



LEADERSHIP STYLES, ATTRIBUTES, AND FUNCTIONS OF SCHOOL HEADS

CHONA C. CLORES

Institute of Graduate and Professional Studies,
Lyceum-Northwestern University
Dagupan City

Abstract :

This research determined the school heads' leadership styles, attributes and functions, as well as the issues and concerns they faced as basis for Education Progression-Driven Era Development Plan. This study utilized descriptive method. The respondents of this study were the school heads and teachers in Dagupan City Division. Percentage, frequency distribution, weighted mean and Z-Test were used in this study. The findings revealed that school heads apply a conglomeration of leadership styles. It was also found that the perception of school heads and teachers with regard to attributes, specifically to skill and attitude and to the functions of school heads in basic education, education governance and regulatory and developmental have significant difference. However, there is no significant difference to the perception of school administrators and teachers with regard to knowledge as an attribute. It was concluded that though school heads apply different leadership styles, face different issues and challenges and have polar perceptions with their teachers with regard to their attributes and functions, they are still functioning and doing the best of their abilities to be effective and efficient leaders of the public schools.

Keywords: School Head; attribute, function; leadership style

INTRODUCTION

According to them, leadership is a universal phenomena that has been the subject of extensive research. Leadership definitions are complex, difficult, and even contradictory. Others believe that people-oriented leaders are the most effective, while others believe that the outcome of a leader's action defines his success. In terms of school leadership, the success of a school can be related to the level of leadership provided by its school administrator. A school administrator is a principal, a school head, or a teacher in charge who is in charge of running a school. Despite his various positions, he is considered the school's leader. He makes choices on behalf of the school with the assistance of teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders. However, among all others who assist him, he is the one in command of all operations and undertakes all obligations of a certain school. However, as a leader, he is always confronted with new challenges in order to attain the goals of the institution he serves. He also faces a variety of issues, which can be attributed to instructors, students, the community, or other stakeholders.

An administrator is another title for a school principal. Manager is not the preferred term because it is more businesslike than administrator. Boss is a less formal title than administrator or leader. He is in charge of the educational organization's lowest unit: The School. His responsibility is to analyze the school's needs, determine important changes, and develop plans to address the concerns of teachers, students, and other stakeholders. In addition, he is familiar with several perspectives on how to address problems in conduct and leadership. He is regarded to be capable of coping with the varied attitudes of students, instructors, and stakeholders. He combines knowledge and experience to successfully deal with challenges that may develop as he leads his individual school. Furthermore, as a school administrator, he may possess some of the qualities required for effective leadership, but this is insufficient. He should also improve in what he does; he has to broaden his expertise of good leadership. School administration is a sort of metamorphosis. This is due to many programs implemented by the Department of Education, such as the School Based-Management system, which empowers every school administrator to make decisions concerning the school. This necessitates that school administrators possess knowledge, abilities, and attitudes that distinguish them from their subordinates.

Since school administrator is a leader, the questions may arise on the qualities/attributes that set him apart from the other teachers who may also do the job.

Eric Sheninger (2011) discussed the traits of effective principals in his blog on The Huffington Post, quoting Dr. James Strong. In his blog, he discussed what good principals do. His thoughts are as follows:

Great communicator: Principals must be able to articulate the mission of the school. School leaders are not always the best examples of good communication. In terms of evaluations, we cannot continue to tell instructors that they are doing a fantastic job when they are not. Being a straightforward communicator is sometimes overlooked when conversations about teacher performance.

Difference maker: Principals must be able to maintain attention on critical programs and culture traits that influence student learning and achievement. They put in place accountability methods to hold teachers and students accountable for their learning. Great principals see solutions rather than problems.

Risky, but not too risky: Principals must be willing to attempt new things and have the perseverance to keep trying until improvement is achieved. They require a safety net that allows them to fail in these endeavors. The most effective decision makers take chances, but they never bet the farm or make quantum leaps without knowing the outcome.

Manage by walking around: Principals who walk throughout the school on a regular basis get to know the children, can identify areas where teachers can improve, and set the tone for practices that will be replicated throughout the campus. The human element is incredibly crucial. Great principals foster a healthy school culture by treating students the way they want to be treated. Setting a pleasant tone begins with how we smile, say hello, and engage in discussions.

Address problems: Strong principals will conduct the difficult, unsatisfying work of confronting and replacing ineffective employees. This necessitates confronting challenges with a positive attitude. When employing new employees, principals must go to tremendous lengths to find instructors who best fit the school's goal.

Cares about students and staff: Effective principals never give up on their students or their employees. They are the pinnacle of instructional leadership and will show teachers how to improve their effectiveness based on evaluation data. As Dr. Strong mentioned, the elements listed above are vital on a personal level. He then identified the following research-backed markers of principal quality.

Instructional leadership: Creating a vision, establishing a shared leadership model, leading a learning community, utilizing data, and monitoring curriculum and instruction are all part of the job. The most effective instructors use numerous teaching tactics at the same time throughout a session, and competent principals can spot them.

School climate: creating a positive culture, establishing high expectations, adhering to a practice of respect.

Human resource administration: Hiring excellent teachers and other personnel, inducting and supporting current personnel, offering significant chances for advancement, retaining quality personnel, and successfully evaluating teacher performance are all important.

Organization management: safety, daily operations, facilities maintenance, and securing & using resources to increase student achievement.

Communication and community relations: effective communicator with all stakeholder groups.

Professionalism: ethical standards, serves as a role model, models lifelong learning.

Krasnoff (2015) provided some characteristics of an effective principal, referencing Hull (2012). According to her, highly effective principals are more likely to have more than three years of overall leadership experience, at least three years of leadership experience at that school, share leadership responsibilities rather than just delegate paperwork, have a clear sense of instructional goals, provide ongoing, informal feedback and support toward goals, conduct unannounced, informal teacher evaluations or classroom visits and provide feedback afterwards, a clear sense of instructional goals, a clear sense of instructional goals, a clear sense of instructional goals, a clear sense of instructional goals

Schools with highly effective principals have standardized test scores that are 5 to 10 percentile points higher than schools led by an average principal, fewer student and teacher absences, effective teachers who stay longer, ineffective teachers who are typically replaced with more effective teachers, and principals who are more likely to stay for at least three years, according to Hull (2012), as cited by Krasnoff (2015).

Furthermore, Krasnoff (2015) remarked, citing Hull (2012), that excellent principals support instructors. Teachers say principals provide instructional support by emphasizing the value of research-based strategies and effectively applying them to their own school, encouraging teacher collaboration, providing more time for teacher planning, observing teachers' work, offering constructive feedback, providing instructional guidance, and developing a caring and trusting environment.

Krasnoff (2015) stated in her conclusion to her work *Leadership Qualities of Effective Principals* that research and practice confirm that without a skilled and committed instructional leader to shape teaching and learning, there is little chance of creating and sustaining a high quality learning environment. The principal is certainly a vital factor in the functioning of the school, especially if the school enrolls a substantial number of low-performing, disadvantaged, and minority children. Unfortunately, less experienced and less successful principals are more likely to lead problematic schools. And, while effective principals tend to stay in difficult schools longer than ineffective principals, most effective principals eventually shift to less difficult schools within the district—not because of the students, but because of the working environment. As the pressure mounts for all students in every school to flourish as learners, there is widespread agreement that education administrators must be more than just facility managers. Principals must have the knowledge, abilities, and experience to focus on instructional leadership and optimize teachers' individual success as well as the school's overall effectiveness if they are to be effective in turning around low-performing schools and driving student learning. State agencies and politicians who are concerned with supporting the principle as the instructional leader must gather and act on accurate data about principal effectiveness. If principals are expected to be instructional leaders, only continuous evaluation of their actions and skills will drive continuous growth in their effectiveness.

