respondents on the leadership styles of school administrators in terms of shared vision, communication, collaborative decision-making, and support?

3. Are there significant differences between the two groups of respondents in their assessments of the administrators' leadership styles regarding the variables listed above?

4. What leadership training program can be proposed based on the results of the study?

Hypothesis

H_0: There are no significant differences in the assessment of teacher-respondents and administrator-respondents on the leadership styles of school administrators at MPC in terms of shared vision, communication, collaborative decision-making, and support.

Methods

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-quantitative research design. As described by Perez (2010), this method addresses relationships between variables, tests hypotheses, and develops generalizable principles through systematic investigation of existing conditions. The design was appropriate for assessing and comparing the perceptions of two distinct respondent groups on a defined set of leadership dimensions without manipulating any variables.

Research Setting

The study was conducted at Marikina Polytechnic College (MPC), a state technical college located at Mayor Juan Chayungco St., Brgy. Sta. Elena, Marikina City. The institution is affiliated with SCUAA-NCR and AACUP, and offers the Bachelor of Technical Teacher's Education (BTTE) and Bachelor of Industrial Technology (BIT) programs.

Participants

Purposive sampling was used to select respondents. The sample consisted of 50 teacher-respondents and 10 school administrator-respondents (deans and program coordinators), for a total of 60 respondents. Table 1 shows the distribution by group.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by Group

Institution	Teachers	School Administrators	Total
Marikina Polytechnic College	50	10	60
Total	**50**	**10**	**60**

Research Instrument

The survey instrument was adopted from Diesta (2015), whose study assessed bridging leadership styles in private higher education institutions. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part I covered the demographic profile of respondents (age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, and length of service). Part II assessed administrator leadership styles across four dimensions—shared vision, communication, collaborative decision-making, and support—with five items each (20 items in total), rated on a five-point effectiveness scale. Table 2 presents the scale, score ranges, and verbal interpretations used.

Table 2. Scale, Range, and Verbal Interpretation

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very High Effective (VHE)
4	3.41 – 4.20	High Effective (HE)
3	2.61 – 3.40	Medium Effective (ME)
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low Effective (LE)
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very Low Effective (VLE)

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher secured institutional permission before administering the questionnaire. Upon approval, the researcher personally distributed and administered the questionnaire to both teacher and administrator respondents. Completed questionnaires were retrieved and analyzed with the assistance of a professional statistician.

Statistical Analysis

Three statistical tools were employed: (1) frequency and percentage, to describe the demographic profile of both respondent groups; (2) weighted mean, to determine the average assessment of each leadership dimension by each

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

respondent group; and (3) paired t-test (two-sample for means), to determine whether significant differences existed between the two groups' assessments of administrator leadership styles. For each dimension, the test compared the two groups' weighted means across the five paired indicators (df = 4). Hypotheses were tested at the 0.01 level of significance, and the null hypothesis was rejected when the computed *t*-statistic exceeded the critical two-tailed value of 4.60.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

RESULTS

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Age

Table 3 shows that the majority of teacher-respondents (60.0%, *n* = 30) were 35 years old and below, 34.0% (*n* = 17) were 36–53 years old, and 6.0% (*n* = 3) were 54 years old and above. In contrast, 70.0% of the administrator-respondents (*n* = 7) were aged 36–53 and 30.0% (*n* = 3) were 54 years old and above. No administrator-respondent was 35 years old or below.

Table 3. Age Distribution of Respondents

Category	Teachers (f)	Teachers (%)	Administrators (f)	Administrators (%)
35 years old and below	30	60.00	0	0.00
36 – 53 years old	17	34.00	7	70.00
54 years old and above	3	6.00	3	30.00
Total	**50**	**100.00**	**10**	**100.00**

Gender

As shown in Table 4, female teachers comprised the majority of teacher-respondents (62.0%, *n* = 31), while male respondents made up most of the administrator group (70.0%, *n* = 7).

Table 4. Gender Distribution of Respondents

Category	Teachers (f)	Teachers (%)	Administrators (f)	Administrators (%)
Male	19	38.00	7	70.00
Female	31	62.00	3	30.00
Total	**50**	**100.00**	**10**	**100.00**

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

Civil Status

Table 5 shows that most teacher-respondents were single (52.0%, *n* = 26), followed by married (44.0%, *n* = 22) and widowed (4.0%, *n* = 2). Administrator-respondents were predominantly married (80.0%, *n* = 8), with the remaining 20.0% (*n* = 2) single.

