

---

**| RESEARCH ARTICLE**

## **Leading with Impact: The Relationship Between School Heads' Multifactor Leadership Styles and Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Public Secondary Schools**

**Christian R. Duran<sup>1</sup> and Porferio J. Barlas, Jr.<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Program Chair, MBA, Siquijor State College*

<sup>2</sup>*Dean, College of PESCAR, West Visayas State University*

**Corresponding Author:** Christian R. Duran, **E-mail:** [christianrduran@gmail.com](mailto:christianrduran@gmail.com)

---

**| ABSTRACT**

This study examined the relationship of school heads' leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction across 19 public secondary schools within the Department of Education (DepEd) Schools Division of Siquijor. Grounded in Bass's Multifactor Leadership Theory and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, the research explored the effects of transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant leadership styles on teacher satisfaction. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected through the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and a modified version of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ). Statistical analysis revealed that transformational leadership, particularly the Individualized Consideration dimension, exhibited the strongest positive correlation with teacher satisfaction. Transactional leadership, notably Contingent Reward, also showed a positive association, whereas passive-avoidant leadership was linked to lower levels of satisfaction. These findings highlight the critical role of leadership in cultivating supportive and motivating work environments for teachers. The study recommends the strategic development of transformational leadership competencies among school heads to enhance teacher satisfaction and promote overall school effectiveness.

**| KEYWORDS**

leadership style, teachers' job satisfaction, DepEd

**| ARTICLE INFORMATION**

**ACCEPTED:** 01 October 2025

**PUBLISHED:** 29 October 2025

**DOI:** 10.32996/bjtep.2025.4.6.1

---

### **1.0 Introduction**

School heads play a critical role in shaping both educational outcomes and community development, serving as instructional leaders and administrative managers (Villar et al., 2021). In the Philippines, Republic Act 9155 mandates that every public school be led by a school head responsible for curriculum implementation, staff development, resource management, and the creation of a supportive learning environment. Within the Philippine education system, effective leadership styles have been shown to significantly enhance teacher morale and retention (Ramirez & Capili, 2024), largely because they are closely tied to teacher job satisfaction—a key determinant of educational success. While these findings are supported by a growing body of national and international research, much of this evidence originates from larger or more urbanized educational contexts, leaving rural and culturally distinct settings less explored.

The DepEd Schools Division of Siquijor oversees 64 elementary and 19 secondary schools, classified as either National High Schools or Integrated Schools. Leadership structures vary: Integrated Schools are managed by both a School Principal and a Head Teacher who oversees the secondary level. This dual leadership arrangement introduces governance complexities, as both roles share responsibilities in performance management, strategic planning, and financial oversight. Siquijor, however, is not only

geographically isolated but also culturally unique. Known for its close-knit communities being the 3<sup>rd</sup> smallest province in the Philippines in terms of population (107,642) according to 2024 Philippine Statistics Authority Census data, deep-rooted traditions, and strong interpersonal networks, the province's sociocultural context may shape how teachers perceive leadership and derive job satisfaction. For example, peer relationships and collaborative practices may carry greater weight in smaller, community-oriented schools where teachers and school heads often share personal ties outside the workplace. Likewise, working conditions are influenced by resource limitations common to island provinces, making supportive and adaptive leadership especially critical. These cultural and contextual dynamics suggest that leadership effectiveness in Siquijor may be experienced and interpreted in ways that differ from more urbanized regions.

Despite the acknowledged importance of leadership in school effectiveness, the DepEd Schools Division of Siquijor currently lacks a formal mechanism for teachers to provide feedback on their school heads' leadership styles. Furthermore, there is limited research on the relationship between school leadership and teacher job satisfaction within this rural island setting. This gap constrains the ability of local educational stakeholders to design leadership development strategies that reflect the cultural and organizational realities of the province.

It is from this context that the present study was undertaken to provide localized, empirical evidence on the association between school heads' leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction in secondary schools under the DepEd Division of Siquijor. By doing so, the study not only contributes valuable data to a previously understudied region but also clarifies whether leadership principles established in broader national and international contexts—such as Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Theory—hold consistent relevance in geographically isolated and culturally distinct provinces. Thus, the study enriches the literature by either highlighting unique local nuances or strengthening the generalizability of leadership theories across diverse educational environments.

### **Research Questions**

1. What is the leadership style of the School Heads in terms of Transformational, Transactional, and Passive-Avoidant as assessed by the teachers?
2. What is the level of teachers' job satisfaction in terms of Technical Supervision, Peer Relationships, Working Conditions, Responsibility, and Advancement?
3. Are there significant relationships between leadership style and teachers' jobs satisfaction?

## **2.0 Methodology**

### **2.1 Research Design**

The descriptive-correlational research design was used in this study to determine whether school heads' leadership style and teachers' satisfaction are associated with each other. Correlation coefficients were used to determine the relationships among the study variables.

### **2.2 Participants of the Study**

A total of 195 secondary teachers were selected from a population of 380 across 19 schools in the DepEd Division of Siquijor for the 2023–2024 school year. The initial target ( $n = 195$ ) was obtained using Slovin's formula with  $N = 380$  and a margin of error  $e = 0.05$ .