According to Levine Nelson et al. (2007), citing Levine (2005), school administrators no longer serve as supervisors. They have been asked to take the lead in redesigning their schools and systems. Administrators must lead their schools in rethinking goals, priorities, money, staffing, curriculum, pedagogies, learning resources evaluation methodologies, technology, and the utilization of time and space in the progression and accountability-driven era. They must recruit and retain top personnel while also educating newcomers and veterans to comprehend and get comfortable with an education system that is undergoing substantial and ongoing change. Furthermore, one of the most important duties of any administrator is to transform and encourage instructors' efforts (Hoy and Hoy, 2003 as cited by Nelson, et al. 2007). Furthermore, school administrators are responsible for schools and must exercise leadership while accepting responsibility for educational outcomes. Schools require competent leaders who can promote learning, support and reward effective teaching, and guarantee that schools serve the community (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Fullan, 2001; Creighton, 2005, as quoted by Nelson et al. 2007). Furthermore, it is the responsibility of administrators to lead schools and school reform. Practicing instructors enthusiastically support administrators who take on the role of instructional leader (Fullan, 2001).

Statement of the Problem

This research study ascertained the leadership styles, attributes, functions as well as the issues and concerns encountered by the school heads in the Department of Education (DepEd), Dagupan City Division during School Year 2025-2026 as basis for designing an education progression-driven era development plan.

This study sought to answer the following sub-problems:

1. What is the profile of the respondent groups as to:
 - 1.1 personal and
 - 1.2 styles of leadership
2. What attributes are possessed by the school heads in terms of:
 - 2.1 knowledge
 - 2.2 skills
 - 2.3 attributes
3. As perceived by the respondent groups, do the school heads comply with the following functions:
 - 3.1 Basic Education
 - 3.2 Education Governance
 - 3.3 Regulatory and Developmental
4. Is there a significant difference between respondent groups' perception to the heads' attributes and functions?
5. What are the issues and concerns encountered by the school heads?
6. Based on the findings, what education progression-driven era development plan can be designed?

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, sources of data, instrumentation and data collection and the tools for data analysis.

Research Design

This study employed the descriptive-evaluative research design. The descriptive-evaluative technique, according to Sanchez (2000), encompasses all research that describe, assess, and interpret what it is. It is concerned with existing relationship circumstances, behaviors, and beliefs, as well as processes, impacts, and emerging trends. As a result, the researcher considers it to be the most appropriate way for discovering the school heads' leadership styles, traits, and functions, as well as the challenges and concerns they faced, as the foundation for the Education Progression-Driven Era Development Plan. This method is critical and appropriate since descriptive-evaluative is concerned with the questionnaire as the primary data collection instrument.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

In order to collect the essential data for this study, the researcher created a questionnaire. Some sections of the survey questionnaire were modeled after the Result Based Performance Management System (RPMS) for school administrators. Before the administration, the researcher requested permission from the Superintendent to conduct the research and collect data through a questionnaire among the school heads and teachers in Dagupan City Division. The questionnaires were personally handed to the respondents when the authorization letter was approved. The researcher personally retrieved the research instruments as soon as the respondents completed their tasks.

Tools for Data Analysis

This study utilized the following statistical formula in the treatment of the data:

Simple Percentage. This was used to determine the percentage of the responses of the respondents.

Weighted Mean. This was utilized to analyze and interpret the responses

Mode. This was used to assess and evaluate the attributes that were chosen most often by the respondents.

Frequency Distribution. This was used to show the number of instances in which a variable takes each of each possible values.

Z-Test. This was used to find the significant difference between the mean of the mean of the respondent groups.

Scoring Procedures

The validity of the responses of the respondents was scored using the following:

Weight	Scale	Category	Verbal Description
3	2.33-3.00	Well Manifested	If the leadership style is highly perceived
2	1.67-2.32	Manifested	If the leadership style is perceived
1	1.00-1.66	Less Manifested	If the leadership style is less perceived

Weight	Scale	Category	Verbal Description
3	2.33-3.00	Well Possessed	If the attribute is highly possessed
2	1.67-2.32	Possessed	If the attribute is possessed
1	1.00-1.66	Less Possessed	If the attribute is less possessed

Weight	Scale	Category	Verbal Description
3	2.33-3.00	Well Complied	If the function's success is highly complied
2	1.67-2.32	Complied	If the function's success is complied
1	1.00-1.66	Less Complied	If the function's success is less complied

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered relative to sub-problems in the study.

Profile of the Respondents

Personal. This section presents the elementary teachers' profile and school heads' profile as to personal and styles of leadership.

Age and Sex. Age and sex play vital roles in analyzing the responses of the respondents in terms of who and which age dominates the leadership roles in schools and who and which age dominates the teaching loads.

Table 1. Age and Sex of the Respondents

	School Heads				Teachers			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
Age	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
61 and above	0	0.00	1	3.33	1	0.67	3	2.00
51-60	2	6.67	2	6.67	3	2.00	9	6.00
41-50	3	10.00	15	50.00	5	3.33	8	5.33
31-40	2	6.67	4	13.33	8	5.33	64	42.67
20-30	1	3.33	0	0	10.00	6.67	39	26.00
Total	8	26.67	22	73.33	27	18.00	123	82.00

According to Table 1, only one (1), or 3.33 percent, of school heads are between the ages of 20 and 30. School heads aged 31-40, on the other hand, account for only six (6) or 20.00% of all respondents. According to the survey, the majority of school heads, or 60.00 percent of all respondents, are between the ages of 41 and 50. There are just four school heads between the ages of 51 and 60, accounting for 13.33 percent of the respondents. Finally, only one (1), or 3.33 percent, of the total respondents are school heads aged 61-70. In contrast, 32.67 percent of teacher responses (49 out of 150) are between the ages of 20 and 30. The findings also show that the majority of respondents, 72 or 48.00 percent, are between the ages of 31 and 40. Only 13 or 8.67 percent of teachers are between the ages of 41 and 50. Teachers between the ages of 41 and 50 are not on par with those between the ages of 51 and 60. Teachers between the ages of 51 and 60 account for barely 12 percent (8.00 percent) of all teacher respondents. Finally, only four (4) or 2.67 percent of respondents are teachers aged 61-70.

