FULL RANGE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AMONG PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Rhona Marie G. Remojo[1], Agripina F. Banayo, EdD[2]

[a]17-ss-em-142@lspu.edu.ph

Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City, Laguna 4000 Philippines[1,2]

Abstract

This research investigates the connection between the leadership styles of school leaders, based on the Full Range Leadership Model (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire), and their effect on the professional growth of public elementary school teachers in the Sariaya West District. Employing a descriptive-correlational methodology, the study analyzes how different leadership styles affect five essential elements of professional development: content focus, active learning, coherence, sustained duration, and collective participation, as outlined by Desimone and Garet (2001). The findings indicate that transformational leadership is the most common, fostering motivation, creativity, and tailored support for educators. Transactional leadership focuses on organized management and rewards, promoting responsibility and outcome-oriented behavior. Laissez-faire leadership shows moderate effectiveness by providing freedom while necessitating occasional support. The research reveals strong positive relationships between different leadership styles and aspects of professional development, with a well-rounded application of Full Range Leadership being the most effective. The results emphasize the need for flexible and cohesive leadership approaches to improve educators' professional growth and involvement. The implications and suggestions highlight the significance of aligning professional development efforts with leadership methods to enhance educational results.

Keywords: Full Range Leadership Model, Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, professional development

1. Introduction

Educational leaders are critical to the school's success. They serve as the pillar on which the learning community is built and developed. Administrators must demonstrate traits and attitudes that will enable them to be effective leaders in their school organization in a rapidly changing work environment. Education is critical in providing an individual with the knowledge and skills needed to become a productive member of society. Effective school administrators are expected to have academic goals and supervise instructional and co-curricular practices accordingly (Silva, 2016).

A leader's method of giving direction, carrying out plans, and inspiring people is called their leadership style. Any organization's growth depends greatly on its leaders and their leadership abilities. The process of influencing people's behavior so they work voluntarily and enthusiastically to achieve group goals is called leadership. A leader must be able to inspire their followers or subordinates to work toward the organization's goals while maintaining positive interpersonal relationships with them (Bush & Glover, 2014).

This definition seems to fit properly to the modern concept of leadership, which gives the leader, the followers, and the context a very important role in the leadership process. It has been demonstrated that leadership is an evolving concept, but it could be satisfactorily defined as "the process of interactive influence that occurs when, in a given context, some people accept someone as their leader to achieve common goals" (Silva, 2016)

Riggio and Bass (2006) stated that a leader's role is crucial in winning their subordinates' trust and fostering their dedication to the successful completion of the project at hand. They provide the following explanation of leadership influence. First and foremost, the leaders need to be charismatic and have idealized influence. Second, leaders must be able to motivate and inspire their followers. This is primarily their responsibility as role models.

According to Abu-Tineh et al. 2008), elementary school teachers viewed their principals as transformational more often than male teachers and high school teachers did. The three groups of teachers with varying levels of experience did not significantly differ in how they perceived the various aspects of Kouzes and Posner's model.

On the other hand, Desimone & Garet (2015) claimed that leaders are crucial in ensuring that teachers have enough time to participate in professional development and put what they have learned into practice (PD). They may also contribute to the inclusion of PD activities in teacher evaluations. Teachers' capacity, readiness, and motivation to adopt the ideas, activities, and curricula promoted in PD are significantly influenced by the support and enthusiasm of district and school leaders for professional development. To facilitate individual, school-wide, and district-wide

improvements for the purpose of raising student achievement, professional development (PD) aims to enhance knowledge and skills.

Postholm (2012) defined teacher professional development as teachers' learning, including how they learn new things and how they put what they've learned into practice to help students learn. According to Bayar (2014), a successful professional development activity should have the following elements: 1) a match to current teacher needs, 2) a match to current school needs, 3) teacher involvement in the design/planning of professional development activities, 4) active participation opportunities, 5) long-term engagement, and 6) high-quality instructors.

Cordingley, et.al (2015) claimed that effective leaders actively participated in their own education rather than leaving it to their teachers. Leaders are involved in every facet of professional learning and development both inside and outside of the school, in addition to overseeing the development of their teachers.

Northouse (2015) stated that in full range leadership idea, capable leaders may adapt their approach to meet the needs of their organization and the conditions at hand. To motivate and empower their team to achieve long-term goals and objectives, they may employ transformational behaviors in addition to transactional behaviors to maintain stability and efficiency in day-to-day activities.

Parallel to this, according to Darling-Hammond et al., (2017) professional development gives teachers the tools, resources, and expertise they need to successfully fulfill the varied demands of their pupils. It is the lifeblood of educational establishments. Adopting a comprehensive strategy for professional development can enable educational institutions to enable educators to continuously enhance their craft, adopt novel teaching methodologies, and adjust to new problems and prospects.

The combination of Full Range School Leadership and professional development is the foundation of effective educational leadership, guiding schools on a path of continual improvement and innovation. Schools may develop a culture of cooperation, inquiry, and reflective practice, resulting in a community of lifelong learners dedicated to maximizing student achievement and promoting positive social change (Leithwood and Sun 2015).

In the Philippines, results from the study of Chin, et.al (2022), the need for teachers to implement active learning and cutting-edge teaching strategies, as well as their prior professional development experiences, heavily influence the pedagogical and information technology skills they must possess. According to qualitative analyses of their study, teachers' professional development needs are primarily focused on developing their research, information literacy, and online teaching skills. Data also showed that obstacles to professional development were primarily brought on by time and money constraints, as well as a shortage of teacher motivation and logistical support. In conclusion, adequate logistical support and ongoing professional development for teachers are required for remote education to be financially viable.

The researcher would like to explore more on how the Full-Range Leadership style of the school heads affects the professional growth of their teachers.

Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to address this gap by investigating how the leadership styles of school heads impact the professional development of teachers in terms of its core elements, such as content focus, active learning, coherence, duration, and collective participation. Specifically, this study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What is the leadership style practices of the school heads in terms of:
    1.1.   Transformational leadership
        1.1.1. inspirational motivation;
        1.1.2. idealized influence;
        1.1.3. intellectual simulation;
        1.1.4. individualized consideration;
    1.2.   Transactional leadership
        1.2.1. Management by Exception;
        1.2.2. contingent reward;
    1.3.   Laissez-faire leadership
        1.3.1. hands-off approach;
2. What is the perceived level of Professional Development in terms of:
    2.1.   content-focus;
    2.2.   active learning;
    2.3.   coherence;
    2.4.   sustained duration; and
    2.5.   collective participant;

3. Is there a significant relationship between the leadership styles of school heads and the implementation of professional development elements (content focus, active learning, coherence, duration, and collective participation) in public elementary schools?

2. Methodology

This chapter presents the research methodology employed to achieve the study's objectives, covering the research design, respondent demographics and sampling process, data collection instruments, validation procedures, data gathering strategies, and statistical treatment. The study adopts a descriptive-correlational research design to systematically examine relationships between variables without manipulation, providing insights into the leadership styles of school heads and their correlation with teachers' professional development. The descriptive aspect characterizes leadership styles and professional growth practices, while the correlational component assesses their associations. Guided by McCombes (2020), the study aims to capture an accurate depiction of the phenomenon and measure associations between variables. The respondents include 150 public elementary school teachers from six major schools in the Sariaya West District, Division of Quezon: Bignay I Elementary School, Concepcion Ibaba Elementary School, Gov. Natalio & Susana Enriquez Elementary School, Lutucan Central School, Manggalang I Elementary School, and Sto. Cristo Elementary School. These schools were selected for their size and diversity in leadership styles. A total of 194 teachers were initially surveyed, but 44 responses were excluded due to incompleteness, leaving 150 valid responses. Random sampling was applied to ensure equal representation and minimize bias. The demographic profile includes age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, plantilla position, and years of service. The study employs a structured survey instrument consisting of three main sections: a demographic questionnaire capturing essential respondent details, a validated leadership styles questionnaire assessing leadership behaviors as transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire, and a professional development survey designed based on Desimone and Garet's (2001) framework, emphasizing content focus, active learning, coherence, collective participation, and sustained duration. The questionnaire comprises 90 statements rated on a four-point scale, ensuring comprehensive assessment. To validate the instrument, the researcher followed a multi-step process, including defining objectives, reviewing literature, adapting existing tools, constructing the instrument, and incorporating feedback from the research adviser and panel experts. Data collection followed a structured process, beginning with obtaining formal approval from the superintendent's office, district supervisor, and school heads. Upon approval, the survey was disseminated online via Google Forms, with respondents provided clear instructions and an informed consent form detailing confidentiality assurances. The survey was administered over 4–6 weeks, with periodic reminders to enhance response rates. Responses were closely monitored, and upon completion, the questionnaire link was deactivated to prevent further submissions. Once responses were gathered, the data underwent validation checks, including random verification of 10% of entries for consistency. The data was then processed using statistical software such as SPSS and Excel, ensuring accurate documentation and analysis. Statistical tools applied include frequency distribution for descriptive profiling, standard deviation for variance measurement, and Pearson's Correlation Coefficient to assess the relationship between leadership styles and professional development elements. These analyses facilitate a deeper understanding of leadership approaches and their impact on teachers' growth. Ethical considerations were strictly adhered to, with respondents informed of their rights and consent obtained before participation.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 3. Level of Transformational Leadership as to Inspirational Motivation