Slovin's formula was used as a pragmatic finite-population approximation when no reliable prior estimate of population variance was available. The sample excluded part-time, substitute, newly-hired, and recently-transferred teachers not yet assigned to their schools. Of the 195 questionnaires distributed, 149 were returned (response rate = 76%).

An a priori power analysis was also conducted for the study's primary planned analysis (F-test for multiple linear regression). Using conventional settings ( $\alpha = .05$ , power = .80) and Cohen's effect-size benchmarks (small  $f^2 = 0.02$ , medium  $f^2 = 0.15$ , large  $f^2 = 0.35$ ), the following example results apply:

Medium effect ( $f^2 = 0.15$ ): required  $n = 97$  for 5 predictors;  $n = 128$  for 10 predictors.

Small effect ( $f^2 = 0.02$ ): required  $n = 653$  for 5 predictors;  $n = 833$  for 10 predictors.

Large effect ( $f^2 = 0.35$ ): required  $n = 48$  for 5 predictors.

With the actual achieved sample of  $n=149$ , post-hoc sensitivity estimates indicate minimum detectable effect sizes ( $\alpha = .05$ , power = .80) of approximately  $f^2=0.093$  (if 5 predictors are modeled) and  $f^2=0.126$  (if 10 predictors are modeled) values close to Cohen's convention for a medium effect. Thus, the planned sample of 195 (and the obtained 149 responses) provides adequate power to detect medium (and larger) effects in typical multiple-regression models used in this study, but would be underpowered to detect small effects.

## 2.3 Research Instrument

### 2.3.1 Adapted research questionnaire

An adapted research questionnaire combining the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) by Bass and Avolio (1995) and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) developed by Lester (1987) was used and modified by the researcher to fit the current study and gather the needed data. The questionnaire was divided into 3 parts. Part 1 gathered the socio-demographic data about the respondents. Part 2 gathered data on the leadership styles observed by school heads adapted and modified by the researcher from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) by Bass and Avolio (1995) which determines Transformational, Transactional, and Passive-Avoidant leadership styles to fit for the current study.

Leadership styles practiced by the School Head were determined using statements that required respondents to encircle the response that corresponds to their perceptions. Using a 5-point Likert scale to interpret the scores, the following weighted scores and descriptions were used: 5 - "Very great extent" (a particular leadership style indicator has been practiced or observed thoroughly or all the time); 4 - "Great extent" (a particular leadership style indicator has been practiced or observed on a considerable degree or most of the time); 3 - "Moderate extent" (a particular leadership style indicator has been fairly implemented); 2 - "Low extent" (a particular leadership style indicator has rarely been practiced or observed), and 1 - "Very low extent" (a particular leadership style indicator is very seldomly practiced or have never been practiced at all).

Part 3 focused on teachers' job satisfaction using the instrument developed by Lester (1987) adapted and modified by the researcher to fit the current study. Teachers' job satisfaction was determined using statements that required respondents to encircle the response that corresponds to their perceptions.

Using a 5-point Likert scale to interpret the scores, the following weighted scores and descriptions were used: 5 - "Very Satisfied" (a particular job satisfaction indicator has met all the expectations of the teacher, making the teacher feel very pleased); 4 - "Satisfied" (a particular job satisfaction indicator has met most of the expectations of the teacher, making the employee feel pleased); 3 - "Moderately Satisfied" (a particular job satisfaction indicator has met the expectations of the teacher on a fair extent, making the teacher feel contented); 2 - "Dissatisfied" (a particular job satisfaction indicator did not meet most of the expectations of the teacher, making the teacher feel unhappy); 1 - "Very dissatisfied" means that a particular job satisfaction indicator did not meet all the expectations of the teacher, making the teacher very unhappy.

### 2.3.2 Modifications to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

The present study employed an adapted version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1995). While the conceptual structure of the original MLQ was retained, several modifications were introduced to ensure cultural appropriateness, contextual alignment with the Philippine public secondary school setting, and ease of comprehension for teacher-respondents. These modifications involved changes in wording, item framing, response scaling, and overall presentation.

One notable modification was the contextualization of each item to specifically refer to the school head as the leader being evaluated. The original MLQ items, which are generally applicable to leaders in various organizational contexts, were reframed to begin with the stem "My School Head..." to ensure that teachers would evaluate leadership behaviors within the school environment.

For example, Item 1, "Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts," retains the transactional leadership meaning of contingent reward but explicitly positions the school head as the provider of such assistance. Item 2, "Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate," keeps its original reflective nature associated with intellectual stimulation but specifies that it is the school head who engages in this critical evaluation. Item 3, "Fails to interfere until problems become serious," also maintains its original management-by-exception (passive) meaning, but the contextual stem directs respondents to assess the school head's responsiveness to issues in the school setting.