In terms of the typical age of a school heads, someone must be at least 41-50 years old. It may be deduced that if someone reaches certain ages, he already has experience and knowledge about teaching, management, and leadership, as well as the wisdom to lead his fellow teachers. However, this does not exclude someone from becoming a school head before reaching the age of 40. Furthermore, the majority of the respondents are between the ages of 20 and 40. This merely goes to show that today's schools are dominated by younger generations of teachers. The explanation is most likely the high demand for teachers in the twenty-first century due to the rapid increase in the number of kids and students. The Department of Education mass-hired instructors two years ago in preparation for the K-12 Curriculum. Indeed, some professions, such as engineers, nurses, and business graduates, are already transitioning to the teaching profession due to the numerous chances available in this field. In terms of gender, eight (8) or 26.67 percent of school administrators are male, while 22 or 73.33 percent are female. In terms of gender, there are 24 male teacher respondents, accounting for 18% of all respondents, while female teacher respondents account for 123, or 82.00% of total respondents. According to the data acquired, the majority of teachers are female, with a nearly one-to-four male-to-female ratio. This suggests that female professors are dominate in the teaching profession. The data also reveal that most school administrators are female while only few school administrators are male. The data contradict the usual cliché that "most leaders are men while most subordinates are women." However, in education it is the reverse. Female is the dominant gender in all educational systems because only few men are entering the craft.

Table 2. Years of Experience of the Respondents

Years in Service	School Heads		Teachers	
	F	%	F	%
26-30	0	0	6	4
21 – 25	2	6.67	7	4.67
16-20	7	23.33	13	8.67
11-15	13	43.33	15	10
6-10	7	23.33	53	35.33
1-5	1	3.33	56	37.33
Total	30	100	150	100

Table 2 displays the number of years in service of the school heads and teachers. Their school leadership backgrounds encompass both classroom teaching and school leadership in both private and public institutions. According to the data, only one school heads, or 3.33 percent, has experience ranging from one to five years. Furthermore, seven (7) school heads account for 23.33 percent of all school heads. The majority of school heads have at least 11-15 years of experience. There are 13 of them, accounting for 43.33 percent of all respondents. In addition, seven (7) or 23.33 percent of school heads have at least 16-20 years of experience, while only two (2) or 6.67 percent have 21-25 years of experience. On the one hand, 37.33 percent of teachers surveyed have 1-5 years of experience. On the other side, 53 percent or 35 percent of teachers have 6-10 years of experience, while 15 percent or 10.00 percent of total respondents have 11-15 years of experience. Teachers with 16-20 years of experience account for 13 or 8.67 percent of responses, while teachers with 21-25 years of experience account for 4.67 percent. The most experienced teachers are represented by six (6) or 4.00 percent of the respondents. No teacher, however, has more than 31 years of experience.

According to the research, the majority of school heads have more than 11 years of experience. This demonstrates how difficult the path to becoming a school heads is. Experience is required to lead teachers who are intelligent and may have more experience than them. As a result, running a school with a less experienced school head may be a disadvantage. Less experienced teachers, on the other hand, are not barred from becoming school heads. According to the report, 26.66% of school heads have less than ten (10) years of experience. They may have the capacity to lead schools or possess leadership qualities that distinguish them

from their subordinates. Furthermore, the results show that if someone wants to be a school heads, he must have enough years of experience. According to the data, no school heads has more than 26 years of experience.

According to the data, the majority of teacher respondents have ten (10) or less years of experience, which adds up to 109 out of 150 respondents, or 72.66 percent. This demonstrates that many young instructors are currently teaching Dagupan City Division. This is owing to a large growth in the number of learners, as well as the implementation of the K-12 Curriculum. The growth in the number of teachers can also be attributed to the government's efforts to improve the Philippines' education system. Because of the large increase in teachers in the government, many teachers are now feeling the government's effort. More gaps, such as classrooms, books, and other school facilities that may assist the teaching-learning process, must be filled. Nonetheless, the increased teaching staff at the Department of Education represents a significant step forward for the government in its efforts to improve the Philippine educational system. President Duterte has even stated publicly that he is willing to raise teacher salaries in order to improve their quality of life. The President's gesture demonstrates that the entire administration is eager to increase education quality while also improving the lives of teachers who work tirelessly to provide the greatest education possible for our nation's future leaders.

Table 3. Leadership Styles of School Heads

STYLE	APPROACH	MEAN	DE
Behavioral	I encourage my subordinates to participate and be involved in all activities	2.90	WM
	I observe my subordinates' positive and negative behavior	2.93	WM
	I listen to my subordinates' concern	2.77	WM
Transformational	I coach and mentor my subordinates in attaining the mission, vision, and core values of the Department of Education	3.00	WM
	I have a charisma as a leader that makes my subordinates follow	2.70	WM
	I motivate and inspire my subordinates	3.00	WM
	I challenge my subordinates intellectually	2.63	WM
Transactional	I attend to each of my subordinates' needs	2.40	WM
	I use reward and punishment to make my subordinates follow	2.87	WM
	I give specific instructions and I always want things to be done immediately	2.30	M
	I am willing to work for the benefit of the institution without counting the cost	2.97	WM
	I want to preserve and maintain the culture of Department of Education as an institution	2.67	WM

Legend

- WM - Well-Manifested
- M - Manifested
- LM - Less-Manifested
- X - Weighted Mean
- N-Total frequency

As shown in Table 3, school heads believe they have demonstrated the behavioral style well by encouraging subordinates to join and be involved in all activities, observing subordinates' positive and bad behavior, and listening to their subordinates' concerns. Regarding the transformational style, school administrators believe they have demonstrated it well by coaching and mentoring their subordinates in achieving the Department of Education's mission, vision, and core values; having a charisma as a leader that makes their subordinates follow; motivating and inspiring their subordinates; intellectually challenging their subordinates; and attending to each of their subordinate's needs. Regarding transactional leadership, school heads believe that they have well-exemplified the style by using reward and punishment to compel my subordinates to follow, being willing to work for the benefit of the institution without regard for the cost, and having the desire to preserve and maintain the culture of the Department of Education as an institution. Only one strategy that transactional leaders consider as manifesting is giving explicit directions and always expecting things done instantly.

Data reveal that school heads use a variety of leadership approaches. The most common styles they all exhibit are coaching and mentoring their subordinates in achieving the Department of Education's purpose, vision, and core values, as well as motivating and inspiring their subordinates. The approaches that they all exhibit are not unusual in leadership since as school administrators, they must guide their employees to the accomplishment of the institution's goal, vision, and fundamental values. The purpose, vision and fundamental values serve as guides for each school head in determining where they should lead. School heads are also obligated to assist their subordinates in achieving such missions, visions, and core values because the schools' success is dependent on them. A school head who does not coach or mentor his or her subordinates is an unsuccessful leader because each subordinate's failure is equally his failure. As a school head, he must also inspire and motivate subordinates to complete their assigned tasks. Subordinates, in other words, must be supported and driven so that they do not feel alone or unmonitored by their superiors. Modeling is required for motivation and inspiration, according to Bandura's social learning theory.

A self-motivated leader can send a never-ending ripple effect to his subordinates, encouraging them to do the same. He may also lead them without command because he has already established himself as a positive role model for his subordinates. To give an example, the researcher observed the former Regional Director of the Department of Education picking up rubbish; when he saw his boss doing so, he followed him without saying anything to her and did the same. In other words, a leader's good deeds can have a long-term impact on his subordinates, encouraging and motivating others to follow in his footsteps. Furthermore, most school heads say that they exhibit a style of encouraging their subordinates to participate and be involved in all activities, observing their subordinates' positive and negative behavior, listening to their subordinates' concerns, having the charisma as a leader that makes their subordinates follow, challenging their subordinates intellectually, attending to each of their subordinate's needs, and willingness to work hard.