Table 5. Civil Status of Respondents

Category	Teachers (f)	Teachers (%)	Administrators (f)	Administrators (%)
Single	26	52.00	2	20.00
Married	22	44.00	8	80.00
Widow/Widower	2	4.00	0	0.00
Total	**50**	**100.00**	**10**	**100.00**

Highest Educational Attainment

As shown in Table 6, the largest share of teacher-respondents held a Master's Degree (42.0%, *n* = 21), while 60.0% of administrator-respondents (*n* = 6) held a Doctorate Degree. No respondent in either group held only a baccalaureate degree.

Table 6. Highest Educational Attainment of Respondents

Educational Attainment	Teachers (f)	Teachers (%)	Administrators (f)	Administrators (%)
Baccalaureate Degree	0	0.00	0	0.00
Baccalaureate Degree w/ Master's Units	14	28.00	1	10.00
Master's Degree	21	42.00	2	20.00
Master's Degree w/ Doctorate Units	13	26.00	1	10.00
Doctorate Degree	2	4.00	6	60.00
Total	**50**	**100.00**	**10**	**100.00**

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

Length of Service

Table 7 indicates that most teacher-respondents (46.0%, *n* = 23) and administrator-respondents (60.0%, *n* = 6) had served for more than 5 years. Respondents with less than 3 years of service accounted for 30.0% of each group.

Table 7. Length of Service of Respondents

Length of Service	Teachers (f)	Teachers (%)	Administrators (f)	Administrators (%)
Less than 3 years	15	30.00	3	30.00
3 – 5 years	12	24.00	1	10.00
More than 5 years	23	46.00	6	60.00
Total	**50**	**100.00**	**10**	**100.00**

Assessment of Leadership Styles

Shared Vision

Teachers rated shared vision Highly Effective (overall weighted mean [OWM] = 4.37), and administrators rated it Very Highly Effective (OWM = 4.70) (Table 8). All five indicators were rated HE by teachers (4.24–4.46) and VHE by administrators (4.60–4.80). Teachers gave their highest ratings to representing the school (4.46) and accepting designations as committee chair or member, adviser, and similar roles (4.44); administrators gave their highest ratings (4.80) to accepting designations and to helping construct syllabi, curriculum guides, and instructional materials. Teachers' lowest rating was for sharing ideas in the development of data management procedures (4.24).

Table 8. Assessment of Leadership Styles in Terms of Shared Vision

Indicator: The school administrator is…	Teachers WM	Teachers VI	Admin. WM	Admin. VI
1. Representing the school.	4.46	HE	4.60	VHE
2. Accepting designations as chair/member of committees, advisers, etc.	4.44	HE	4.80	VHE
3. Extending help in the construction of departmental tests and curricular materials.	4.36	HE	4.70	VHE

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

Indicator: The school administrator is…	Teachers WM	Teachers VI	Admin. WM	Admin. VI
4. Helping in the construction of syllabi, curriculum guides, and instructional materials.	4.34	HE	4.80	VHE
5. Sharing ideas in the development of data management procedures.	4.24	HE	4.60	VHE
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.37**	**HE**	**4.70**	**VHE**

Note. WM = weighted mean; VI = verbal interpretation; Admin. = administrators. 4.21–5.00 = Very High Effective (VHE); 3.41–4.20 = High Effective (HE); 2.61–3.40 = Medium Effective (ME); 1.81–2.60 = Low Effective (LE); 1.00–1.80 = Very Low Effective (VLE).

Communication

Communication received an OWM of 3.96 (HE) from teachers and 4.80 (VHE) from administrators (Table 9). All indicators fell within the HE range for teachers (3.80–4.06) and the VHE range for administrators (4.70–4.90). Stimulating creativity and innovation through open communication scored lowest among teachers (3.80) and, likewise, lowest among administrators (4.70), while encouraging faculty to express opinions in open forums scored highest among administrators (4.90).