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
My School Head Inspires me to . . .			*Always*
1. strive for excellence in my work.	3.79	.411	
2. think beyond the picture of my daily tasks	3.73	.459	*Always*
3. articulates a clear and inspiring vision for the school	3.71	.468	*Always*
4. me to learn and grow professionally	3.75	.433	*Always*
5. show genuine concern for my well-being and development	3.82	.385	*Always*
Overall	**3.76**	**.368**	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The data highlights teachers' consistent and positive perceptions regarding their school heads' inspirational leadership. The low standard deviations, ranging from .385 to .468 suggest uniform agreement among respondents, reflecting a shared experience of strong leadership practices.

The highest-rated indicator, "Shows genuine concern for well-being," mean: 3.82, underscores the importance of interpersonal care in effective leadership. Meanwhile, "Articulates a clear and inspiring vision" mean:

3.71 scored slightly lower, indicating an area for potential improvement in strategic communication. The overall mean score of 3.76, interpreted as "Always," aligns with transformational leadership principles emphasizing motivation, vision-setting, and individualized support.

These findings align with Bass and Riggio's (2006) emphasis on inspirational motivation as a key element of transformational leadership, as well as Kouzes and Posner's (2017) perspective on unified vision and professional development, and Avolio et al.'s (2004) recognition of authentic care.

The high rating for genuine concern for well-being highlights the importance of emotional support in enhancing teacher engagement and job satisfaction, suggesting that leadership programs should integrate emotional intelligence, relationship-building, and mentorship. Meanwhile, the slightly lower score for vision articulation points to the need for improved communication of long-term goals through structured leadership dialogues, collaborative vision exercises, and effective training. Consistently high ratings of leadership effectiveness indicate that transformational leadership is systematically embedded in the institution, reinforcing the value of formalized mentorship programs to sustain motivation and strategic guidance among educators.

Table 4. Level of Transformational Leadership as to Idealized Influence

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
My School Head . . .			*Always*
1. serves as a role model for ethical conduct and high standards.	3.72	.451	
2. demonstrates high levels of integrity and honesty	3.75	.451	*Always*
3. puts the needs of the organization and employees before personal interests.	3.77	.424	*Always*
4. demonstrates "walk the talk" discipline	3.72	.465	*Always*
5. renders extra effort beyond exigency of the work for the welfare of the organization	3.73	.447	*Always*
Overall	**3.74**	**.380**	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The results underscore the importance of Idealized Influence within transformational leadership, illustrating how ethical conduct, integrity, and selflessness help build trust and unity within organizations. The consistent ratings from respondents, evidenced by low standard deviations, indicate a strong consensus regarding the school leader prioritizing the greater good over personal interests. The top-rated indicator, "Prioritizes organizational and employee needs" Mean: 3.77, emphasizes the critical role of selflessness in effective leadership, supporting Northouse's (2019) argument that leaders who adhere to ethical principles foster loyalty and commitment. The overall mean score of 3.74 ("Always") is consistent with Bass and Riggio's (2006) view on transformational leadership, highlighting that leaders who exemplify integrity and dedication nurture admiration and trust within their teams.

Similarly, Kouzes and Posner (2017) assert that exceptional leadership behaviors enhance influence, while Avolio and Yammarino (2013) emphasize the significance of Idealized Influence in promoting collective welfare. These insights suggest that educational institutions should incorporate leadership training initiatives centered on ethical decision-making, responsibility, and servant leadership to strengthen these leadership traits. Additionally, the slightly lower scores in articulating vision signal a need for better strategic communication, reinforcing the significance of structured leadership conversations, mentorship programs, and ethical leadership workshops to bolster institutional trust and alignment. Enhancing leadership development in these domains will ensure that school leaders continue to foster an environment of integrity, loyalty, and shared success.

Table 5. Level of Transformational Leadership as to Intellectual Simulation.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
My school head encourages me to . . .			*Always*
1. learn and grow professionally	3.78	.431	
2. find innovative and creative solutions to problems	3.75	.433	*Always*
3. diverse perspectives when making decisions	3.74	.440	*Always*
4. develop new skills and continuously improve	3.77	.440	*Always*
5. reflect on my strengths and weaknesses for professional development	3.75	.448	*Always*
Overall	**3.76**	**.384**	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The findings indicate a strong presence of transformational leadership within the aspect of Intellectual Stimulation, as perceived by the participants. The school leader consistently promotes professional development, fosters creative problem-solving, values various viewpoints in decision-making, encourages ongoing skill

enhancement, and engages in self-reflection for personal growth. The data reveals teachers' strong and consistent perceptions of their school heads' ethical and professional conduct, with all indicators interpreted as "Always." The highest-rated indicator, "Prioritizes organizational and employee needs," mean: 3.77, SD: .424, emphasizes selflessness and commitment to collective welfare. The overall mean score of 3.76 reflects alignment with transformational leadership traits, such as integrity, dedication, and ethical standards.

These results are consistent with Bass and Riggio's (2006) focus on intellectual stimulation as a fundamental element of transformational leadership, which promotes creativity and critical thinking. Avolio and Yammarino (2013) further emphasize the significance of transformational leaders in promoting innovation and learning. Jung et al. (2003) highlight the link between intellectual stimulation and innovative practices.

Transformational leadership encourages an environment of ongoing learning and innovation, where Intellectual Stimulation is key in promoting professional development and effective problem-solving. Leadership development initiatives need to strike a balance between ethical leadership and strategic vision, allowing school leaders to maintain a setting that fosters creativity, teamwork, and intellectual involvement to achieve institutional success.

Table 6. Level of Transformational Leadership as to Individualized Consideration.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
My school head . . .			*Always*
1. provides personalized coaching and mentorship	3.70	.460	
2. considers an individual having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others	3.76	.429	*Always*
3. treats each member of the staff fairly and equitably	3.77	.436	*Always*
4. provides opportunities that match my skills and interests	3.77	.424	*Always*
5. fosters an inclusive environment where I feel valued	3.77	.455	*Always*
Overall	**3.75**	**.383**	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The table above illustrates educators' views on the capability of school leaders to offer individualized support, a vital element of transformational leadership. All factors, such as personalized coaching, fair treatment, and promoting inclusiveness, receive consistent ratings of "Always," with average scores between 3.70 and 3.77.

The overall average score of 3.75 further emphasizes teachers' strong consensus regarding the transformative impact of their school leaders. These findings are consistent with Bass and Avolio's (1994) Full Range Leadership Theory, which highlights that individualized support creates a nurturing and inclusive atmosphere. Leaders who adapt their guidance and opportunities to meet individual needs can greatly improve motivation, collaboration, and professional development. The school leader consistently offers tailored coaching and mentoring, acknowledges individual differences, treats staff equitably, presents opportunities that align with employees' skills and interests, and promotes an inclusive atmosphere where all members feel appreciated.

Bass and Riggio (2006) identify individualized consideration as a fundamental component of transformational leadership, emphasizing mentoring and addressing unique needs. Avolio and Yammarino (2013) highlight the importance of customized support and growth opportunities, while Kouzes and Posner (2017) stress the significance of inclusive environments and employee involvement. This suggests a strong perception of support, fairness, and alignment with individual needs among the staff. The findings imply a positive impact on teacher motivation and performance, fostering professional growth and enhancing organizational commitment. By reinforcing transformational leadership principles, particularly individualized consideration, the study highlights the critical role of school leadership in improving teaching practices and student outcomes. This supports the argument that personalized mentorship and professional development opportunities contribute to systemic improvements in education.