As previously noted, school heads must push their teachers to their limits because they are the direct implementers of the curriculum; hence, the success or failure of such implementation may reverberate back to the school heads. Superiors may inquire, "How did you assist your teachers?" or "How did you improve your professors' performance?" These may be some of the pertinent questions that school heads must address in order to be fully effective school leaders. In order to be good school heads, they must be aware of their subordinates' actions. They must be sensitive to their subordinates' feelings in order to know how to coach and adjust to them, because whether they like it or not, they are working with people who are different from one other. They all come from various backgrounds and have undergone various training. As a result, school heads must be aware of their sentiments, whether positive or negative. To effectively lead their subordinates, they, as Howard Gardner put it, "must possess interpersonal intelligence." Furthermore, charm can be an asset to school administrators. Some people believe that charismatic leaders are leaders who are well-liked by their subordinates. Charisma is a unique charm that only a few people have. Though no one understands how to evaluate charisma or to what extent leaders should have it, one thing is certain: charismatic leaders have the potential to persuade people follow without controlling them. Furthermore, in order to be effective leaders, school heads must attend to the requirements of their subordinates. They have distinct concerns and needs, whether from their parents, students, or, more often than not, their leaders. School heads must be skilled in assisting their subordinates. In School Based Management, this is referred to as "technical support," in which school heads aid their subordinates in resolving difficulties and concerns related to school.

It is also discovered that school leaders intellectually challenge their employees. This must be done by them since they are not only leading people with emotions, but also people with intellect; and because they are leading teachers, school heads must discover ways to stimulate them intellectually. Teachers, as we all know, are creative and talented not because they have to be, but because the majority of them are. If school heads never exploit their subordinates' creativity and talents, they may get bored or burned out because their superiors, whom they trust and respect, fail to meet their expectations.

According to the findings of this study, most school heads work without considering the expense. School heads face Herculean duties. Their tasks and roles are not restricted to enhancing teachers' performance; they are also concerned with students' performance, upgrading school facilities, budgeting the school fund, community links, and many other things. So, in order to be productive and efficient, they must work hard to complete all of those responsibilities or roles.

They are occasionally called upon by the Schools Division Superintendent or Public School District Supervisors to chair or guide academic and non-academic activities, which adds to their workload. Despite this, they do not keep track of how much labor they do. As good soldiers, they carry out the DepEd mandate without accounting for their efforts.

School heads also have a strong desire to preserve and sustain the culture of the Department of Education as an institution. They, as school heads, are the keepers of the institution's enduring culture.

School Heads Attributes

Table 4,5, and 6 present the leadership attributes of school heads in terms of knowledge, skills and attitude.

Knowledge. Knowledge is a relevant attribute needed by school heads, because they lead academic institutions that creativity, wit and intelligence are highly demanded.

Table 4. Leadership Attributes in Terms of Knowledge

Attributes	School Heads		Teachers	
	X N=30	DE	X N=150	DE
Creative	2.93	WP	1.99	P
Reader	1.97	P	1.89	P
Intelligence	2.80	WP	2.05	P
Weighted Mean	2.57	WP	1.98	P

Legend

- WP - Well-Possessed
- P - Possessed
- LP - Less-Possessed
- X - Weighted Mean
- N -Total frequency
- VD - Verbal description

According to Table 4, school heads believe they have good creativity and intelligence, but they do not believe they are good readers. Teachers, on the other hand, believe that their school heads are creative, readers, and intelligent.

According to the findings, there are significant differences between school heads' and teachers' perceptions of creativity and intellect. However, both school heads and teachers believe that school heads possess the ability to read. When the average mean on the perception of school heads and teachers was compared, the school heads' responses received an average mean of 2.57, which can be described verbally as well-possessed, while teachers' responses received an average mean of 1.98, which can be described verbally as possessed. Despite the fact that perceptions of both respondent groups differ, it can be argued that at least school heads possessed knowledge as school leaders. Intelligence is essential in leadership. Because they have the ability to think critically, intelligent leaders are more likely to be successful in terms of decision making and innovation. Intelligence can be inherited or developed. Reading, education, and experience can all help. In the case of school administrators, their intellect is most certainly derived from several sources, but what is more essential is that they apply their intelligence in moral ways.

Skill. School heads' efficiency in work as well as effectiveness in leading their subordinates can be justified to skills they possessed as school leaders.

Table 5. Leadership Attributes in Terms of Skills

Attributes Skill	School Heads		Teachers	
	X N=30	DE	X N=150	DE
Time – management	2.43	WP	1.86	P
Relationship building	2.93	WP	2.01	P
Sharing vision	3.00	WP	2.16	P
Rewarding	2.93	WP	1.67	P
Fair Decisiveness	2.83	WP	1.75	P
Consistency	2.37	WP	1.99	P
Competence	3.00	WP	2.01	P
Conducts effective meeting	2.63	WP	2.01	P
Speaking skills	2.33	WP	1.91	P
Empowerment	3.00	WP	2.07	P
Ability to inspire others	2.73	WP	1.92	P
Taking responsibility	3.00	WP	2.07	P
Takes risk	3.00	WP	2.09	P
Resourceful	3.00	WP	1.81	P
Organized	2.77	WP	2.19	P
Helps others to succeed	2.97	WP	1.83	P
Coaching people	2.93	WP	1.85	P
Weighted Mean	2.81	WP	1.95	P

Legend

WP - Well-Possessed

P - Possessed

LP - Less-Possessed

X - Weighted Mean

N -Total frequency

VD - Verbal description

As seen in Table 5, school heads believe that they all have the necessary talents to lead their particular schools. Teachers, on the other hand, believe that their school heads possess all of these skills.

The statistics show that there are polar variations in the perceptions of the respondent groups. Looking at the average mean of each group's responses, school heads' responses have an average mean of 2.81, which can be vocally defined as well-possessed, while teachers' responses have an average mean of 1.95, which can be verbally described as possessed.

All of the school heads stated that they were excellent at sharing vision, competence, accepting responsibility, taking risks, and being resourceful. These abilities that they claimed to have are required of school heads. Leaders who share their vision with subordinates motivate subordinates to achieve the leaders' vision, competence is earned through experience, taking responsibility is standing firm for decisions made, taking risk is someone's courage gamble for something that he believes is correct or righteous, and being resourceful is finding ways to address problems. However, instructors' perceptions differ from those of school heads. Teachers felt that school heads only possessed leadership qualities. As a result, it is reasonable to conclude that school heads' self-evaluations of their abilities differ from those of their teachers.

Attitude. Walter Scott said, “For success, attitude is equally important as ability.” Thus in leadership, attitude may be a key factor the success of school leaders.