Table 9. Assessment of Leadership Styles in Terms of Communication

Indicator: The school administrator is…	Teachers WM	Teachers VI	Admin. WM	Admin. VI
1. Recognizing the effort of faculty.	4.06	HE	4.80	VHE
2. Empowering and requiring faculty to communicate on school undertakings.	4.06	HE	4.80	VHE
3. Fostering open communication through suggestions.	3.86	HE	4.80	VHE
4. Stimulating creativity and innovation through open communication.	3.80	HE	4.70	VHE
5. Encouraging faculty to express opinions in open forums during meetings.	4.02	HE	4.90	VHE
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.96**	**HE**	**4.80**	**VHE**

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

Note. WM = weighted mean; VI = verbal interpretation; Admin. = administrators. 4.21–5.00 = Very High Effective (VHE); 3.41–4.20 = High Effective (HE); 2.61–3.40 = Medium Effective (ME); 1.81–2.60 = Low Effective (LE); 1.00–1.80 = Very Low Effective (VLE).

Collaborative Decision-Making

Collaborative decision-making yielded an OWM of 3.94 (HE) from teachers and 4.84 (VHE) from administrators (Table 10). Administrators gave their highest ratings (both 4.90) to involving faculty in consultative and mutual decision-making and to laying down problems and solving them more effectively. Among teachers, recognizing faculty effort scored highest (4.18), while laying down and solving problems scored lowest (3.80).

Table 10. Assessment of Leadership Styles in Terms of Collaborative Decision-Making

Indicator: The school administrator is…	Teachers WM	Teachers VI	Admin. WM	Admin. VI
1. Recognizing the effort of faculty.	4.18	HE	4.80	VHE
2. Involving faculty in consultative and mutual decision-making.	3.96	HE	4.90	VHE
3. Developing and maintaining a collaborative professional school culture.	3.88	HE	4.80	VHE
4. Laying down problems and solving them more effectively.	3.80	HE	4.90	VHE
5. Helping faculty brainstorm probable solutions in difficult circumstances.	3.90	HE	4.80	VHE
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.94**	**HE**	**4.84**	**VHE**

Note. WM = weighted mean; VI = verbal interpretation; Admin. = administrators. 4.21–5.00 = Very High Effective (VHE); 3.41–4.20 = High Effective (HE); 2.61–3.40 = Medium Effective (ME); 1.81–2.60 = Low Effective (LE); 1.00–1.80 = Very Low Effective (VLE).

Support

Support was the lowest-ranked dimension among teacher assessments (OWM = 3.86, HE), while administrators rated it 4.78 (VHE) (Table 11). Among teachers, strengthening faculty potential through training or individual coaching received the lowest rating (3.70), followed by developing faculty weaknesses and improving their capabilities (3.72). Engaging team activities and providing opportunities to lead in tasks or committees received the highest teacher rating (4.08). Administrators' ratings ranged from 4.70 to 4.90, with achievement, affiliation, and power motives rated highest (4.90).

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

Table 11. Assessment of Leadership Styles in Terms of Support

Indicator: The school administrator is…	Teachers WM	Teachers VI	Admin. WM	Admin. VI
1. Exerting effort beyond expectations.	3.96	HE	4.70	VHE
2. Arousing achievement, affiliation, and power motives among faculty.	3.86	HE	4.90	VHE
3. Developing faculty weaknesses and improving their capabilities.	3.72	HE	4.80	VHE
4. Strengthening faculty potential through training or individual coaching.	3.70	HE	4.80	VHE
5. Engaging team activities and providing opportunities to lead in tasks or committees.	4.08	HE	4.70	VHE
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.86**	**HE**	**4.78**	**VHE**

Note. WM = weighted mean; VI = verbal interpretation; Admin. = administrators. 4.21–5.00 = Very High Effective (VHE); 3.41–4.20 = High Effective (HE); 2.61–3.40 = Medium Effective (ME); 1.81–2.60 = Low Effective (LE); 1.00–1.80 = Very Low Effective (VLE).