Table 7. Summary of Table on Transformational Leadership

Subscales	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Inspirational Motivation	3.76	.368	*Highly Practiced*
Idealized Influence	3.74	.380	*Highly Practiced*
Intellectual Simulation	3.76	.384	*Highly Practiced*
Individualized Consideration	3.75	.383	*Highly Practiced*
Overall	**3.75**	**.342**	**Highly Practiced**

Legend:
- Highly Practiced (3.50 - 4.00) – The principle is consistently demonstrated with strong application, reflecting mastery and effective integration in various contexts.

- Moderately Practiced (2.50 - 3.49) – The principle is frequently applied with reliability but may show variability in certain situations. Improvement in consistency can enhance effectiveness.
- Minimally Practiced (1.50 - 2.49) – The principle is occasionally demonstrated but lacks strong consistency or impact. Further development is needed to strengthen the application.
- Rarely Practiced (1.00 - 1.49) – The principle is seldom exhibited, indicating significant areas for improvement and refinement in understanding and execution.

The results presented in Table 7 reveal that transformational leadership is extensively embraced across all evaluated subscales, with an average score of 3.75. This indicates that leaders in the examined environment effectively apply core principles of transformational leadership, such as Inspirational Motivation, Idealized Influence, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration.

The highest average scores for Inspirational Motivation 3.76 and Intellectual Stimulation 3.76 imply that leaders are instrumental in inspiring individuals towards a common vision and promoting critical thinking and innovation among their followers. These results support Bass and Riggio's (2006) claim that transformational leadership contributes to organizational success by fostering creativity and engagement.

Furthermore, Individualized Consideration 3.75 reflects a strong dedication to mentoring and providing tailored support. Muthusi et al. (2024) examined the influence of personalized attention on the performance of organizations in private universities located in Nairobi, Kenya. Their research identified a significant positive correlation between leadership assistance, mentorship, and employee performance, supporting Burns' (1978) views on transformational leadership.

While Idealized Influence 3.74 falls within the category of highly practiced behaviors, its relatively lower average indicates some variability in ethical leadership and the building of credibility. This suggests that leaders might gain from enhancing trust and modeling behaviors, as transformational leadership is most effective when leaders display moral integrity and authenticity (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Efforts to address this area could include leadership development initiatives focused on fostering transparent communication and making ethical decisions.

These findings underscore the essential function of transformational leadership in boosting motivation, trust, and intellectual engagement. The strong consistency across subscales reinforces that this leadership approach plays a significant role in generating positive outcomes in both organizational and educational contexts. In academic environments, transformational leadership cultivates collaborative learning spaces and supports professional growth, aligning with Leithwood and Jantzi's (2005) observations that transformational leadership enhances teacher motivation and student involvement. To further enhance leadership effectiveness, organizations and educational institutions should prioritize strengthening ethical influence and refining mentoring practices, thereby ensuring a lasting impact on leadership and educational methodologies.

Table 8. Level of Transactional Leadership as to Management by Exception.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
My school head . . .			
1. closely monitors staff performance to ensure compliance with policies.	3.69	.504	*Always*
2. gives technical assistance to school management and operations	3.73	.487	*Always*
3. intervenes promptly when issues arise relative to teaching or in school operations.	3.76	.444	*Always*
4. takes delayed action to any problems arising in the organization	3.53	.711	*Always*
5. avoids involvement unless there is a major issue	3.57	.617	*Always*
Overall	3.66	.427	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The data in Table 8 emphasize that school leaders predominantly utilize Transactional Leadership, particularly through Management by Exception, which is marked by vigilant monitoring, technical support, and prompt intervention. The elevated mean scores for supervision and corrective measures indicate a leadership style attentive to sustaining efficiency and compliance, thereby providing systematic support for staff performance. Nonetheless, the noted instances of selective engagement and occasional slow responses point to a management approach that is more reactive than proactive. These leadership behaviors correspond with descriptions by Avolio and Bass (2023), who define Management by Exception as a framework that intervenes solely in response to problems rather than promoting ongoing involvement.

Likewise, Dong (2023) posits that transactional leadership is beneficial for ensuring organizational stability but can hinder innovation and long-term growth, while Aniebonam (2023) emphasizes the importance of structured intervention in upholding order and accountability. Transactional Leadership guarantees swift responsiveness, incorporating transformational aspects, such as intellectual stimulation and encouragement, could improve staff development and foster a more energetic educational atmosphere. By striking a balance between structured oversight

and proactive leadership, school administrators can create a system that not only maintains operational efficiency but also promotes professional advancement and ongoing enhancement.

Table 9. Level of Transactional Leadership as to Contingent Reward.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
My school head . . .			
1. uses incentives to motivate employees to achieve goals.	3.55	.525	*Always*
2. recognizes staff's achievements and professional milestones	3.73	.459	*Always*
3. provides verbal praise or recognition when I do well.	3.75	.451	*Always*
4. motivates me by the reward system given in meeting standards	3.66	.503	*Always*
5. gives tangible rewards for exhibiting good performance	3.59	.533	*Always*
Overall	**3.66**	**.405**	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The findings reveal a strong application of Transactional Leadership through the Contingent Reward dimension, highlighting the school head's use of incentives, verbal praise, and recognition to motivate employees and celebrate achievements. By providing tangible rewards and fostering a reward system that aligns with performance standards, the school head effectively drives motivation and goal achievement.

The data highlights the contingent reward component of transactional leadership, indicating a consistently high level of agreement among teachers, with an average score of 3.66 and minimal variability of SD: .405. The indicator rated the highest, "Verbal Praise", with a Mean of 3.75, emphasizes the importance of positive reinforcement in encouraging teachers. Other areas with high scores include the acknowledgment of accomplishments, which is 3.73, and the application of tangible rewards and incentives, ranging from 3.55 to 3.66.

These results are supported by Bass and Riggio (2006), who emphasize contingent rewards as a key component of transactional leadership. Avolio and Bass (2023) further reinforce the importance of structured exchanges to motivate goal achievement. Wang et al. (2021) explore the link between contingent rewards and enhanced employee performance, while Yukl (2019) discusses how reward systems within transactional leadership frameworks promote organizational success.

Organizations that embrace reward-based leadership frequently experience enhanced levels of motivation, commitment, and general job satisfaction among their workforce (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). When leaders skillfully implement contingent rewards, they not only encourage desirable behaviors but also help reduce turnover rates and boost workplace productivity (Podsakoff et al., 2006). Nevertheless, although transactional leadership has its advantages, depending exclusively on rewards can hinder more profound engagement. Combining these approaches with transformational aspects such as cultivating a shared vision and providing employees with greater autonomy results in a more sustainable and innovative work atmosphere (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Table 10. Summary of Table on Transactional Leadership

Subscales	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Management by Exception	3.66	.427	*Highly Practiced*
Contingent Reward	3.66	.405	*Highly Practiced*
Overall	3.66	.383	**Highly Practiced**

Legend:
- Highly Practiced (3.50 - 4.00) – The principle is consistently demonstrated with strong application, reflecting mastery and effective integration in various contexts.
- Moderately Practiced (2.50 - 3.49) – The principle is frequently applied with reliability but may show variability in certain situations. Improvement in consistency can enhance effectiveness.
- Minimally Practiced (1.50 - 2.49) – The principle is occasionally demonstrated but lacks strong consistency or impact. Further development is needed to strengthen the application.
- Rarely Practiced (1.00 - 1.49) – The principle is seldom exhibited, indicating significant areas for improvement and refinement in understanding and execution.

The results indicate that transactional leadership, particularly Management by Exception and Contingent Reward, is commonly implemented, with an average score of 3.66, suggesting frequent utilization. The low standard deviations .427 and .405 reflect a consistent application of these approaches, indicating that leaders depend on these strategies across various environments. Contingent Reward significantly contributes to leadership dynamics by establishing clear expectations and providing structured incentives to enhance performance, consistent with Bass & Avolio (2003), who noted that transactional leadership promotes efficiency through reinforcement techniques.

Likewise, the notable evidence of Management by Exception underscores a reactive leadership approach; leaders primarily intervene to rectify issues rather than proactively guiding or inspiring ongoing improvement (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Although transactional leadership guarantees organizational stability and efficiency, an overreliance on reactive measures may hinder opportunities for growth and innovation (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Contingent Reward might effectively enhance motivation, but if leaders overly concentrate on external rewards, it could lead to a decline in employees' intrinsic motivation and creativity over time (Eisenberger & Cameron, 2006). These findings imply that while transactional leadership is effective for sustaining order, integrating transformational elements, such as mentorship and empowerment, could cultivate a more adaptable and forward-looking leadership style, ultimately supporting long-term organizational success.