Table 6. Leadership Attributes in Terms of Attitude

Attributes Attitude	School Heads		Teachers	
	X N=30	DE	X N=150	DE
Self-motivated	2.43	WP	1.79	P
Optimism & Positivity	2.73	WP	1.88	P
Courage	2.90	WP	1.98	P
Humor	2.10	P	2.16	P
Integrity	3.00	WO	1.93	P
Loyal	3.00	WP	2.05	P
Humility	2.90	WP	2.01	P
Honesty and Transparency	3.00	WP	1.59	LP
Listening	2.67	WP	1.87	P
Empathy and Compassion	2.60	WP	2.07	P
Clarity	2.53	WP	2.09	P
Open-minded	2.80	WP	1.80	P
Flexible	2.93	WP	2.15	P
Independent	3.00	WP	2.00	P
Focused	2.57	WP	2.21	P
Seeks out advice	2.97	WP	2.07	P
Confidence	2.87	WP	1.85	P

Accountable	3.00	WP	1.95	P
Character	2.73	WP	2.06	P
Passion	3.00	WP	1.99	P
Respectable	3.00	WP	2.13	P
Charisma	2.17	P	2.01	P
Discipline	2.53	WP	2.31	P
Maturity	2.77	WP	2.11	P
Reasonable	2.30	P	2.11	P
Authenticity	2.63	WP	1.84	P
Respect for others	2.57	WP	2.00	P
Commitment	3.00	WP	2.08	P
Patience	2.70	WP	1.94	P
Weighted Mean	2.74	WP	2.0	P

Legend:

WP - Well-Possessed
P - Possessed
LP - Less-Possessed
X - Weighted Mean
N -Total frequency
VD -Verbal Description

As seen in Table 6, school heads believe they have the necessary mindset, with the exception of being reasonable, which they believe they have. On the one hand, teachers believe that their school heads possess all of the attitudes except honesty and openness, which teachers say are less-possessed by their school heads.

School heads are unified in their belief that the most crucial attitudes that school leaders must have are honesty and transparency, independence, enthusiasm, respectability, and devotion. Being honest and transparent can gain the respect of subordinates; having independence can free school heads from political forces that would try to sway their decision making; having a passion makes the job of being a school head a calling; being respectable is gaining the respect of others without even asking for it; and, being committed to the job is someone's dedication to the job and willingness to take responsibility for his or her actions.

The weighted mean of school heads view is 2.74, which comes under well-possessed, but the average mean of the teacher answers is 2.0, which falls under possessed.

SCHOOL HEADS' FUNCTIONS

Table 7, 8 and 9 presents the functions of school heads' functions in terms of Basic Education, Education Governance and Regulatory and Developmental.

Basic Education. The Basic Education functions are the roles of school heads that primarily deal on efficiency of school heads through planning, punctuality and attendance.

Table 7. Functions of School Heads in Basic Education

Functions	School Heads		Teachers	
	X N=30	DE	X N=150	DE
Prepare and Implement School Improvement Plan (SIP)	3.00	WC	2.01	C
Prepare Annual Improvement Plan (AIP), Annual Procurement Plan (APP), Project Procurement Management Plan (PPMP), and Monthly Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) Budget Request	3.00	WC	1.83	C
Adopt and implement annual plans and budget	3.00	WC	2.04	C
Plan and manage the performance of all personnel	2.77	WC	2.09	C
Achieve zero (0) number of times tardy in a year	2.40	WC	2.24	C
Complete 100% of the required attendance both academic and non – academic activities in a year	3.00	WC	1.91	C

Legend:

WC - Well-Complied
C - Complied
LC - Less-Complied
X - Weighted Mean
N -Total frequency
VD -Verbal Description

Table 7 shows that school heads believe they have performed effectively in their roles as school heads in basic education. Teachers, on the other hand, believe that school heads have completed their particular tasks.

When the weighted mean of the respondent groups was calculated, the school heads' responses received an average mean of 2.86, which may be classified as well-complied. Teachers' responses, on the other hand, had an weighted mean of 2.05, which can be regarded as compliant. The two responses from school heads and teachers show that their perceptions are contradictory.

The polarity of the responses demonstrates that instructors and school heads have opposing opinions about the functions' compliance.

Education Governance. The specific tasks that include the monitoring of classroom environment and mortality rate of students, observation of classes, technical assistance to teachers, proper liquidation of budget, addressing the professional needs of the teachers and implementing Department of Education Order on Child Protection Policy.

The Table tries to identify the school heads' and teachers' perception whether the school heads complied with these functions.

Table 8. Functions of School Heads in Education Governance

Functions Education Governance	School Heads		Teachers	
	X N=30	DE	X N=150	DE
Organize and monitor different programs, activities and projects (PAPs) to attain desired learning outcomes	2.73	WC	1.95	C
Implement and monitor PAPs to achieve performance indicators using goals and targets in the following: Participation, Drop – outs, Cohort Survival and Completion	2.93	WC	1.95	C
Observe classes among the 25% of the total number of teachers in school every quarter.	2.77	WC	1.59	LC
Provide technical assistance to Master Teachers and/ or Department Heads/ Subject Coordinators	2.73	WC	2.14	C
Inspect and evaluate the school physical plant and equipment/ facilities	3.00	WC	2.20	C
Submit a complete school MOOE liquidation report every month	3.00	WC	1.33	LC
Post updated copies of the liquidation report and other financial resources in the transparency board	3.00	WC	2.12	C
Conduct In-Service Training of Teachers (INSET) based on Teachers' Strength and Needs Assessment (TSNA)	2.60	WC	2.29	C
Propose teachers to attend seminars and training	3.00	WC	2.09	C
Prepare and submit appropriate teaching ancillary loads of teachers	3.00	WC	1.35	LC
Use conflict management of school-based personnel	3.00	WC	2.21	C
Efficiently and effectively ensure compliance with the Child Protection Policy of the Department	3.00	WC	1.87	C
Weighted Mean	2.76	WC	1.92	C

Legend

- WC - Well-Complied
- C - Complied
- LC - Less-Complied
- X - Weighted Mean
- N - Total frequency
- VD - Verbal Description

In terms of school heads' roles in education governance, Table 8 shows that school heads believe they have performed effectively in all areas except sending a complete school MOOE liquidation report every month, which they have done. Teachers, on the other hand, believe that school heads complied with all of their functions except for observing classes among 25% of the total number of teachers in school every quarter, submitting a complete school MOOE liquidation report every month, and preparing and submitting appropriate teaching ancillary loads of teachers, which teachers believe are less-complied with. By comparing the average mean of the respondent groups, school heads' perceptions in all of their functions of education governance are well complied, while teachers' perspectives are not well complied.

Regulatory and developmental. Table 9 depicts school heads' and teachers' perceptions of school heads' compliance with Education Governance. Regulatory and developmental functions include seeking school resources, implementing orders, responding to teacher requests, establishing community links, and conducting action research.

Table 9. Functions of School Heads in Regulatory and Developmental

Functions Regulatory and Developmental	School Heads		Teachers	
	X N=30	DE	X N=150	DE
Request additional provision of crucial resources (i.e.a Teachers, b. Water and Sanitation, d. Textbooks, e. Classrooms)	3.00	WC	2.07	C
Implement DepEd Memoranda and Orders	3.00	WC	2.11	C
Assess and endorse teachers' requests with private schools/ institution within the barangay	2.80	WC	1.90	C
Conduct action research based on school needs and provide interventions	2.13	C	1.15	LC
Prepare and implement project proposal for partnership and linkages	3.00	WC	2.23	C
Weighted Mean	2.82	WC	1.99	C

Legend

- WC - Well-Complied
- C - Complied
- LC - Less-Complied
- X - Weighted Mean

N -Total frequency

VD -Verbal Description

As illustrated in Table 9, school heads believe they have performed effectively in all regulatory and developmental functions. Teachers, on the other hand, believe that school administrators fulfilled all regulatory and developmental tasks except doing action research based on school needs and providing interventions. When the average means of the respondent groups were compared, the school heads' perception in their regulatory and developmental functions received weighted mean of 2.82, which can be verbally described as well-complied, while the perception in the given functions received an weighted mean of 1.99, which can be interpreted as complied.