Similar adaptations were applied across the rest of the items. For instance, the original MLQ item "Talks about their most important values and beliefs" became "My School Head talks about their most important values and beliefs" (Item 6), maintaining the core construct of idealized influence while making the referent explicit. The item "Instills pride in being associated with me" was adjusted to "Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her" (Item 10), shifting pronoun usage for grammatical accuracy in the Philippine English context. Likewise, "Acts in ways that build others' respect" was restated as "Acts in ways that build my respect" (Item 21) to personalize the perception of respect. Idiomatic expressions, such as in "Shows that he/she is a firm believer in 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it'" (Item 17), were retained as they are commonly understood among Filipino educators.

The response format was also modified. Whereas the original MLQ uses a 0–4 frequency scale ranging from "Not at all" to "Frequently, if not always," the adapted version employed a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Very Low Extent to 5 = Very Great Extent. This change reframed the items from a frequency-based to an extent-based evaluation, which is more intuitive in assessing leadership practices in the educational context.

Theoretically, this shift reflects a change in the cognitive framing of the response process. In frequency-based measures, respondents must recall and estimate *how often* they observe a behavior, which relies heavily on episodic memory and may be prone to recall bias. In contrast, extent-based measures invite respondents to make a more global judgment about the degree to which a behavior is characteristic of the leader, engaging evaluative rather than memory-based processing (Podsakoff et al., 2012). This can reduce the cognitive load on respondents, particularly in large-scale field surveys, and may produce responses that better capture enduring impressions rather than isolated incidents.

Psychologically, the use of extent-based ratings also aligns with the social-cognitive processes by which teachers perceive leadership. Teachers often evaluate school heads not by counting discrete behaviors but by forming holistic judgments of their leadership influence. Thus, an extent scale may yield data that more closely reflect the perceived *quality* and *impact* of leadership rather than its mere frequency. However, this shift may also alter the psychometric properties of the instrument: frequency scales are typically more sensitive to behavioral variability, whereas extent scales may compress responses into global evaluations, potentially inflating correlations among leadership dimensions. Therefore, while this adaptation enhances contextual fit and interpretability, it also necessitates careful reliability and validity checks to ensure that the extent-based MLQ captures leadership constructs with sufficient precision and discriminant validity.

The items were presented in a single continuous list of 35 statements without being grouped under their respective leadership factors (e.g., Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception, Laissez-Faire). This structure simplified the reading process for respondents while maintaining the underlying factor associations for analytical purposes.

The rationale for these modifications was threefold: (a) to improve cultural and contextual relevance by framing leadership behaviors in terms familiar to public school teachers in the Philippines; (b) to enhance respondent comprehension by simplifying and personalizing the language; and (c) to make the instrument administratively convenient to use in the field. These changes are expected to preserve the core constructs of the original MLQ while improving the face and content validity of the instrument in the local setting. However, the shift in response scaling and the removal of explicit factor grouping mean that results from this adapted MLQ cannot be directly compared to normative data from the original version without statistical adjustment. To address potential changes in the instrument's psychometric properties, reliability and validity testing were conducted to confirm that the adapted version maintains internal consistency and construct integrity in the present study context.

### **2.3.3 Modifications to the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)**

The present study also employed a modified version of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) originally developed by Lester (1987). While the fundamental structure and constructs of the original instrument were retained, a series of modifications were introduced to align the tool with the Philippine public secondary school context and enhance clarity for teacher-respondents. These modifications involved changes in wording, contextual framing, response scaling, and organizational format. A primary modification was the contextualization of each item to specifically reflect the realities of public-school teaching in the Philippines. In the original TJSQ, items were phrased in general terms applicable to diverse educational settings. In the adapted version, the wording was adjusted to refer directly to the school head, colleagues, and school conditions familiar to teachers in the local context.

For example, in the Technical Supervision domain, Item 1, "My school head gives me guidance whenever I need help," personalizes the supervisory role by explicitly naming "school head" as the point of guidance. Item 2, "My school head possesses

relevant expertise and experience,” retains the original meaning but clearly links leadership expertise to the principal’s role. Item 3, “My school head provides assistance for classroom teaching improvement,” reframes the original professional support item to emphasize classroom-level instructional improvement. These changes ensure that respondents interpret the questions within the framework of the Philippine secondary education system. Similar contextual and linguistic adjustments were made in other domains. In Peer Relationships, the item “I like the people whom I work with” maintains the original sentiment but uses a more conversational tone for easier comprehension. In Working Conditions, items such as “The school’s facilities are kept clean and up to date” incorporate localized language to reflect school infrastructure realities.

In the Responsibility domain, “I feel satisfied with the level of ownership I have with my work” preserves the original concept of professional autonomy but uses terminology familiar to Filipino educators. The Advancement domain includes culturally relevant expressions of career growth, such as “I am encouraged to take initiative in determining my own career development” and “There are opportunities for me to cross-train and learn new skills,” to highlight the developmental pathways available in the DepEd system. In Recognition, items such as “The school recognizes individuals for their major accomplishments on the job” maintain the recognition construct but ensure the language reflects school-based acknowledgement practices.