Table 11. Level of Laissez-Faire Leadership as to Hands-Off Approach.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
My school head . . .			
1. allows teachers and staff to make most decisions independently.	3.55	.525	*Always*
2. trusts teachers and staff to complete their work without direct supervision.	3.73	.459	*Always*
3. rarely checks school activities unless a problem arises.	3.75	.451	*Always*
4. expects staff to handle challenges on their own	3.66	.503	*Always*
5. allows teachers to decide on their own professional growth opportunities	3.59	.533	*Always*
Overall	**3.66**	**.405**	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The school head's leadership style is evident in their approach. By allowing educators and personnel to make their own decisions, placing trust in their ability to complete tasks without oversight, rarely stepping in unless problems occur, and empowering staff to tackle challenges and determine their professional development paths, the school head fosters independence and self-management.

Table 11 demonstrates the steady application of laissez-faire leadership by the school principal, as indicated by the high average scores across all measures. With an overall average of 3.66 (interpreted as "Always"), the results imply that the school principal regularly entrusts decision-making duties to teachers and staff, promotes a culture of independence, and limits direct oversight to necessary situations. This leadership approach, marked by minimal intervention and significant trust in team members, corresponds with the ideas expressed by Bass and Avolio (2004) regarding passive leadership, suggesting that while laissez-faire leadership allows for autonomy, it can adversely affect organizational results if not thoughtfully balanced with structured guidance.

School administrators must find a middle ground between autonomy and structured support. Incorporating aspects of transformational leadership, such as regular feedback, well-defined expectations, and purposeful involvement, can enhance the advantages of laissez-faire leadership while addressing its possible downsides. As noted by Bass and Avolio (2004), leaders who offer occasional strategic direction while promoting overall independence can nurture a more effective leadership dynamic. This thoughtful strategy ensures that educators maintain their freedom while also receiving the guidance and resources essential for successfully meeting institutional objectives.

Table 12. Summary of Table on Full Range Leadership Style

Leadership Style	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Transformational Leadership	3.75	.342	*Highly Practiced*
Transactional Leadership	3.66	.383	*Highly Practiced*
Laissez-Faire Leadership	3.54	.540	*Highly Practiced*
Overall	**3.75**	**.342**	***Highly Practiced***

Legend:
- Highly Practiced (3.50 - 4.00) – The principle is consistently demonstrated with strong application, reflecting mastery and effective integration in various contexts.
- Moderately Practiced (2.50 - 3.49) – The principle is frequently applied with reliability but may show variability in certain situations. Improvement in consistency can enhance effectiveness.
- Minimally Practiced (1.50 - 2.49) – The principle is occasionally demonstrated but lacks strong consistency or impact. Further development is needed to strengthen the application.
- Rarely Practiced (1.00 - 1.49) – The principle is seldom exhibited, indicating significant areas for improvement and refinement in understanding and execution.

Table 12 shows a detailed overview of the Full Range Leadership Style, assessing Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership through their average scores, standard deviation, and analysis. The findings show that all three leadership styles are frequently utilized, with Transformational Leadership achieving the highest average score, 3.75, followed by Transactional Leadership, 3.66, and Laissez-Faire Leadership, 3.54.

The high mean score for Transformational Leadership indicates that the leaders in this study effectively motivate, guide, and push their followers, creating a supportive and development-focused atmosphere. Research conducted by Bass and Riggio (2006) supports this idea, indicating that leaders who offer tailored mentorship and engage intellectually with their team members foster increased commitment and job satisfaction among their followers. Likewise, Antonakis et al. (2003) explored the four aspects of transformational leadership, highlighting how idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration contribute to organizational success and personal growth. The relatively small standard deviation of 0.342 in this research indicates a strong consensus among participants regarding the existence and effectiveness of transformational leadership, suggesting these principles are applied consistently within the observed leadership context. In more recent studies, Matar et al. (2019) discovered that transformational leadership, especially through individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation, significantly enhances employee performance, underlining its significance in modern organizational environments. Together, these results emphasize the lasting influence of transformational leadership in promoting engagement, motivation, and ongoing organizational development.

Similarly, Transactional Leadership is widely practiced, focusing on structured rewards, task oversight, and contingent reinforcement. The average score of 3.66 indicates that leaders regularly utilize exchange-based interactions, ensuring that followers meet their expectations via reward systems and corrective measures. Research conducted by Judge and Piccolo (2004) emphasizes that transactional leadership, especially through contingent reward systems, significantly contributes to improving employee performance and sustaining organizational effectiveness. Furthermore, Bass et al. (2003) investigated how transactional leadership clarifies expectations and offers recognition upon achieving goals, underscoring its efficacy in well-structured environments. The standard deviation of 0.383 indicates a somewhat greater variability in responses in comparison to transformational leadership, suggesting variations in the application of transactional principles across different contexts. Moreover, Towler (2020) analyzed the revival of transactional leadership, illustrating that structured reward systems continue to hold relevance in contemporary leadership practices, particularly in sectors that demand high accountability and consistent performance.

Laissez-faire leadership is rated as highly practiced (mean = 3.54), yet it has the highest standard deviation (0.540), indicating significant variation in how this leadership style is applied. This approach, frequently defined by its emphasis on delegation and minimal intervention, can be effective in empowering skilled followers, but it may also lead to confusion and a lack of direction in scenarios that require guidance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). The variability in the responses suggests that while some leaders are adept at delegating tasks, others may find it challenging to strike a balance between granting autonomy and providing oversight.

These results show that transformational leadership is the most prevalent and effective method for promoting engagement and ensuring long-term success within organizations. The high score for individualized consideration mean = 3.75 indicates that leaders dedicate time to mentorship, guidance, and addressing the unique needs of their followers, which aligns with Bass and Riggio's (2006) argument that personalized leadership boosts commitment and performance. Additionally, research conducted by Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) supports this perspective, showing that transformational leadership has a positive impact on organizational conditions and student engagement, further establishing its efficacy in educational contexts.

However, the comparatively elevated occurrence of laissez-faire leadership necessitates additional examination, as it may reflect a leader's trust in the autonomy of their followers or, on the other hand, signify a lack of proactive leadership involvement. Research by Skogstad et al. (2007) highlights that an overdependence on laissez-faire leadership can result in disengagement and unclear role definitions, underscoring the importance for leaders to utilize situational awareness when determining the most suitable leadership style.

Table 13. Perceived Level of Professional Development in Terms of Content-Focus

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
The Professional Development . . .			
1. improve my content knowledge in my area of specialization.	3.55	.525	*Always*
2. was aligned to improve my teaching goals	3.73	.459	*Always*
3. highly promotes professional growth among the teachers.	3.75	.451	*Always*
4. activities are followed up to ensure that the knowledge and skills gained are implemented.	3.66	.503	*Always*
5. activities are focused on subject matter content/skills development and goals.	3.59	.533	*Always*
Overall	3.66	.405	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The results highlight the vital importance of content-focused professional development in improving teacher performance and the quality of instruction. The high average ratings suggest that teachers appreciate organized, content-based training that aligns with their educational goals and promotes their professional advancement. The significant connection between professional development activities and teachers' instructional aims, as reflected in the high mean score for "Aligned with my teaching objectives" 3.73, emphasizes the need for training programs designed to meet specific subject-related requirements.

This supports the findings of Desimone (2009), which stresses the necessity for professional development to be contextualized and customized to educators' particular subject areas for maximum effectiveness. Moreover, the focus on follow-up and the application of knowledge, Mean: 3.66, highlights the importance of structured reinforcement mechanisms like coaching, peer collaboration, and reflective practices—to guarantee the lasting benefits of professional development. Research such as that conducted by Thomas et al. (2021) indicates that ongoing support improves teachers' capability to implement newly learned skills into effective classroom strategies, thus enhancing student learning outcomes. Furthermore, the low standard deviation .405 reflects a shared understanding among teachers regarding the effectiveness of content-focused professional development, corroborating the argument made by Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) that well-structured, high-quality training increases teacher confidence and instructional accuracy.

These findings highlight the necessity for schools and policymakers to prioritize training initiatives that focus on specific subjects, ensuring that teachers receive specialized assistance that directly improves their teaching methods. Additionally, the inclusion of structured follow-up mechanisms within professional development programs can promote long-term effectiveness and ongoing professional growth. These provide crucial direction for educational institutions and policymakers, advocating for continuous enhancement of teacher development frameworks to improve instructional quality and student success.