The results in tables 9, 10, and 11 show that the majority of school heads believe they have performed their functions well, with the exception of performing action research based on school needs, which the majority believes they have performed well. Teachers, on the other hand, believe that their school heads fulfilled their duties. Though most school heads believe they have performed their duties successfully, teachers have a quite different opinion. The school heads' conformity to their tasks is a Herculean undertaking because they will have to fulfill various functions. The responsibilities assigned to them are far too numerous to handle.

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RESPONDENT GROUPS' PERCEPTION TO THE ADMINISTRATORS' ATTRIBUTES AND FUNCTIONS

The statistical treatment of data was computed using the Z-Test Calculation to determine the significant difference between school heads' view of their characteristics and functions and teachers' impression of their school heads' attributes and functions.

Attributes. Tables 10, 11, and 12 show the Significant Difference between the respondent groups' perceptions of school heads' qualities in terms of knowledge, abilities, and attitudes.

Table 10. Significant Difference between the Respondent Groups' Perception to the School Heads' Attributes in Terms of Knowledge

Z-Test: Two Sample for Means		
	Sample 1	Sample 2
	School Heads	Teachers
Mean	2.566666667	1.976666667
Known Variance	0.271233	0.006533
Observations	3	3
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Level of Significance	0.05	
Z	1.93897896	
Z Critical two-tail		
Lower Critical Value	-1.959963985	
Upper Critical Value	1.959963985	

As shown in the table, the population 1 sample of school heads has a mean of 2.566666667, whereas the population 2 sample of teachers has a mean of 1.976666667. The Z-Test was used to calculate the significant difference between school heads' perceptions with a threshold of significance of 0.05 using the Two-Tail Test, with a lower critical value of -1.959963985 and an upper critical value of 1.959963985.

The Z-Value of 1.93897896 indicates that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of school leaders and teachers. As a result, the null hypothesis regarding the view of school leaders and teachers toward knowledge-related traits is confirmed. According to the findings, both school heads and teachers consider that the school heads of Fifth Congressional District has knowledge in terms of intelligence, creativity, and being a reader.

Table 11. Significant Difference between the Respondent Groups' Perception to the School Heads' Attributes in Terms of Skills

Z-Test: Two Sample for Means		
	Sample 1	Sample 2
	School Heads	Teachers
Mean	2.814705882	1.952941176
Known Variance	0.055889	0.02096
Observations	17	17
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Level of Significance	0.05	
Z	12.81722634	
Z Critical two-tail		
Lower Critical Value	-1.959963985	
Upper Critical Value	1.959963985	

As shown in the table, the population sample 1 consists of school heads, with a mean of 2.814705882, while the population sample 2 consists of teachers, with a mean of 1.952941176. Using the Z-Test with critical Two-Tail, with a lower critical of -1.959963985 and an upper critical of 1.959963985, with a 0.05 level of significance, the test reveals that the perceptions of school heads and teachers regarding the skill of school heads are significantly different, as indicated by the Z-Value of 12.81722634, which is greater than the upper critical value of 1.959963985. As a result, the null hypothesis of no meaningful difference is rejected. In other words, there is a considerable gap in the perceptions of school leaders and teachers regarding the school leaders' skill attribute.

Table 12. Significant Difference between the Respondent Groups' Perception to the School Heads' Attributes in Terms of Attitudes

Z-Test: Two Sample for Means		
	Sample 1	Sample 2
	School Heads	Teachers
Mean	2.737931034	2.001024483
Known Variance	0.068246	0.021538
Observations	29	29
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Level of Significance	0.05	
Z	13.24359979	
Z Critical two-tail		
Lower Critical Value	-1.959963985	
Upper Critical Value	1.959963985	

Table 12 shows that the sample 1 population is made up of school heads with a weighted mean of 2.737931034 and teachers with a mean of 2.001034483. The Z Critical Two-Tail Value is employed with a 0.05 level of significance and a lower critical value of -1.959963985 and an upper critical value of 1.959963985.

The Z-Test demonstrates, through the Z-Value of 13.24359979, which is significantly higher than the upper critical value of 1.959963985, that there is a considerable difference between school heads' and teachers' perceptions of school heads' qualities in terms of attitude. The null hypothesis is thus rejected. This suggests that there is a considerable difference between the respondent groups' assessments of the school officials' attitude. In summarizing the Z-Test significant difference between school heads' and teachers' perceptions of school heads' attributes, it is discovered that there is no significant difference between the school heads' attributes in terms of knowledge to the perception of the respondent groups. However, there is a large significant difference in the respondent groups' perceptions of skill and attitude, and because of this significant difference, the null hypothesis is rejected for these two broad qualities.

Tables 13, 14, and 15 show the Z-Test calculation of the substantial difference in school heads' and teachers' perceptions of their roles in Basic Education, Education Governance, and Regulatory and Developmental.

Functions. Table 13, 14 and 15 present the Significant Difference between the respondent groups' perception to the school heads' functions in Basic Education, Education Governance and Regulatory and Developmental.

Table 13 Significant Difference between the Respondent Groups' Perception to the Compliance of School Heads' Functions in Basic Education

Z-Test: Two Sample for Means		
	Sample 1	Sample 2
	School Heads	Teachers
Mean	2.862857143	2.045714289
Known Variance	0.04969	0.021629
Observations	7	7
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Level of Significance	0.05	
Z	8.095513218	
Z Critical two-tail		
Lower Critical Value	-1.959963985	
Upper Critical Value	1.959963985	

The table shows that the sample 1 population are the school heads with the mean of 2.862857143 while the sample 2 population are the teachers with the mean of 2.045714286. The Z-Critical two tail value with the lower critical value of -1.959963985 and upper critical value of 1.959963985 with 0.05 level of significance was used.

The test reveals that since the Z-Value of 8.095513218 is greater than the upper critical value of 1.959963985, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference between the respondent groups' perception with regard to the compliance of the school administrators to their functions in Basic Education.

Table 14 . Significant Difference between the Respondent Groups' Perception to the Compliance of School Heads' Functions in Education Governance

Z-Test: Two Sample for Means		
	Sample 1	Sample 2
	School Administrators	Teachers
Mean	2.7575	1.924166667
Known Variance	0.222439	0.1099336
Observations	12	12
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Level of Significance	0.05	
Z	5.01172864	
Z Critical two-tail		
Lower Critical Value	-1.959963985	
Upper Critical Value	1.959963985	

The sample 1 population is school heads, with a mean of 2.7575, while the sample 2 population is teachers, with a mean of 1.924166667. With a 0.05 level of significance, the Z- Critical Two-Tail value is used with a lower critical value of -1.959963985 and an upper critical value of 1.959963985.