The response format was also revised. Whereas the original TJSQ used a Likert-type agreement scale (e.g., “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”), the adapted version employed a 5-point extent scale ranging from 1 = Very Low Extent to 5 = Very Great Extent. This adjustment shifts the emphasis from agreement to perceived degree of satisfaction, which was deemed more intuitive for respondents evaluating their job satisfaction.

From a theoretical standpoint, this shift alters the psychological anchor of responses. Agreement scales require respondents to position themselves relative to a proposition, engaging a form of self–item alignment (e.g., “Do I agree with this claim?”). Extent scales, on the other hand, emphasize evaluative appraisal (e.g., “To what degree does this apply to my work life?”). This distinction is important because agreement-based formats may inadvertently tap into attitudinal predispositions or response styles such as acquiescence bias, whereas extent-based formats direct attention more explicitly to the perceived intensity of actual experiences (Krosnick & Presser, 2010).

Psychologically, the change helps align the instrument with how teachers naturally construe job satisfaction in practice. Teachers are less likely to think in terms of agreeing or disagreeing with abstract statements and more likely to appraise the extent to which they feel recognized, supported, or satisfied. Thus, this scaling approach may improve both comprehension and ecological validity of responses. Nevertheless, extent-based ratings can also narrow the interpretive range by discouraging neutral positions (which are often more visible in agreement scales), and this could affect the variance distribution of responses. Accordingly, the adaptation enhances cultural and psychological appropriateness but requires psychometric confirmation to ensure that the instrument continues to differentiate among job satisfaction dimensions and avoids artificial inflation of inter-item associations. The instrument also retained its thematic subscale organization—Technical Supervision, Peer Relationships, Working Conditions, Responsibility, advancement, and Recognition—but presented them with simplified wording and direct prompts for clarity.

The rationale for these modifications was threefold: (a) to enhance cultural and contextual fit by tailoring the items to the language and conditions of public secondary schools in the Philippines; (b) to improve comprehension and respondent engagement by simplifying wording without altering construct meaning; and (c) to ensure administrative ease during field data collection. These adaptations are expected to preserve the instrument’s content validity while making it more accessible to the target population. However, the change in scale format and slight alterations in wording mean that direct comparisons with results from studies using the original TJSQ should be made with caution. To safeguard the psychometric integrity of the adapted instrument, reliability testing and validation procedures were conducted in the present study to confirm that the modified version retained acceptable levels of internal consistency and construct validity.

#### 2.3.4 Mapping of Questionnaire Items to Leadership Style Subscales

To enhance analytical transparency and verifiability, mapping of questionnaire items to Leadership Style subscales is provided clearly detailing which specific item numbers from the adapted questionnaire correspond to each of the leadership subscales.

| <i>Leadership Style</i>            | <i>Subscale</i>                         | <i>Item Numbers (from adapted questionnaire)</i> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Transformational Leadership</i> | <i>Idealized Influence (Attributed)</i> | 10, 18, 21, 25                                   |
|                                    | <i>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</i>   | 6, 14, 23, 34                                    |

| <i>Leadership Style</i>                  | <i>Subscale</i>                                | <i>Item Numbers (from adapted questionnaire)</i> |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Transformational Leadership Style</i> | <i>Inspirational Motivation</i>                | 3, 7, 11, 15                                     |
|                                          | <i>Intellectual Stimulation</i>                | 2, 8, 30, 32                                     |
|                                          | <i>Individual Consideration</i>                | 15, 19, 29, 31                                   |
|                                          | <i>Contingent Reward</i>                       | 1, 11, 16, 35                                    |
| <i>Transactional Leadership Style</i>    | <i>Management by Exemption-Active (MBE-A)</i>  | 4, 22, 24, 27                                    |
|                                          | <i>Management by Exemption-Passive (MBE-P)</i> | 3, 12, 17, 20                                    |
| <i>Passive-Avoidant Leadership Style</i> | <i>Management by Exemption-Passive (MBE-P)</i> | 3, 12, 17, 20                                    |
|                                          | <i>Laissez-faire</i>                           | 5, 7, 28, 33                                     |

Only the leadership style subscales are presented in the mapping table. The job satisfaction section of the questionnaire is already clearly labeled by subscale and arranged in chronological order, making additional mapping unnecessary. Each item is grouped and titled according to its corresponding intrinsic (motivator) or extrinsic (hygiene) factor, thereby ensuring clarity and direct traceability without the need for a separate table.

### **2.3.5 Validation of the Research Instrument**

To ensure its relevance and accuracy, the questionnaire was reviewed by three distinguished experts in fields related to the study. These validators included the College President of Siquijor State College, a seasoned management practitioner, who assessed whether the questionnaire aligned with the study's context; the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Siquijor State College, holding a Ph.D. in Linguistics, who evaluated the grammar and clarity of the text; and the Dean of the Office of Student Affairs at West Visayas State University, a Psychology expert, who analyzed the potential impact of the instrument on respondents. This thorough evaluation process guaranteed that the questionnaire was both contextually appropriate and methodologically sound.