Summary of Leadership Style Assessments

Table 12 summarizes the assessments across all dimensions. The grand weighted means were 4.03 (HE) for teachers and 4.78 (VHE) for administrators. Teachers ranked shared vision highest (4.37) and support lowest (3.86), whereas administrators ranked collaborative decision-making highest (4.84) and shared vision lowest (4.70). The difference between administrator and teacher OWMs was smallest in shared vision (0.33) and largest in support (0.92), followed by collaborative decision-making (0.90) and communication (0.84).

Table 12. Summary of Leadership Style Assessments Across All Dimensions

Leadership Dimension	Teachers OWM	Teachers VI	Admin. OWM	Admin. VI	Mean Diff.	Rank (T)	Rank (A)
Shared Vision	4.37	HE	4.70	VHE	0.33	1	4
Communication	3.96	HE	4.80	VHE	0.84	2	2
Collaborative Decision-Making	3.94	HE	4.84	VHE	0.90	3	1

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

Leadership Dimension	Teachers OWM	Teachers VI	Admin. OWM	Admin. VI	Mean Diff.	Rank (T)	Rank (A)
Support	3.86	HE	4.78	VHE	0.92	4	3
Grand Weighted Mean	**4.03**	**HE**	**4.78**	**VHE**	**0.75**	—	—

Note. OWM = overall weighted mean; VI = verbal interpretation; Admin. = administrators. Mean Diff. = administrators' OWM minus teachers' OWM; Rank (T) = rank by teachers; Rank (A) = rank by administrators. WM = weighted mean; VI = verbal interpretation; Admin. = administrators. 4.21–5.00 = Very High Effective (VHE); 3.41–4.20 = High Effective (HE); 2.61–3.40 = Medium Effective (ME); 1.81–2.60 = Low Effective (LE); 1.00–1.80 = Very Low Effective (VLE).

Significant Differences in Assessment Between the Two Groups

Table 13 presents the paired t-test results. All four computed t-statistics exceeded the critical two-tailed value of 4.60 at the 0.01 level of significance; hence, the null hypothesis was rejected for each dimension. Communication registered the largest t-value (20.02), followed by collaborative decision-making (11.55), support (9.28), and shared vision (6.34).

Table 13. Paired t-test Results: Significant Differences in Leadership Style Assessments

Leadership Dimension	t-Statistic	t-Critical (Two-Tail)	Decision	Interpretation
Shared Vision	6.34	4.60 @ 0.01 alpha	Reject H_0	Significant
Communication	20.02	4.60 @ 0.01 alpha	Reject H_0	Significant
Collaborative Decision-Making	11.55	4.60 @ 0.01 alpha	Reject H_0	Significant
Support	9.28	4.60 @ 0.01 alpha	Reject H_0	Significant

Note. If $|t\text{-statistic}| \geq t\text{-critical}$ (two-tailed), H_0 is rejected (significant). Level of significance: $\alpha = 0.01$.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

DISCUSSION

Principal Findings

The overarching finding of this study—that MPC administrators are rated as effective leaders by both teachers and themselves, but that significant perceptual gaps exist between the two groups—is consistent with a well-documented pattern in educational leadership research. As Diesta (2015) found in private higher education institutions (HEIs), transformational leadership dimensions such as shared vision and communication were rated High by faculty and Very High by administrators, a pattern that closely mirrors this study's findings at a state technical college. The convergence suggests that the perception gap may not be institution-specific but may reflect a structural dynamic in how leaders and followers assess leadership effectiveness in Philippine higher education. The grand weighted means (4.03 for teachers, 4.78 for administrators) confirm that MPC administrators are perceived as effective leaders by both groups; the disagreement is one of degree, not of fundamental direction.

Respondent Profile

The age stratification between teaching and administrative ranks—young teachers and middle-aged administrators—is consistent with expected career progression patterns in Philippine state colleges. Young adults are typically characterized as energetic and still building their careers, while the middle adulthood stage is associated with accumulated experience and professional wisdom. The gender inversion between ranks (female majority among teachers, male majority among administrators) reflects a pattern documented in Philippine higher education, where female teachers outnumber male counterparts at the faculty level while males more often hold administrative positions, though this pattern is gradually shifting. The civil status profile follows the age profile: single teachers are generally perceived as more available for school-related tasks, while married administrators manage both professional and family obligations. The educational profile reflects the expectation that administrators possess the highest level of academic preparation, and the absence of baccalaureate-only respondents indicates a high level of professional qualification throughout the institution. Finally, that most respondents in both groups had served for more than five years indicates a largely experienced workforce, which suggests institutional stability, continuity of leadership, and an established faculty culture.