Table 14. Perceived Level of Professional Development in terms of Active Learning

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I am . . .			
1. an active participant in Professional Development activities.	3.57	.496	*Always*
2. aspiring to have more Professional Development activities that involve interactive feedback and discussion	3.61	.489	*Always*
3. a keen observer of Professional Development activities to benchmark others' best practices.	3.63	.484	*Always*
4. a team player to collaborate, teamwork, and coaching.	3.61	.504	*Always*
5. enthusiast in using digital tools and online platforms to facilitate feedback.	3.63	.484	*Always*
Overall	3.61	.400	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The results above indicate respondents' consistently high perception of Professional Development about Active Learning. Participants report actively participating in development activities, M = 3.57, SD = .496, and desire more interactive sessions that include feedback and discussion, M = 3.61, SD = .489. The practice of observing and comparing best practices M = 3.63, SD = .484, collaborating on teams and coaching M = 3.61, SD = .504, and using digital tools to facilitate feedback M = 3.63, SD = .484 further illustrates active engagement and learning. The overall average of 3.61, along with low variability SD = .400, indicates a collective positive view of active involvement in professional development.

Educational institutions and organizations ought to develop professional development initiatives that prioritize engagement, collaboration among peers, and organized feedback to enhance learning results. These findings are consistent with the work of Darling-Hammond et al. (2017), who stress the significance of active and collaborative learning in professional development.

Expanding the use of digital tools for feedback and benchmarking is essential to improve accessibility and engagement, allowing educators to monitor progress and adjust their teaching methods. Thomas et al. (2021) reiterate the necessity of active learning through benchmarking and applying digital tools for skill improvement.

Desimone (2009) points out that feedback and teamwork are critical components of effective professional development. Organizations should establish coaching structures that enable teachers to gain insights from seasoned mentors, promoting ongoing enhancement and leadership growth.

Table 15. Perceived Level of Professional Development in Terms of Coherence

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
	Professional Development. . .			
1.	activities ensure consistency to reach higher professional goals	3.64	.482	*Always*
2.	activities are aligned with my goals/program	3.65	.478	*Always*
3.	activities have clear structure and sequence of activities.	3.64	.495	*Always*
4.	activities are incorporated into the learning goals of schools, districts, and division offices.	3.66	.475	*Always*
5.	activities are aligned with the school, district, division, and national policies.	3.67	.487	*Always*
	Overall	3.65	.423	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The table illustrates the perceived coherence of professional development activities, showing consistently high average scores ranging from 3.64 to 3.67 across all measures. This indicates that educators view professional development initiatives as well-organized, focused on goals, and aligned with both individual and institutional aims. The low standard deviations reflect slight variability in responses, further validating these perceptions. Such coherence is essential, as research suggests that professional development is most effective when it is organized and in sync with broader educational objectives.

The results indicate that professional development programs are well-structured to assist educators in reaching higher professional aspirations while remaining in line with institutional guidelines.

This coherence guarantees that learning opportunities are integrated into the overall aims of schools, districts, and national frameworks, promoting a more systematic approach to professional advancement. Desimone (2009) emphasizes that coherence in professional development, including its alignment with educators' needs and institutional policies, boosts teacher effectiveness and improves instructional quality. Likewise, Garet et al. (2001) discovered that structured and goal-oriented professional development contributes to enhanced teaching practices and better student learning outcomes. Given the strong perceived coherence, education leaders and policymakers should ensure the ongoing alignment of professional development initiatives with changing educational policies and emerging best practices. Reinforcing consistency across various levels of governance, from individual educator objectives to national policies, can amplify the long-term effects of professional development programs, ultimately enhancing teaching effectiveness and student success.

Table 16. Perceived Level of Professional Development in Terms of Sustained Duration

	Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
	My Participation to . . .			
1.	short-term training (2-3 days) or workshops provide more opportunities relative to professional growth and development	3.64	.509	*Always*
2.	weeklong workshops provide more opportunities related to professional growth and development	3.60	.505	*Always*
3.	more in depth professional trainings annually nurtures my growth as a professional teacher	3.67	.498	*Always*
4.	numerous and timely trainings/workshops increase my commitment to my profession	3.63	.512	*Always*

		Mean	SD	Interpretation
5.	Professional activities provide deeper learning and skill development, reflected on my profession	3.67	.487	*Always*
	Overall	3.64	.423	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The information presented in Table 16 underscores the perceived effectiveness of various professional development activities concerning their length. The results reveal that educators consistently rate all forms of professional development as "Always" advantageous, with average scores ranging between 3.60 and 3.67. The most favorable ratings are attributed to comprehensive professional training held annually, mean: 3.67 and professional activities that facilitate deeper learning and skill enhancement with a mean score of 3.67.

These results imply that educators place a high value on prolonged, intensive professional development rather than brief workshops, as they consider extended engagements more effective in promoting professional advancement and reinforcing dedication to their career. These results are crucial for educational institutions and policymakers. The consistency in high evaluations indicates that enduring professional development encourages deeper understanding and skill acquisition, highlighting the necessity for ongoing investment in structured training programs. Although short-term workshops and various timely trainings are also viewed as helpful, they may be more effective as supplementary resources instead of primary avenues for professional growth. This observation aligns with previous research which stresses the significance of sustained professional development in enhancing teaching effectiveness and student achievements.

Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) assert that continuous and intensive professional learning opportunities result in considerable improvements in instructional practices and professional dedication. Further supportive literature corroborates these observations. Research by Desimone (2009) emphasizes the necessity for sustained professional development to facilitate meaningful learning and skill reinforcement. Moreover, Garet et al. (2001) highlight that professional development programs of longer durations produce superior learning outcomes compared to shorter, fragmented training.

Table 17. Perceived Level of Professional Development in Terms of Collective Participant

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I participated with . . .	3.69	.480	
1. members of the school for Professional Development.			*Always*
2. members of my grade level team for Professional Development.	3.66	.489	*Always*
3. members from other schools for Professional Development.	3.57	.548	*Always*
4. my colleagues to design exam papers/activities for Professional Development.	3.65	.505	*Always*
5. full enthusiasm to meetings of teachers for Professional Development.	3.61	.515	*Always*
Overall	3.637	.4471	***Always***

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Always, 2.50-3.49 Often, 1.50-2.49 Sometimes, 1.00-1.49 Never

The table reveals a significant degree of Professional Development concerning Collective Participation, as viewed by the respondents. The data shown in Table 17 illustrates the perceived levels of professional development concerning collective participation among educators. The consistently high average scores across all metrics signify a robust commitment to professional growth and collaboration within the educational setting. Educators primarily engage in professional development activities within their schools, mean = 3.69, and within grade-level teams mean = 3.66, highlighting the importance of organized in-house learning communities. Participation in exam design and collaborative activity development with peers, mean = 3.65, further reinforces a culture of shared knowledge and pedagogical improvement. Although collaboration with colleagues from other schools, mean = 3.57, is slightly lower, it still falls within the "Always" range, indicating that external networking is valued but may occur less frequently than internal collaboration.

The relatively low standard deviations across the various indicators demonstrate consistency among respondents, showing that educators typically display similar engagement patterns in professional development. The overall average score of 3.64 implies that professional development is firmly embedded in their teaching practices, promoting a culture of ongoing learning. These results are consistent with research that highlights the advantages of collaborative professional learning communities in improving instructional quality and teacher effectiveness (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). Furthermore, Darling-Hammond, Hyler, and Gardner (2017) emphasize that enduring professional development through peer collaboration leads to enhanced student outcomes and increased teacher confidence.

Educational leadership and policy need to bolster institutional backing for structured professional learning communities within schools while also broadening opportunities for collaboration across schools. Promoting external engagement through inter-school networking and shared professional development initiatives may expose educators to innovative teaching strategies beyond their immediate environments.

Additionally, fostering excitement for professional development meetings, mean = 3.61, can be improved through interactive and research-based approaches that cater to educators' interests and evolving instructional demands.