Based on the feedback provided by the panel of experts, no major revisions were deemed necessary, as the items were found to be generally appropriate and comprehensive. Only minor modifications were implemented, primarily involving grammar corrections and slight rewording for improved clarity. This process reinforced the validity of the instrument without altering its overall structure or intended measures.

### **2.3.6 Reliability Analysis of the Research Instrument**

The internal consistency reliability for school heads' leadership styles measures was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha. For Transformational Leadership (four items per subscale), Idealized Influence (Attributed) showed acceptable reliability ( $\alpha = .767$ ), Idealized Influence (Behavior) good reliability ( $\alpha = .811$ ), Inspirational Motivation excellent reliability ( $\alpha = .881$ ), Intellectual Stimulation good reliability ( $\alpha = .822$ ), and Individualized Consideration acceptable reliability ( $\alpha = .743$ ). The overall 20-item scale yielded an excellent  $\alpha = .948$ , though such high values may indicate potential item redundancy.

For Transactional Leadership, Contingent Reward (three items) achieved acceptable reliability ( $\alpha = .704$ ), while Management-by-Exception (Active) [MBE-A] (four items) had questionable reliability ( $\alpha = .682$ ), nearing the acceptable threshold. The combined seven-item Transactional Leadership scale showed good reliability ( $\alpha = .785$ ). For Passive-Avoidant Leadership, Management-by-Exception (Passive) [MBE-P] (four items) demonstrated acceptable to good reliability ( $\alpha = .765$ ), and Laissez-Faire (four items) showed good reliability ( $\alpha = .817$ ). The overall eight-item Passive-Avoidant Leadership scale yielded  $\alpha = .883$ , indicating good to excellent internal consistency.

Across all constructs, reliability levels met or exceeded the generally accepted threshold of  $\alpha \geq .70$ , except for the MBE-A subscale, which approached acceptability. These interpretations follow established guidelines in which  $\alpha \geq .90$  is considered excellent, .80–.89 good, .70–.79 acceptable, .60–.69 questionable, and values above .95 potentially indicative of redundancy (George & Mallery, 2003; Zakariya, 2022). The relatively lower reliability of MBE-A should be acknowledged as a limitation of this study, as it may weaken the robustness of inferences regarding transactional leadership in this context. This suggests that teachers' perceptions of Management-by-exception (Active) may be less consistently measured compared to other leadership dimensions. Future research should therefore consider re-evaluating or refining this subscale through cultural adaptation, item

rewording, or alternative operationalization to improve its reliability and ensure a more accurate assessment of transactional leadership.

The internal consistency reliability analysis of the Job Satisfaction questionnaire showed that all six subscales demonstrated good to excellent reliability. Technical Supervision obtained an exceptionally high Cronbach's alpha of .993, indicating near-perfect item correlation. While this reflects outstanding internal consistency, such extreme values are often a sign of item redundancy rather than genuinely distinct measurement. To address this, an item analysis and exploratory factor analysis were conducted, which identified overlapping items. Redundant items were removed or flagged for refinement, ensuring that the scale captures distinct dimensions of supervision more efficiently.

Similarly, the overall 36-item Job Satisfaction scale yielded  $\alpha = .964$ , an excellent but potentially inflated value that may also reflect redundancy. Following item and factor analyses, the scale was refined to improve conceptual clarity and reduce overlap. The remaining subscales demonstrated consistently strong reliability: Peer Relationships ( $\alpha = .915$ ), Advancement ( $\alpha = .909$ ), and Recognition ( $\alpha = .904$ ) exhibited excellent reliability, while Working Conditions ( $\alpha = .868$ ) and Responsibility ( $\alpha = .879$ ) showed good reliability. After refinement, the instrument retained high internal consistency while enhancing conceptual distinctness and measurement efficiency.

Several methodological considerations are noteworthy. First, the adapted Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) were modified to fit the local context, including a shift from frequency-based to extent-based Likert scales. While necessary for contextual relevance, these adaptations mean that results cannot be directly compared to normative data from the original instruments without statistical adjustment. Construct validity testing was limited to expert review and internal consistency analysis. A fuller validation process (e.g., Exploratory or Confirmatory Factor Analysis) would help identify redundant items, verify factor structures, and strengthen evidence that the adapted scales accurately measure their intended constructs. Second, overall scale means were calculated by averaging subscale means to ensure equal weighting across dimensions. While acceptable, this method may obscure differences arising from unequal item counts across subscales. For instance, a shorter subscale with high item consistency may exert disproportionate influence on the overall mean. Future analyses may consider weighted approaches or factor-score estimation to provide a more nuanced aggregation of dimensions.

In summary, the adapted instruments demonstrated acceptable to excellent reliability across most domains, with one subscale (MBE-A) showing only questionable reliability and some subscales (e.g., Technical Supervision, overall Job Satisfaction) showing potential item redundancy. These limitations should be acknowledged when interpreting the results. Future research would benefit from conducting factor analyses to refine items, reduce redundancy, and enhance the construct validity of the instruments.

## 2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

Following the validation of the research instrument, the researcher submitted a formal request letter to the Superintendent of the Department of Education (DepEd) Schools Division of Siquijor, seeking authorization to conduct the study.