Leadership Styles by Dimension

Shared vision was the highest-rated dimension among teachers, although administrators rated it lowest of the four dimensions, albeit still Very Highly Effective. The strength of this dimension aligns with Buletic-Sindingan (2012), who found that the leadership skill of "Create a Vision" was among the most often practiced by school administrators. The highest-rated shared-vision indicators—representing the school and accepting committee designations—reflect administrators' active institutional engagement.

In communication, all indicators remained within the HE and VHE ranges, but teachers rated stimulating creativity and innovation through open communication lowest. Dahiya (2015) emphasized that effective managerial communication—encompassing motivation, persuasion, and support—is among the most critical skills required of leaders, underscoring the importance of this dimension.

In collaborative decision-making, teachers rated recognition of faculty effort highest and problem-laying and problem-solving lowest, while administrators rated consultative decision-making and problem-solving highest. Ejimabo (2015) highlighted that the leadership decision-making process is central to organizational leadership, supporting the primacy of collaborative decision-making as a leadership dimension.

Support was the lowest-rated dimension among teachers, with the weakest indicators being individual coaching and faculty capability development. Strengthening faculty potential through training or coaching received the

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

lowest teacher rating (3.70), suggesting that while administrators believe they provide strong individualized development support, teachers perceive it as somewhat less impactful. Engaging team activities and providing leadership opportunities received the highest teacher score (4.08), indicating that collective support mechanisms are more visible than individualized ones. This finding is theoretically grounded in transformational leadership theory: Kash (2012) identified the personal development of followers as a defining characteristic of transformational leadership, and its relative underperformance in teacher ratings suggests that while administrators practice transformational leadership in institutional and collective dimensions (shared vision, collaborative processes), they may be less consistent in individualized faculty development—the dimension closest to the transformational leadership ideal.

The Teacher–Administrator Perception Gap

Communication produced the largest t-statistic (t = 20.02) and is significant because it is the leadership behavior most directly experienced by faculty daily. While administrators may believe they are fostering open dialogue, encouraging innovation, and empowering faculty voices, teachers may experience these efforts less frequently or with less impact than intended. Dahiya (2015) argued that effective managerial communication requires not just the presence of communication channels but the active demonstration of receptiveness, which may be the gap at MPC. It should be noted, however, that the t-statistic reflects the consistency of the difference across indicators as well as its size; in terms of raw mean difference, the gap was widest in support (0.92) and collaborative decision-making (0.90), followed by communication (0.84), and narrowest in shared vision (0.33). Teachers and administrators thus appear to hold more closely aligned perceptions of institutional vision than of day-to-day communicative, collaborative, and supportive practices.

These results indicate that administrators consistently evaluated their own leadership more favorably than their teachers did. Because administrators and teachers rated the same practices from different vantage points, the difference may reflect self-assessment tendencies, differences in how frequently the practices are experienced, or both; the data do not permit a determination of which group's assessment is more accurate.

Implications: Proposed Leadership Training Program

The significant differences across all four dimensions at the 0.01 level necessitate a programmatic response. A leadership training program focused on narrowing the perception gap—particularly in communication and support—would benefit both administrators (who can refine their leadership delivery) and teachers (who can develop shared understanding of leadership responsibilities and institutional expectations). Leithwood and Jantzi (2010) called for precisely this kind of evidence-based, systematically conceptualized approach to school leadership improvement, warning against relying solely on theoretical or speculative foundations.