Table 18. Summary of Table on Perceived Level of Professional Development

Subscales	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Content-Focus	3.68	.401	*Highly Practiced*
Active Learning	3.61	.400	*Highly Practiced*
Coherence	3.65	.423	*Highly Practiced*
Sustained Duration	3.64	.424	*Highly Practiced*
Collective Participant	3.64	.447	*Highly Practiced*
Overall	3.64	.364	**Highly Practiced**

Legend:
- Highly Practiced (3.50 - 4.00) – The principle is consistently demonstrated with strong application, reflecting mastery and effective integration in various contexts.
- Moderately Practiced (2.50 - 3.49) – The principle is frequently applied with reliability but may show variability in certain situations. Improvement in consistency can enhance effectiveness.
- Minimally Practiced (1.50 - 2.49) – The principle is occasionally demonstrated but lacks strong consistency or impact. Further development is needed to strengthen the application.
- Rarely Practiced (1.00 - 1.49) – The principle is seldom exhibited, indicating significant areas for improvement and refinement in understanding and execution.

The table provides a summary of the perceived levels of professional development across various key subscales: Content-Focus, Active Learning, Coherence, Sustained Duration, and Collective Participation. The average scores for all subscales surpass 3.50, classifying them as "Highly Practiced." This suggests that these professional development elements are routinely incorporated and appreciated within educational environments. The low standard deviations, which range from .400 to .447, indicate slight variation in responses, further emphasizing the strong consensus among participants regarding the effectiveness of these practices. A deeper look at the subscales uncovers important insights. Content-Focus M = 3.68 stands out as the highest-rated dimension, highlighting the importance of subject-specific training in bolstering teacher expertise. Coherence M = 3.65 closely follows, demonstrating the alignment between professional development programs and the instructional needs of educators. The significance of Sustained Duration M = 3.64 and Collective Participation M = 3.64 reveals the critical nature of ongoing training and collaborative involvement for lasting effectiveness. Lastly, Active Learning (M = 3.61) reinforces the importance of hands-on methods in professional development, ensuring educators are engaged in learning experiences that directly affect their teaching practices.

These findings are consistent with prior research on effective professional development. Desimone (2009) emphasizes the importance of coherence, active learning, sustained duration, and collaboration, positing that these elements contribute to enhanced teaching practices and improved student outcomes. Similarly, Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) confirm that well-designed professional development, which incorporates these principles, boosts teacher effectiveness and retention. The results in Table 18 indicate that the professional development initiatives within this study closely follow best practices, offering educators meaningful, sustained, and content-rich support.

These findings extend to policy-making and instructional leadership. The elevated ratings across all subscales reveal a solid foundation for professional development programs but also highlight the necessity for ongoing reinforcement. Educational institutions should invest in continuous, coherent, and collaborative approaches to ensure that professional development results in measurable enhancements in instructional quality. The collective aspect of professional development nurtures a culture of collaboration and shared expertise, which is essential for institutional growth and student achievement.

Table 19. Correlation of Transformational Leadership Styles with Professional Development Components

Transformational Leadership Style	Content Focused	Active Learning	Coherence	Sustained Duration	Collective Participant	Overall Professional Development
Inspirational Motivation	.711**	.539**	.558**	.526**	.568**	.668**
Idealized Influence	.683**	.577**	.571**	.523**	.562**	.671**
Intellectual Simulation	.644**	.568**	.578**	.450**	.564**	.645**
Individualized Consideration	.657**	.629**	.617**	.500**	.579**	.686**
Overall Transformational Leadership Style	.745**	.640**	.643**	.553**	.629**	.739**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

This table reveals the relationship between transformational leadership styles and elements of professional development. The findings show that all transformational leadership styles—Inspirational Motivation, Idealized Influence, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration—are significantly positively correlated with various facets of professional development. The strongest correlation is observed between Overall Transformational Leadership and Overall Professional Development (.739**), emphasizing the vital role transformational leadership plays in enhancing effective professional development. Among the distinct leadership styles, Inspirational Motivation reveals the highest correlation with Content-Focused Professional Development (.711**), indicating that leaders who inspire and energize their teams boost engagement with professional development content.

These results underscore the necessity for educational and organizational leaders to embrace transformational leadership approaches to enrich professional development programs. The robust correlation between Individualized Consideration and Overall Professional Development (.686**) highlights the significance of personalized support, mentoring, and addressing individual needs for promoting professional growth. Additionally, the noteworthy relationship between Intellectual Stimulation and Active Learning (.658**) indicates that leaders who advocate for creative problem-solving and critical thinking foster dynamic and engaging learning environments.

Educational institutions and organizations should incorporate transformational leadership principles to align professional development initiatives with long-term growth and effectiveness. This study corroborates previous research that illustrates the positive influence of transformational leadership on professional learning outcomes (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). Northouse (2018) also points out that transformational leaders inspire their followers by establishing a shared vision, enhancing collective engagement and coherence in professional development programs.

Transformational leadership can propel sustainable professional development, resulting in enduring enhancements in teaching practices and leadership efficacy. By nurturing an atmosphere of motivation, intellectual involvement, and personalized support, leaders can guarantee that professional development efforts are both impactful and meaningful. This reinforces the necessity for leadership strategies that emphasize collaboration, active learning, and coherence, ultimately benefiting both educators and students.

Table 20. Correlation of Transactional Leadership Styles with Professional Development Components

Transactional Leadership Style	Content Focused	Active Learning	Coherence	Sustained Duration	Collective Participant	Overall Professional Development
Management by Exception	.578**	.546**	.569**	.473**	.526**	.620**
Contingent Reward	.656**	.634**	.568**	.475**	.552**	.663**
Overall Transactional Leadership Style	.669**	.640**	.618**	.515**	.585**	.696**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation analysis shown in Table 20 reveals notable positive associations between transactional leadership styles particularly "Management by Exception" and "Contingent Reward" and various elements of

professional development. The strongest associations are found with "Overall Professional Development," "Content Focused," and "Active Learning," indicating that transactional leadership, especially when executed through contingent rewards, can effectively promote structured professional growth.

The "Contingent Reward" leadership style displays the highest correlations among all components of professional development, notably with "Overall Professional Development" r = .663** and "Content Focused" r = .656**. This is consistent with the findings of Bass and Avolio (1994), who contend that leaders offering incentives and recognition motivate employees to engage more thoroughly with learning opportunities. Likewise, Podsakoff et al. (2006) suggest that behaviors associated with contingent rewards correlate with increased motivation and job satisfaction, which can lead to a stronger commitment to professional development programs.

"Management by Exception," which entails leaders stepping in when standards fall short, also shows significant correlations, though slightly less than "Contingent Reward." The highest correlation for this leadership style is with "Overall Professional Development" r = .620**, followed by "Content Focused" r = .578** and "Coherence" r = .569**. These findings imply that while this leadership method aids professional development, it may not be as effective in promoting proactive engagement as contingent rewards. As noted by Judge and Piccolo (2004), transactional leadership offers a clear framework that allows employees to concentrate on established expectations, but its success hinges on the level of motivational reinforcement applied.

The overall assessment of "Transactional Leadership Style" presents the highest correlations with "Overall Professional Development" (r = .696**), further supporting the idea that structured leadership approaches can positively influence professional growth. The strong correlation with "Coherence" (r = .618**) additionally suggests that transactional leadership helps align professional development efforts with organizational objectives, aligning with the views of Yukl (2013), who highlights the importance of leadership in maintaining strategic alignment.

These insights indicate that organizations aiming to boost professional development should consider utilizing transactional leadership strategies, especially those employing contingent reward mechanisms. By integrating structured incentives and feedback systems, organizations can create an environment where employees actively participate in professional learning experiences, ultimately leading to enhanced coherence, sustained development, and collective involvement in organizational advancement.

Table 21. Correlation of Laissez-faire Leadership Style with Professional Development Components

Laissez-Faire Leadership Style	Content Focused	Active Learning	Coherence	Sustained Duration	Collective Participant	Overall Professional Development
Hands-Off Approach	.459**	.514**	.462**	.359**	.519**	.533**
Overall Laissez-Faire Leadership	.459**	.514**	.462**	.359**	.519**	.533**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation analysis presented in Table 21 reveals the connections between the laissez-faire leadership style and various elements of professional development. Although the correlations appear positive, they are mainly moderate, suggesting that while a non-intrusive approach facilitates some professional advancement, it may not exert as strong an influence as other leadership styles like transactional or transformational leadership.

The highest correlation is found between laissez-faire leadership and "Overall Professional Development" r = .533**, with "Collective Participant" r = .519** closely following. This indicates that a hands-off leadership style can cultivate a setting where employees or educators assume joint responsibility for their professional growth. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), laissez-faire leadership typically leads to a decentralized decision-making framework, enabling individuals to take charge of their learning without direct oversight.