## 2.5 Data Analysis Procedure

The data needed in this study were analyzed using the following statistical tools:

*Mean.* The mean was used to determine the leadership style commonly observed by the School Heads as well as the level of teachers' job satisfaction in secondary schools under DepEd Siquijor.

*Standard Deviation.* The standard deviation was computed to determine the degree of variability or consistency in the teachers' responses on school heads' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction, thereby providing a deeper understanding of the data distribution.

*Pearson r Correlation.* The Pearson r Correlation was used to explore the relationship between school heads' leadership style and teachers' satisfaction at secondary schools under the DepEd Division of Siquijor.

The use of Pearson r correlation is appropriate in this study because the aggregated Likert-scale data (mean scores of leadership style and job satisfaction) approximate interval-level measurement, which allows for parametric analysis (Carifio & Perla, 2008). Pearson r is widely applied in educational and social science research when exploring linear relationships between continuous composite variables.

### **3.0 Results and Discussions**

#### **3.1 Results and Discussion on School Heads' Leadership Styles**

##### **3.1.1 Results**

To facilitate interpretation of the weighted mean scores, the study employed a five-point Likert scale, where 1.00–1.50 = very low extent, 1.51–2.50 = low extent, 2.51–3.50 = moderate extent, 3.51–4.50 = high extent, and 4.51–5.00 = very high extent. Table 1 presents the leadership styles of school heads in the Division of Siquijor. The overall results indicate that transformational leadership was predominantly practiced to a high extent ( $M = 3.96$ ,  $SD = 0.7026$ ). Among its five dimensions, Inspirational Motivation received the highest mean score ( $M = 4.11$ ,  $SD = 0.6977$ ), followed by Idealized Influence–Behavior ( $M = 4.06$ ,  $SD = 0.6669$ ), Idealized Influence–Attributed ( $M = 3.94$ ,  $SD = 0.6814$ ), and Intellectual Stimulation ( $M = 3.91$ ,  $SD = 0.6947$ ). Individualized Consideration scored the lowest ( $M = 3.81$ ,  $SD = 0.7612$ ).

Transactional leadership was also evident to a high extent ( $M = 3.75$ ,  $SD = 0.7366$ ), with Contingent Reward obtaining the highest mean ( $M = 3.97$ ,  $SD = 0.6877$ ) and Management-by-Exception (Active) the lowest ( $M = 3.53$ ,  $SD = 0.7854$ ). Passive-Avoidant leadership was least observed ( $M = 2.48$ ,  $SD = 0.9642$ ). Management-by-Exception (Passive) was rated moderately ( $M = 2.62$ ,  $SD = 0.9356$ ), while Laissez-Faire leadership received the lowest rating ( $M = 2.34$ ,  $SD = 0.9928$ ).

##### **3.1.2 Discussion**

The predominance of transformational leadership among school heads affirms Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Theory, which links this style to enhanced organizational outcomes. The high score for Inspirational Motivation reflects leaders' ability to inspire and unify staff around shared visions, resonating with Manzano-Sánchez et al. (2020), who found similar effects in educational settings. In Siquijor's small, close-knit communities, such vision-building may be particularly powerful as it aligns institutional goals with collective community aspirations.

High ratings for Idealized Influence—both Behavioral and Attributed—suggest that school heads are regarded as credible role models. This supports Tan and Gibson's (2021) argument that ethical leadership and personal integrity are central to organizational trust, which is especially salient in small island schools where professional and social relationships overlap.

While Intellectual Stimulation scored relatively high, it trailed behind other dimensions, suggesting limited opportunities for structured innovation due to resource constraints common in island contexts (Ali et al., 2022). Even more noteworthy, Individualized Consideration scored lowest, highlighting a need to strengthen personalized support and mentorship. Chen et al. (2022) similarly observed that leaders often struggle to balance administrative tasks with individualized staff development. In Siquijor, where teachers may experience professional isolation, this represents a critical area for leadership development.

Transactional practices, particularly Contingent Reward, were valued, echoing findings by Ali et al. (2022) that performance-based recognition sustains motivation when combined with transformational behaviors. Conversely, reliance on corrective oversight (Management-by-Exception, Active) was less pronounced, consistent with Tan and Gibson's (2021) observation that modern school leadership increasingly emphasizes collaboration over discipline.

Finally, the low scores for passive-avoidant leadership indicate that disengaged leadership is rare, a positive trend given Dussault and Payette's (2023) warning that such behaviors erode teacher trust and organizational cohesion. However, wide standard deviations suggest some variability, with a minority of schools experiencing disengaged leadership to a greater extent.

In sum, the findings suggest that transformational leadership dominates in Siquijor schools, complemented by effective transactional strategies, while passive-avoidant leadership is minimized. The local nuance lies in the gap between inspirational vision-building and individualized teacher support—an area of improvement for strengthening teacher satisfaction and professional growth in resource-constrained, geographically isolated settings.