Accordingly, a Leadership Training Program is proposed to address the perception gaps identified between teacher and administrator assessments, with particular emphasis on communication (the dimension with the largest t-statistic, t = 20.02) and individualized faculty support (the lowest-rated sub-indicators in the support dimension). The program aims to help administrators better calibrate their leadership practices to their faculty's actual needs and perceptions. Table 14 presents the module overview.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

Table 14. Proposed Leadership Training Program Module Overview

Module	Target Gap	Key Activities	Expected Outcomes
Module 1: Vision Communication and Alignment	Shared Vision (t = 6.34)	Vision articulation workshops; institutional goal-setting sessions with faculty participation; shared planning roadmaps	Stronger faculty ownership of institutional vision; reduced perception gap in shared vision
Module 2: Effective Leadership Communication	Communication (t = 20.02), largest t-value	Communication style self-assessment; open-forum facilitation training; feedback-giving and receiving workshops; innovation dialogue clinics	More consistent faculty experience of open communication; increased trust in administrator accessibility
Module 3: Collaborative Decision-Making Practicum	Collaborative Decision-Making (t = 11.55)	Problem-solving simulation workshops; consensus-building exercises; participatory policy development sessions	Faculty-perceived increase in meaningful involvement in institutional decisions
Module 4: Individualized Faculty Development and Support	Support (t = 9.28); individual coaching sub-indicators (lowest teacher scores)	Individual coaching skills training for administrators; professional development planning templates; mentorship pairing system for neophyte faculty; training-need analysis procedures	Improved faculty awareness of administrator support; increased faculty professional growth through targeted coaching

The program is designed for delivery over two academic semesters, with one module per eight-week block. Pre- and post-assessments using the same 20-item leadership effectiveness instrument should be administered to track changes in teacher perceptions across all four dimensions. The target outcome is to narrow the teacher–administrator perception gap from its current spread of 0.33–0.92 OWM points to within 0.20 OWM points across all dimensions.

Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. The study was conducted in a single state college using purposive sampling, so the results may not generalize to other institutions. The two respondent groups were unequal in size (50 teachers and 10 administrators), and the data are self-reported perceptions rather than objective measures of leadership performance. In addition, the paired t-test was applied to indicator-level weighted means (five pairs per dimension), which yields a small number of degrees of freedom; the findings on group differences should therefore be read as indicative of consistent differences across indicators rather than as a test on individual respondents' ratings. Future studies may address these limitations through larger samples, multiple institutions, and respondent-level inferential analyses.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

Conclusions

Based on the findings and discussion, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Teacher-respondents at MPC are predominantly young adults (35 years and below), female, single, and holders of a Master's Degree, while administrator-respondents are predominantly middle-aged adults (36–53 years), male, married, and holders of a Doctorate Degree. Both groups are veterans with more than five years of service.

2. The leadership styles of MPC school administrators are rated Highly Effective (HE) by teachers across all four dimensions (grand WM = 4.03) and Very Highly Effective (VHE) by administrators themselves (grand WM = 4.78). Shared vision is the highest-rated dimension by teachers and support is the lowest-rated, though all remain within the HE range. Among administrators, collaborative decision-making is the highest-rated dimension and shared vision the lowest, though all remain within the VHE range.

3. Significant differences exist between the two groups of respondents across all four leadership dimensions at the 0.01 level of significance (t-statistics of 6.34, 20.02, 11.55, and 9.28, all exceeding the critical value of 4.60). The null hypothesis is rejected in all cases. Administrators consistently rated their leadership more favorably than teachers did, with communication showing the largest t-statistic and support showing the widest difference in means.

4. Despite statistically significant perceptual differences, both groups affirm that MPC administrators demonstrate effective leadership in shared vision, communication, collaborative decision-making, and support. The gap is one of degree—administrators rating themselves higher—rather than a disagreement about the fundamental effectiveness of leadership at MPC.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, the following are recommended:

1. MPC administrators should be encouraged to sustain their effective leadership practices, particularly in shared vision—the dimension rated highest by teachers and the one on which both groups' views are most closely aligned—while systematically seeking faculty feedback to understand better how their leadership is experienced.

2. The perception gap in communication—the dimension with the largest t-statistic (20.02)—should be addressed through structured communication audits, regular open-dialogue sessions, and anonymous faculty feedback mechanisms that allow teachers to share perceptions without fear of professional repercussions.

3. Individualized faculty support through training, coaching, and capability development—the lowest-rated sub-indicators in the support dimension—should be formalized through a professional development calendar that documents specific support activities undertaken for each faculty member.