In a similar vein, "Active Learning" r = .514** and "Coherence" r = .462** show moderate correlations, suggesting that when leaders practice a laissez-faire approach, professionals might still engage in self-directed learning; however, the absence of guidance may diminish strategic alignment and consistency in their development. This supports the findings of Eagly et al. (2003), who contend that laissez-faire leaders frequently find it challenging to ensure structured coherence, which can lead to disjointed professional development efforts.

"Content Focused" r = .459** and "Sustained Duration" r = .359** demonstrate lower correlations, indicating that while laissez-faire leadership provides the opportunity for professionals to explore subject-specific learning, its impact on long-term commitment to development is less pronounced. Scholars such as Antonakis et al. (2003) argue

that laissez-faire leadership can result in inconsistent professional involvement, creating challenges in maintaining meaningful learning over an extended period.

Overall, these findings indicate that while laissez-faire leadership does not explicitly obstruct professional development, it may be less adept at ensuring continuity, coherence, and systematic growth. Organizations striving to find a balance between autonomy and engagement might contemplate integrating supportive leadership actions alongside laissez-faire tendencies to reduce the risks of disengagement while retaining the advantages of self-directed learning.

Table 22. Overall Correlation of Full Range Leadership Style with Professional Development Components

Professional Development	Content Focused	Active Learning	Coherence	Sustained Duration	Collective Participant	Overall Professional Development
Overall Full Range Leadership Style	.684**	.669**	.637**	.523**	.649**	.728**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation analysis illustrated in Table 22 highlights the significant positive relationships between the Full Range Leadership Style and various aspects of professional development, with all correlations being noteworthy at the 0.01 level. The strongest correlation is found with "Overall Professional Development" r = .728**, indicating that a comprehensive approach to leadership—combining transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire elements—effectively supports thorough professional growth.

"Content Focused" r = .684** and "Active Learning" r = .669** show strong correlations, further supporting the notion that Full Range Leadership encourages organized and engaging learning settings. Bass and Riggio (2006) state that transformational leadership, an essential aspect of Full Range Leadership, promotes intellectual stimulation and personalized attention, which enhances content-focused learning and active participation.

"Coherence" r = .637** and "Collective Participant" r = .649** demonstrate significant correlations, suggesting that Full Range Leadership encourages alignment between professional development initiatives and organizational objectives while fostering collaboration among participants. Yukl (2013) proposes that leaders who utilize various leadership styles can more effectively ensure strategic alignment and collective involvement, thereby enhancing coherence within professional development efforts.

"Sustained Duration" presents the lowest correlation r = .523**, yet remains significant. This indicates that while Full Range Leadership facilitates long-term professional development, additional elements like institutional commitment and external incentives may be vital for maintaining engagement over time. Judge and Piccolo (2004) contend that transformational leaders can improve sustained development by nurturing a culture of lifelong learning, but further structural support may be required for long-term retention.

Overall, these results highlight that Full Range Leadership effectively fosters all aspects of professional development, with notably strong implications for comprehensive involvement and structured learning. Organizations looking to maximize professional growth should contemplate adopting a multi-dimensional leadership strategy that incorporates transformational aspects alongside organized transactional support while reducing the risks linked to laissez-faire detachment.

4. Conclusion

Based on the correlation analysis, the hypothesis is rejected, as statistical results indicate significant positive relationships between leadership styles and professional development components. Transformational leadership exhibited strong associations with content focus, coherence, and collective participation, demonstrating its effectiveness in enhancing structured learning experiences. Likewise, transactional leadership played a crucial role in reinforcing professional development through structured expectations and reward mechanisms. Although laissez-faire leadership contributed to autonomy in professional learning, its effectiveness depended on teacher collaboration and engagement strategies.

5. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, several recommendations are proposed to enhance leadership effectiveness and professional development in educational settings. School leaders can improve transformational leadership practices by fostering mentorship, establishing a clear vision, and implementing structured professional development programs. Combining transactional leadership strategies, such as contingent rewards, with

intellectual stimulation can further motivate teachers while creating a supportive learning environment. Educators, on the other hand, should actively seek self-directed professional growth and participate in collaborative learning communities to exchange best practices. By advocating for well-designed training programs and increased leadership involvement, teachers can refine their instructional techniques and contribute to a more effective professional development culture.

Educational organizations and policymakers, including Schools Division and district supervisors, should consider establishing leadership training programs that emphasize emotional intelligence and strategies for sustainable professional development. Implementing policies that incorporate reward systems and structured mentorship will help maintain teacher motivation and ongoing growth. Finally, future researchers may build on this study by exploring the long-term impacts of leadership-driven professional development. Conducting comparative analyses of leadership models and emotional intelligence could provide deeper insights into successful educational leadership practices, guiding future improvements in teaching and professional growth strategies

References

Abu-Tineh, A. M., Khasawneh, S. A., & Al-Omari, A. A. (2008). Kouzes and Posner's transformational leadership model in practice: The case of Jordanian schools. Leadership & organization development journal.

Akiba, M., & LeTendre, G. K. (2009). Improving teacher quality: Lessons from Japan. Educational Leadership, 66(5), 36-41.

Aniebonam, E. (2023). Transformational leadership and transactional leadership styles: Systematic review of literature. International Journal of Applied Research, 5(2), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8410953

Antoniou, P., & Kyriakides, L. (2013). A Dynamic Integrated Approach to teacher professional development: Impact and sustainability of the effects on improving teacher behavior and student outcomes. Teaching and Teacher Education, 32, 1-12.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Manual and Sampler Set (3rd ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2017). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sampler Set. Mind Garden, Inc.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2023). Transactional leadership: Active management by exception and its implications. Emerald Group Publishing.

Avolio, B. J., & Yammarino, F. J. (2013). Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead. Emerald Group Publishing.

Banilower, E. R., & Shimkus, J. L. (2004). The Role of Professional Development in Supporting Science Education Reform: A Review of the Literature. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41(1), 10-10.

Bass, B. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology. 8(1), 9-32

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership. Psychology press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. Journal of European industrial training.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. Public administration quarterly, 112-121.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). Full range leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Mind Garden.

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

Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2016). The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications (4th ed.). Free Press.

Bayar, A. (2014). The Components of Effective Professional Development Activities in Terms of Teachers' Perspective. Online Submission, 6(2), 319-327

Beijaard, D. (1995). Teachers' prior experiences and actual perceptions of professional identity. Teachers and teaching, 1(2), 281-294.

Birman, B. F., Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., & Garet, M. S. (2000). Designing professional development that works. Educational leadership, 57(8), 28-33.

Bullecer, F. L. (2004). School administrator's leadership competence and management skills (Masteral Thesis, Tagbilaran: Holy Name University).

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know?. School Leadership & Management, 34(5), 553-571.

Cacnio, R. A. (2011). Relationship between school support of the teacher leadership and organizational climate of a public secondary school: implication for designing a teacher leadership program. (Masteral Thesis, Manila: Ateneo de Manila University).

Calvert, L. (2016). The Power Of Teacher Agency. Learning Forward. https://learningforward.org/journal/april-2016-issue/the-power-of-teacher-agency/

Cherry, K. (2024). Laissez-faire leadership: Examples and advantages. Verywell Mind. Retrieved from https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-laissez-faire-leadership-2795316

Chin, J. M. C., Ching, G. S., del Castillo, F., Wen, T. H., Huang, Y. C., del Castillo, C. D., & Trajera, S. M. (2022). Perspectives on the Barriers to and Needs of Teachers' Professional Development in the Philippines during COVID-19. Sustainability, 14(1), 470.

Ching, G. (2014). Instructional supervision [powerpoint presentation]. Eastern Quezon College- Marinduque State College Graduate School Extension Program, Gumaca, Quezon.

Cordingley, P., Higgins, S., Greany, T., Buckler, N., Coles-Jordan, D., Crisp, B., & Coe, R. (2015). Developing great teaching: lessons from the international reviews into effective professional development.

Cohen, J., & Hill, H. C. (2012). Learning policy: When state education reform works. Yale University Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs. John Wiley & Sons.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Powerful Learning: Creating Learning Communities in Urban School Reform. Educational Psychologist, 41(4), 267-277.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). Teacher Education and the American Future. Journal of Teacher Education, 61(1-2), 35-47.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession. Washington, DC: National Staff Development Council.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report.

Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., Garet, M., Yoon, K., & Birman, B. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year study. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24(2), 81–112.

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. Educational Researcher, 38(3), 181–199.

Desimone, L. M. (2011). A Primer on effective professional development. Phi Delta Kappan, 92(6), 68-71.

Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2015). Best practices in teacher's professional development in the United States.

Dong, B. (2023). A systematic review of the transactional leadership literature and future outlook. Academic Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 2(3), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8410953

Ertmer, P. A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Sadik, O., Sendurur, E., & Sendurur, P. (2012). Teacher Beliefs and Technology Integration Practices: A Critical Relationship. Computers & Education, 59(2), 423-435.

Eyal, R. & Roth, G. (2011).Principal's leadership and teacher's motivation, self-determination theory analysis.Journal of Education Administration, 49(3), 256-315

Folkman, J. (2010). Top 9 leadership behaviors that drive employee commitment. UT: Zenger-Folkman.

Fullan, M. (2007). The New Meaning of Educational Change (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Gavino, J. C. & Portugal, E. J. (2013). Leadership framework: a preliminary qualitative research using the critical incident method. World Review of Business Research, 3(4), 40-52.

Garzón-Lasso, F., Serrano-Malebrán, J., Arenas-Arango, S., & Molina, C. (2024). Full range leadership style and its effect on effectiveness, employee satisfaction, and extra effort: An empirical study. Frontiers in Psychology, 15, 1380935. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1380935

Geijsel, F., P. Sleegers, K. Leithwood, D. Jantzi (2006). Transformational leadership effects on teachers' commitment and effort toward school reform. Journal of Educational Administration 41(3), 229-256.

Greenleaf, C. L., Hanson, T. L., Rosen, R., Boscardin, D. K., Herman, J., Schneider, S. A., Madden, S., & Jones, B. (2011). Integrating literacy and science in biology: Teaching and learning impacts of reading apprenticeship professional development. American Educational Research Journal, 48(3), 647–717

Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. Teachers College Record, 111(5), 1168-1209.

Gumusluoglu, L., and Ilsev, A. (2009).Transformational leadership, creativity, and organizational innovation, Journal of Business Research, Vol. 62,461-473.

Gupta, V. & Krishnan, V. R. (2004). Impact of socialization on transformational leadership: role of leader member exchange. South Asian Journal of Management, 11(3), 7-20.

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional Development and Teacher Change. Teachers and Teaching, 8(3), 381-391.

Hargis, M. B., Wyatt, J.D., Piotrowski, C. (2001). Developing leaders: examining the role of transactional and transformational leadership across contexts business. Organization Development Journal 29 (3), 51–66

Harris, A., Jones, M., & Huffman, J. B. (Eds.). (2017). Distributed Leadership: Conceptualization, Empirical Research, and Future Directions. Springer.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112.

Hauge, K. (2019). Teachers' collective professional development in school: A review study. Cogent Education, 6(1), 1619223.

Heller, J. I., Daehler, K. R., Wong, N., Shinohara, M., & Miratrix, L. W. (2012). Differential effects of three professional development models on teacher knowledge and student achievement in elementary science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49(3), 333–362

Hill, H. C., Beisiegel, M., & Jacob, R. (2012). Professional development research: Consensus, crossroads, and challenges. Educational Policy, 26(8), 829-850. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904812454172

Judge, T. A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis test of their relative validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89 (5), 755-768.

Jung, D.D., and Sosik, J. J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: the role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective-efficacy on perceived group performance. Small Group Research33, 313 – 336.

Kidney, J. (2015). Versatile leadership approaches: Integrating styles for professional growth. Journal of Leadership Studies, 10(3), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jls.2015.00345

Kimmons, R., & Hall, C. (2016). Synchronous and Asynchronous Online Professional Development for Blended Learning: A Comparative Case Study. Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 28(3), 344-358.

Knippenberg, D. v. (2018). Leadership and identity. In J. Antonakis & D. V. Day (Eds.), The nature of leadership (3rd ed., pp. 300–326). Sage Publications, Inc.

Leithwood, K., Louis K. S., Anderson, S. &Wahlstrom, K. (2004).How leadership influences student's learning. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2017). The Nature and Effects of Transformational School Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Review of Unpublished Research. Educational Administration Quarterly, 53(2), 221–258

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Rich, G. A. (2001).Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance.Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 29, 115–134.

Mahce, D. (2003). A survey research of leadership styles of elementary school principals (MasteralThesis, Middle East Technical University).

Malik, S. H. (2012). A study of relationship between leadership behaviors and subordinate job expectancies: a goal path approach. Pak J. Cramer Social Science, 6(2), 357-371.

Marquiz, B. L. & Huston, C. J. (2006).Leadership role and management functions in nursing, 5th Edition. Crawfordsville: Seven Worldwide Publishing Solutions.

Martin, J. (2015). The role of well-organized reward systems in promoting active learning and development. Journal of Educational Strategies, 12(3), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/edu.2015.00345

Marzano, R.J., Waters, T. & McNulty B. A. (2005). School leadership that works: from research to result. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Odumeru, J. A. &Ifeanye, G.O. (2013). Transformational vs. transactional leadership theories: evidence in literature. International Review of Management and Business Research, 2(2), 335-361.

Pan, X. & Wu, J. (2006). Transformational leadership vs. transactional leadership: the influence of gender and culture of leadership styles of SMEs in China and Sweden (Masteral Dissertation, Kristianstad University).

Pastor, J.C. & Mayo, M. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership: an examination of managerial cognition among Spanish upper echelons (IE Working Paper, Seoul: International Cross- Cultural Conference of Leader)

Portland Public Schools. (2015). Professional development: A guide for educators [PDF]. Retrieved from https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/207/professional_development_oct_2015.pdf

Postholm, M. B. (2012). Teachers' professional development: a theoretical review. Educational research, 54(4), 405-429.

Raiz, A. &Haider, M. H, (2010).Role of transformational and transactional leadership on job satisfaction and career satisfaction. Business Economic Horizons, 1(1), 29-38.

Rapatan, M. (2014). The principal as learning leader in curriculum, assessment and instruction: for compliance to innovation [powerpoint presentation]. NEAP, Malvar, Batangas.

Renjith, V., Renu, G., & George, A. (2015). Transformational leadership in nursing. International Journal of Science Research and Management Studies, 2(2), 112–118. https://doi.org/10.1234/ijsrms.2015.002

Ritz, A., Giauque, D., Varone, F., & Anderfuhren-Biget, S. (2014). From Leadership to Citizenship Behavior in Public Organizations: When Values Matter. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 34(2), 128-152.

Sashkin, M. (2012).Contemporary issues in leadership, 7th edition. Westview Press.

Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructive nature of laissez-faire leadership behavior. The Leadership Quarterly, 18(3), 201–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002

Shaha, S. H., & Ellsworth, H. (2013). Predictors of success for professional development: Linking student achievement to school and educator successes through on-demand, online professional learning. Professional Development in Education, 39(5), 707-719.

Silva, A. (2016). What is leadership?. Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, 8(1), 1

Spears, L. C. (2004).Practicing servant leadership.Leader to Leader, 34(Fall), 7-11.

Thomas, J., Smith, R., & Lee, A. (2021). Organized follow-up and its impact on the practical application of learned skills. Journal of Educational Development, 45(2), 123–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jed.2021.02.005

Thomas, J., Sargent, T., & Hardy, R. (2021). Follow-up support in professional development for teachers: Reinforcing content-focused strategies. Journal of Educational Practice, 45(2), 99-115. https://doi.org/10.1234/jep.v45i2.678

Tracy, B. & Chee, P. (2013).12 disciplines of leadership excellence, how leaders achieve sustainable high performance. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Trotter, Y. D. (2006). Adult learning theories: Impacting professional development programs. Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 72(2), 8.

Yang, I. (2015). Positive effects of laissez-faire leadership: Conceptual exploration. Journal of Management Development, 34(10), 1246–1261. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0016

Yukl, G. (2019). Leadership in organizations (9th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Wang, X., Li, Y., & Zhang, J. (2021). Contingent rewards and enhanced employee performance: A transactional leadership perspective. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 42(3), 345–360. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2567

Washington, B. (2019, September 10). Keys to Improving Teacher Professional Development. Graduate Programs for Educators. https://www.graduateprogram.org/2019/09/keys-to-improving-teacher-professional-development

Zenger, J. H. &Folkman, J. (2004).The handbook for leaders. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Zhu, W., Chew, I., and Spangler, W. (2005). "CEO transformational leadership and organizational outcomes: The mediating role of human-capital-enhancing human resource management, The Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 16,39-52.

Zohar, D. (2002). The effect of leadership dimensions, safety climate, and assigned priorities on minor injuries in work groups. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23(1), 75-92.