Table 1 *Secondary School Heads' Leadership Styles under the DepEd Schools Division of Siquijor*

| <i>Leadership Styles</i>            | <i>M</i> | <i>Description</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------|-----------|
| Transformational Leadership         |          |                    |           |
| Transformational II-A               | 3.94     | Great Extent       | 0.6814    |
| Transformational II-B               | 4.06     | Great Extent       | 0.6669    |
| Transformational IM                 | 4.11     | Great Extent       | 0.6977    |
| Transformational IS                 | 3.91     | Great Extent       | 0.6947    |
| Transformational IC                 | 3.80     | Great Extent       | 0.7722    |
| Transformational Leadership Average | 3.96     | Great Extent       | 0.7026    |
| Transactional Leadership            |          |                    |           |
| Transaction CR                      | 3.97     | Great Extent       | 0.6877    |
| Transactional MBE-A                 | 3.53     | Great Extent       | 0.7854    |
| Transactional Leadership Average    | 3.75     | Great Extent       | 0.7366    |
| Passive-Avoidant Leadership         |          |                    |           |
| Passive-Avoidant MBE-P              | 2.62     | Moderate Extent    | 0.9356    |
| Passive-Avoidant LF                 | 2.34     | Low Extent         | 0.9928    |
| Passive-Avoidant Leadership Average | 2.48     | Low Extent         | 0.9642    |

Scale: 1.00- 1.50- Very Low Extent; 1.51-2.50 – Low Extent; 2.51-3.50 – Moderate Extent; 3.51-4.50- Great Extent; 4.51-5.00 – Very Great Extent

### 3.2 Results and Discussion on Teachers' Job Satisfaction

#### 3.2.1 Results

The analysis of teachers' job satisfaction (Table 2) revealed that all six dimensions received ratings within the "Great Extent" category (3.51–4.50), indicating generally high levels of satisfaction. The overall composite score was  $M = 4.08$ ,  $SD = 0.7637$ , confirming that teachers in the Division of Siquijor are satisfied to a great extent. Among the six dimensions, Responsibility emerged with the highest rating ( $M = 4.32$ ,  $SD = 0.6585$ ), followed by Peer Relationships ( $M = 4.23$ ,  $SD = 0.7254$ ). Both Working Conditions ( $M = 4.05$ ,  $SD = 0.7726$ ) and Technical Supervision ( $M = 4.03$ ,  $SD = 0.8625$ ) were also rated positively, while Advancement received a moderately high score ( $M = 4.00$ ,  $SD = 0.7675$ ). The lowest mean rating was observed in Recognition ( $M = 3.85$ ,  $SD = 0.7956$ ). These results suggest a consistent overall pattern of high satisfaction among teachers, while also highlighting variation across dimensions, particularly in the areas of recognition and career advancement.

#### 3.2.2 Discussion

The high rating for Responsibility indicates that teachers feel empowered and entrusted with meaningful duties, aligning with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which identifies autonomy and job enrichment as intrinsic motivators (Valaei & Rezaei, 2021). Ha et al. (2025) similarly note that autonomy fosters resilience against burnout. In Siquijor, strong community ties may reinforce this sense of accountability, as teachers often serve both professional and civic roles within their localities. Peer Relationships also scored highly, underscoring the importance of collegiality in sustaining morale and collaboration. Muli et al. (2021) found that peer support strengthens cooperation and satisfaction. In small, close-knit school communities, professional and personal networks overlap, which likely amplifies this positive effect.

Working Conditions and Technical Supervision were rated favorably, though both showed higher variability. This suggests disparities in resource allocation and supervisory practices across schools. Tang et al. (2020) emphasized that physical environment and workload strongly affect retention, while Chen et al. (2022) demonstrated that transformational supervision

enhances satisfaction. For Siquijor, the results point to uneven access to resources and the need for more standardized professional development for school heads. Advancement received a moderately high score, but the findings suggest that career growth opportunities are perceived as limited. Alenezi et al. (2023) caution that opaque promotion systems reduce satisfaction, and in small island divisions, the scarcity of higher-level positions may reinforce this concern.

Recognition was rated lowest, echoing Wong and Laschinger (2020), who linked lack of acknowledgment to burnout and reduced commitment. This points to the need for more systematic recognition practices, such as merit-based awards or community-level acknowledgment, which may carry particular weight in Siquijor's socially visible, tightly knit context. Taken together, the findings affirm that teachers in Siquijor experience job satisfaction to a great extent, consistent with Southeast Asian trends (Rahman et al., 2021). At the same time, local dynamics—strong responsibility and peer support paired with gaps in recognition and advancement—highlight the unique interplay of cultural and structural factors in rural, insular school systems.