The Z-Test demonstrates that there is a considerable difference between the respondent groups' perceptions of the functions of school heads in education governance, as indicated by the Z-Value of 5.01172864, which is greater than the upper critical value of 1.959963985. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. The research hypothesis is affirmed that there is a significant difference between the school heads and teachers' perception to school administrators' functions in Education

Table 15. Significant Difference between the Respondent Groups' Perception to the Compliance of School Heads' Functions in Regulatory and Developmental

Z-Test: Two Sample for Means		
	Sample 1	Sample 2
	School Administrators	Teachers
Mean	2.821666667	1.991666667
Known Variance	0.1212217	0.208417
Observations	6	6
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Level of Significance	0.05	
Z	3.54107089	
Z Critical two-tail		
Lower Critical Value	1.959963985	
Upper Critical Value	1.959963985	

According to the table, the weighted mean of the sample 1 population is 2.821666667, whereas the weighted mean of the sample 2 population is 1.991666667. The Z-Critical Two-Tail Value is employed with a 0.05 level of significance and a lower critical value of -1.959963985 and an upper critical value of 1.959963985.

The test demonstrates that because the Z-Value of 3.54107089 is greater than the upper critical value of 1.959963985, there is a significant difference between the respondent groups' perceptions of school administrators' compliance in Regulatory and Developmental functions. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS ENCOUNTERED BY SCHOOL HEADS

School heads encounter a variety of difficulties and concerns. These issues and concerns may stem from individuals, instructional materials, the school budget, or buildings. The table summarizes the challenges and concerns raised by school officials.

Table 16. Issues and Concerns

Issues and Concerns	F	%
Teachers' punctuality and attendance during meetings.	30	100
Teachers' lack of support in school activities	30	100
Teachers' lack of skills in technology.	30	100
Teachers who do not come to class to teach.	30	100
Teachers who escape or who go out to school during office or class	30	100
Teachers' efficiency in submitting reports and forms	30	100
Teachers' attitude towards work.	30	100
Teachers' lack of resourcefulness in addressing the needs of the learners	30	100
Teachers' methodologies in teaching.	30	100
Lack of school facilities such as classrooms, comfort rooms, computer and science laboratory, chairs, blackboards, etc.	27	100
Lack of Instructional Materials (e.g. books, curriculum guides, modules, etc.)	30	100
Maintaining cleanliness and orderliness in school	30	100
Behavioral problems of students (e.g. bullying, teasing, stealing, absenteeism, cutting classes, etc.)	30	100
Students' lack of support from parents	30	100
Budgeting and liquidating the Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE)	30	100
Heavy load of paper works	30	100
Lack of monitoring from the Division office regarding my performance as a school administrator.	30	100
Interruption of work due to the meetings, seminars and other directives from the Division Office	30	100

In Table 16, which assesses the common problems encountered by school heads, all (30 or 100.00 percent) of the school heads believe they have problems with teachers' punctuality and attendance during meetings, teachers' lack of support in school activities, teachers' lack of technological skills, teachers who do not come to class to teach, teachers' efficiency in submitting reports and forms, teachers' attitude toward work. On the one hand, 27 or 90.00 percent of school heads believe that the lack of school facilities such as classrooms, comfort rooms, computer and science laboratories, chairs, blackboards, and so on, as well as the lack of monitoring from the Division office regarding my performance as a school head, is a problem.

The school heads face a variety of issues based on the facts supplied. Teachers, a lack of school facilities, a lack of instructional materials, student behavior, parental support, the MOOE's budgeting and liquidating, a heavy load of paper work, a lack of monitoring from the Division Office, and interruption of work due to meetings, seminars, and other Division Office directives are the sources of those problems. Regarding school heads' problems with their teachers, Hoy and Hoy (2003), as referenced by Nelson et al. (2007), claimed that one of the primary duties of every school head is to change and motivate teachers' efforts. As a result, if certain teachers fail to show up for meetings on time, do not support school activities, or have a negative attitude about work, school heads must find ways to push teachers to be accountable and participating. Teachers are already a part of, if not the driving force behind, all activities in this way. Furthermore, teachers who do not come to class to teach, teachers who do not go to their respective

classes, teachers' efficiency in submitting reports, teachers' lack of resourcefulness in addressing the needs of the learners, and their teaching methodologies are all problems for school heads. With these issues, school heads must accept responsibility for the success or failure of their schools because they are in charge of them. As leaders, they must encourage subordinates, promote and recognize excellent teachers, and ensure that instructors are steered toward the Department of Education's goal, vision, and core values. According to Fullan (2001), "practicing teachers eagerly lend their support to school heads who assume instructional leadership positions." This indicates that when school managers direct their teachers to improve instruction, the teachers or their subordinates are more likely to comply.

Furthermore, the majority of them believe that a lack of school infrastructure, instructional resources, and preserving school cleanliness and order are issues. They are required to handle these issues. According to R.A. 9155, these issues are part of their responsibility. According to the law, school heads must construct the school education program and school improvement plan, create a climate favorable to teaching and learning inside the school, improve and expand school facilities, and offer instructional materials and equipment. With these responsibilities, it is expected that school heads will have ongoing worries about the stated problem; all they need to do is find means to address those concerns on a regular basis. They may receive donations, gifts, bequests, and grants to upgrade their facilities and provide educational materials. The Department of Education, as the organization in charge of the entire public basic education system, is likewise looking for solutions to such issues.

In terms of behavioral issues, these are widespread because, according to learning psychology, students and pupils are various, and because they are diverse, they have different beliefs and attitudes that teachers and school heads must deal with. If teachers have the authority to discipline students who violate school rules and policies, then school heads have the authority to discipline students or pupils who violate school rules and policies through a rigorous process. For example, for first and other minor crimes, a suspension from school of no more than three (3) days may be approved by the principal without the Division Superintendent's agreement. However, parents must be informed by the teacher or the school principal of any wrongdoing by their children that necessitates disciplinary action (Paragraph 1.1.2, Section 1, Chapter III, Part IV of the DECS Manual). This is only one example of how a school administrator can punish delinquent kids. With a suggestion from the instructor or guidance coordinator/counselor, school administrators may reprimand or urge students to transfer.

Another problem that school heads encounter is the lack of support from parents. They play the vital role in rearing the future leaders of our country but sometimes that vital role is ignored by them. Since the school heads run the educational institution, part of their concern is to be in cooperation with parents, but sometimes parents do not cooperate. Even the researcher, as classroom teacher experiences the same. Some parents during Homeroom Meetings do not attend and also in General Parents-Teachers Assembly. Some parents also do not or never monitor their children in school. These concerns are also concerns of school heads. As leaders of schools, the problems of the teachers are their problems, and part of the problems is the lack of support from parents.

Other issues they confront include budgeting and liquidating Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) and a significant workload of paper work. Every school receives the MOOE on a monthly basis, but before they receive the next month's MOOE, they must first liquidate the previous month's MOOE. However, liquidating and budgeting MOOE can be difficult because school administrators are the only people who have control over the money, and the money cannot be spent in any way because the expected expenses in each school year are already reflected in the Annual Procurement Plan (AIP), and there are rules and regulations on how such budget is spent per school. This is a concern for all administrators because they already have a lot of responsibilities, and liquidating and budgeting MOOE adds to their workload. They may delegate the purchase, canvass, and liquidation to their teachers or employees, but the duty and liabilities for the MOOE remain with them. As a result, MOOE is an additional hardship for them in addition to the heavy weight of paper work.