4. The veteran teachers and administrators of MPC should continue to mentor and inspire newer faculty members, leveraging institutional experience to build a culture of continuous learning and leadership development.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

5. Other State Colleges and Universities in the National Capital Region are encouraged to conduct similar studies to assess their own administrators' leadership styles and identify context-specific gaps and strengths.

6. Future researchers may replicate this study with expanded samples, additional dimensions (e.g., organizational commitment and climate), and additional inferential statistical tools to further validate and deepen findings on administrator leadership effectiveness.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

JASDG
JOURNAL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
Advancing Knowledge. Inspiring Innovation. Achieving the SDGs.
AN INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED, OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL
www.jasdg.com
Volume 1 Issue 3 Pages 2403-2421

REFERENCES

Adams, C. M. (2010). Leadership theories and practice in educational institutions. *Educational Administration Review, 18*(3), 11–15.

Ayman, R. (2010). Leadership: Theory and research in context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*(2), 155–163.

Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bhavna, D. (2012). Organizational commitment: A conceptual overview. *Journal of Management, 4*(1), 86–95.

Buletic-Sindingan, R. (2012). *Leadership skills of administrators and the teachers' morale in the secondary schools of Bayog* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Zamboanga del Sur.

Cardillo, D. (2010). School climate reform: Respect as a measure of quality. *Educational Review Quarterly, 15*(2), 13–18.

Cooper, T. (2011). Leadership styles and organizational outcomes. *Management Studies Review, 6*(1), 1–8.

Daft, R. L. (2011). *The leadership experience* (5th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning.

Dahiya, S. (2015). Managerial communication and leadership effectiveness. *Business Communication Journal, 9*(2), 22–30.

De Guzmán, R. (2012). Age and professional maturation in educational settings. *Philippine Education Review, 7*(1), 10–15.

Diesta, R. M. (2015). *Bridging leadership style of private higher education institutions (HEIs) and their faculty organizational commitment and climate: Basis for a proposed managerial leadership program* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation].

Dubrin, A. J. (2013). *Leadership: Research findings, practice, and skills* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Ejimabo, N. O. (2015). A vital approach to understanding leadership decision-making in organizational leadership and management. *European Scientific Journal, 11*(11), 1–18.

Germano, M. A. (2010). Leadership style and organizational impact. *Library Worklife, 7*(6), 10–15.

Giri, V. N. (2010). Situational leadership theory in educational administration. *International Journal of Educational Management, 5*(2), 85–92.

Herscovitch, L. (2012). Organizational commitment: Components and their effects on workplace behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 7*(2), 85–92.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.

Ivancevich, J. M. (2010). *Organizational behavior and management* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Kash, D. (2012). Transformational leadership theory and its application in higher education. *Journal of Educational Administration, 10*(2), 45–55.

Kong, E. (2012). Leadership that gets results: Application of Goleman's six leadership styles. *Business Leadership Review, 9*(1), 119–124.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2011). *The leadership challenge* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Lai, A. (2011). Transformational-transactional leadership theory. *AHS Capstone Projects*, Paper 17.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2010). Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 12*(1), 143–165.

Makuch, M. (2015). Authentic leadership, social support, and workplace bullying. *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 15*(4), 77–85.

McLaughlin, C. (2011). Organizational climate and culture in educational settings. *Educational Management Quarterly, 6*(3), 75–80.

Newstrom, J. W. (2011). *Organizational behavior: Human behavior at work* (13th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Nikezic, S., & Puric, S. (2012). Transactional and transformational leadership: Development through changes. *International Journal for Quality Research, 6*(3), 285–296.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Odumero, J. (2013). Transactional versus transformational leadership theories: Evidence in literature. *International Review of Management and Business Research, 2*(2), 355–361.

Perez, A. B. (2010). *Research methods in education* (Rev. ed.). Rex Publishing.

Ronquillo, J. (2013). Leadership theories in public administration. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration, 57*(2), 198–210.

Verda, K. (2012). Organizational commitment and its determinants. *Journal of Business Research, 9*(3), 120–130.

Xue, B. (2013). *Leadership competencies of school administrators and their relationship to teachers' commitment among selected Buddhist Chinese schools* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Manila, Philippines.

Zulueta, F. M. (2010). *Principles of management and organization*. National Book Store.

© 2026 Advancing SDG Impact. All rights reserved.