Summary

It was shown that the majority of school heads are between the ages of 41 and 50. In terms of sex, the bulk of them are female, accounting for 73.33 percent of all respondents. According to the research, the majority of school heads have at least 11 years of experience. According to the age of the teacher responses, the majority of teachers at both the primary and secondary levels are between the ages of 20 and 40. The bulk of their gender was female. According to the data, the ratio of male to female teachers was about one to four. In terms of experience, 72.66 percent or 109 of total teacher responses had ten (10) years or less.

Through an analysis of the weighted mean of the school heads' responses, it was discovered that school heads well-manifested practically all behavioral, transformational, and transactional leadership styles. According to them, transactional leadership manifests only one approach: issuing explicit instructions and always wanting things done right away.

Furthermore, when it comes to the traits of school heads, on average, consider that they possess the attributes under knowledge. Teachers, on the other hand, believe that their school administrators are knowledgeable, based on an average mean of 1.98. In terms of skill as an attribute, school administrators regarded themselves to be well-equipped, with an average mean of 2.81. On the one hand, teachers believe that their school administrators possess the traits listed under skill, based on an average mean of 1.95. Furthermore, it was discovered that school administrators, with an average mean of 2.74, believe that they have a positive attitude, whereas teachers, with an average mean of 2.0, believe that school administrators have a positive attitude.

On the functions of school heads in basic education, education governance, and regulatory and developmental, school heads stated that they performed well in their basic education functions; however, teachers believe their school heads performed well in their basic education functions. Furthermore, in education governance, school heads believe they have well-complied with their functions, whilst teachers say they have not. Finally, in regulatory and developmental functions, school heads believe they have performed well, whereas teachers believe their school heads have performed well.

The null hypothesis is verified in the test of significant difference using Z-Test with upper critical value of 1.95963985 and lower critical value of -1.95963985 with 0.05 level of significant difference in knowledge as attribute of school heads. In other words, both school heads and teachers believed that school heads possessed the expertise required to be effective school leaders. The null hypothesis is rejected for the qualities of skill and attitude.

As a result, there is a considerable difference in the respondent groups' perceptions of school heads' ownership of those traits.

The significant difference was tested using the Z-Test with an upper critical value of 1.95963985 and a lower critical value of -1.95963985 at the 0.05 level of significant difference on to the respondent groups' perceptions of the functions of school heads in basic education, education governance, and regulatory and developmental, and it was discovered that there is a significant difference

between the school heads perception and the teachers perception. As a result, the null is refused. It suggests that there is a considerable disparity in perceptions of school heads and teachers regarding the function of school heads.

It is discovered that school heads have issues with teachers' punctuality and attendance during meetings, teachers' lack of support in school activities, teachers' lack of technological skills, teachers who do not come to class to teach, teachers' efficiency in submitting reports and forms, teachers' attitude toward work, and teachers' lack of resourcefulness in addressing the needs of the learner. On the one hand, 27 or 90.00 percent of school heads believed that their problems stemmed from a lack of school facilities such as classrooms, comfort rooms, computer and science laboratories, chairs, blackboards, and so on, as well as a lack of monitoring from the Division office regarding my performance as a school head.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that before becoming a school head, a person must have at least 11 years of experience. However, years of experience does not preclude someone from aspiring to be a school head, as some school heads have less than 11 years of experience. Furthermore, the majority of school heads are female, as the female gender is the dominant gender in the teaching profession. It was discovered that school administrators do not use a unique leadership style, but rather use behavioral, transformational, and transactional leadership styles. In terms of functions, school administrators believe they have performed effectively in fundamental education, education governance, and developmental and regulatory functions. On the contrary, teachers believe that their school administrators simply performed such functions. The null hypothesis regarding school administrators' attribute in terms of knowledge is confirmed using the Z-Test to detect the significant difference. However, there is a considerable difference between the respondent groups' perceptions of school administrator traits in terms of skill and attitude, therefore the choice to reject the null hypothesis to that extent was made. Furthermore, there is a considerable difference between respondent groups' opinions of conformance to the functions of school administrators in basic education, education governance, and developmental and regulatory, and thus the hypothesis must be rejected.

In addition to the conclusion, school administrators encounter a variety of issues relating to instructors, students, school facilities, instructional materials, parents, and superiors, all of which have an impact on their tasks or positions as school leaders.

In a nutshell, school administrators must have sufficient expertise to effectively and efficiently run their individual schools. They also use different leadership styles; they have different characteristics; they have different functions or roles; and they encounter various issues and concerns that may affect their performance as leaders, but what is most important is that they survive all of the challenges that they may face as leaders of the Department of Education's schools.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made for related studies on leadership styles, traits, functions, and challenges and concerns experienced by school heads.

1. Potential school heads must receive proper training on the functions or roles of school heads before accepting the position of school head.
2. The Division and Central Office must find ways to minimize, if not narrow, the functions of school heads as instructional leaders and school managers.
3. Teachers must be aware of the functions of school heads in order to fully comprehend and respect the work and accomplishments of their leaders.
4. The Department of Education must place a greater emphasis on school leadership empowerment because it is the foundation of more productive schools.
5. Because this study focuses on the characteristics of school heads, the Department of Education must specify the characteristics that it finds in its school heads.

REFERENCES

1. Adair, John (2004). Adair on Creativity and Innovation. London: Thorogood Publishing Ltd.
2. Bauzon, Prisciliano (2012). Handbook in Legal Bases of Education. Mandaluyong, Philippines: National Bookstore.
3. Bilbao, Purita P., et al. (2015). The Teaching Profession. Quezon City, Philippines: LORIMAR PUBLISHING, INC.
4. Burns, James Macgregor (1978). Leadership. New York USA: Harper and Row, Publishers.
5. Corpuz, Brenda B. and Salandanan, Gloria G. (2013) Principles of Teaching 1. Quezon City, Philippines: LORIMAR PUBLISHING, INC.
6. Nelson, Jack, et al. (2007). Critical Issues in Education- Dialogues and Dialectics. New York USA: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
7. Sizer, Theodore (1992). Horace's Compromise- the Dilemma of the American High School. United States of America: Theodore Sizer.
8. Republic Act 9155 also known as Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001.
9. Barrette, Catherine and Breyer, Robert (2014). The Influence of Effective
10. Leadership on Teaching and Learning. Accessed from <http://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=jri>
11. Cherry, Kendra (2016). The Great Man Theory of Leadership. Accessed from <https://www.verywell.com/the-great-man-theory-of-leadership-2795311>
12. Cherry, Kendra (2016). The Major Leadership Theories. Accessed from <https://www.verywell.com/leadership-theories-2795323>
13. Krasnoff, Basha (2015). Leadership Qualities of Effective Principal. Accessed from <http://nwcc.educationnorthwest.org/files/nwrcc/research-brief-leadership-qualities-effective-principals.pdf>

14. Lai, Andrea (2011). Transformational-Transactional Leadership Theory. Accessed from http://digitalcommons.olin.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1013&context=ahs_capstone_2011
15. Odumeru, James A. (2013). Transformational Vs. Transactional Leadership Theories: Evidence in Literature. Accessed from
16. <https://www.irmbrjournal.com/papers/1371451049.pdf>