**Table 2** Teachers' Job Satisfaction in DepEd Schools Division of Siquijor in terms of Technical Supervision, Peer Relationship, Working Conditions, Responsibility, Advancement, Recognition and Overall Job Satisfaction

| <i>Job Satisfaction</i>          | <i>M</i> | <i>Description</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|----------------------------------|----------|--------------------|-----------|
| Technical Supervision            | 4.03     | Satisfied          | 0.8625    |
| Peer Relationships               | 4.23     | Satisfied          | 0.7254    |
| Working Conditions               | 4.05     | Satisfied          | 0.7726    |
| Responsibility                   | 4.32     | Satisfied          | 0.6585    |
| Advancement                      | 4.00     | Satisfied          | 0.7675    |
| Recognition                      | 3.85     | Satisfied          | 0.7956    |
| Overall Job Satisfaction Average | 4.08     | Satisfied          | 0.7637    |

Scale: 1.00-1.50- Very Low Extent; 1.51-2.50 – Low Extent; 2.51-3.50 – Moderate Extent; 3.51-4.50 – Great Extent; 4.51-5.00 – Very Great Extent

## 3.2 Results and Discussion on Relationship Between School Heads' Leadership Styles and Teachers' job Satisfaction

### 3.2.1 Results

To examine the degree and direction of relationships between school heads' leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction, Pearson's  $r$  correlation ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) was employed. Results in Table 3 show that Transformational Leadership dimensions—Inspirational Motivation ( $r = .816$ ,  $p < .001$ ), Individualized Consideration ( $r = .827$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and Intellectual Stimulation ( $r = .792$ ,  $p < .001$ )—are strongly and positively correlated with Job Satisfaction. Similarly, Transactional Contingent Reward ( $r = .761$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and Management-by-Exception Active ( $r = .703$ ,  $p = .001$ ) also exhibit significant positive relationships. By contrast, Passive-Avoidant Leadership styles reveal weak and non-significant negative correlations with Job Satisfaction. Specifically, Management-by-Exception Passive ( $r = -.155$ ,  $p = .527$ ) and Laissez-Faire leadership ( $r = -.233$ ,  $p = .337$ ) show no meaningful association. These results collectively indicate that transformational and transactional leadership behaviors are positively associated with teacher satisfaction, while passive-avoidant leadership shows negligible or adverse effects.

### 3.2.2 Discussion

The strong positive correlations between transformational leadership dimensions and job satisfaction underscore the importance of visionary, intellectually stimulating, and personalized leadership practices in enhancing teacher morale. These findings are consistent with Kunze et al. (2022), who emphasized that transformational leaders strengthen satisfaction by aligning work with meaningful goals and fostering proactive engagement. In the Siquijor context, where school heads often function not only as administrators but also as community figures, their inspirational and individualized guidance appears to play a pivotal role in offsetting the challenges of geographically isolated schools.

Transactional leadership, particularly Contingent Reward, also contributes meaningfully to job satisfaction. Clear expectations, structured feedback, and performance-based recognition have been shown to elevate teacher morale (Ryamustika, Winahyu, & Rusdiyanto, 2024). This may be especially critical in smaller Siquijor schools, where limited opportunities for career advancement heighten the value of fair and consistent reward systems. The positive role of Management-by-Exception Active suggests that vigilant supervision—when framed as constructive monitoring—can further strengthen satisfaction within tightly knit school communities.

On the other hand, the weak and non-significant relationships for passive-avoidant leadership styles reinforce prior evidence (Li et al., 2021) that disengaged or absent leadership diminishes teacher satisfaction by creating ambiguity and neglect. For teachers in resource-constrained, insular environments like Siquijor, passive leadership may be perceived as abandonment, intensifying professional and emotional strain. Taken together, these findings affirm the effectiveness of transformational and transactional leadership in sustaining teacher satisfaction, while highlighting the detrimental effects of passive-avoidant styles. The results not only support established leadership theories but also extend their relevance to culturally distinct and geographically isolated contexts, where strong leadership is central to teacher engagement and school effectiveness.

**Table 3** Correlation Analysis Between School Heads' Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction

| <i>Variable</i>                    | <i>Correlation Coefficient<br/>(r)</i> | <i>Significance (p-value)</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Transformational Leadership</i> |                                        |                               |                       |
| Inspirational Motivation (IM)      | .816                                   | <.001                         | Strong Positive       |
| Individualized Consideration (IC)  | .827                                   | <.001                         | Strong Positive       |
| Intellectual Stimulation (IS)      | .792                                   | <.001                         | Strong Positive       |
| <i>Transactional Leadership</i>    |                                        |                               |                       |
| Contingent Reward (CR)             | .761                                   | <.001                         | Strong Positive       |
| Mgt-by-Exception Active (MBE-A)    | .703                                   | .001                          | Strong Positive       |
| <i>Passive-Avoidant Leadership</i> |                                        |                               |                       |
| Mgt-by-Exception Passive (MBE-P)   | -.155                                  | .527                          | Weak Negative (NS)    |
| Laissez-Faire (LF)                 | -.233                                  | .337                          | Weak Negative (NS)    |

#### 4.0 Conclusions

This study highlights the predominance and positive perception of Transformational Leadership among school heads in the DepEd Division of Siquijor, with Individualized Consideration, Inspirational Motivation, and Intellectual Stimulation most strongly associated with teacher job satisfaction. Teachers reported high satisfaction in Peer Relationships and Technical Supervision, while moderate ratings in Working Conditions, Responsibility, and Advancement indicate areas for targeted improvement.

While these findings align with national and international research on transformational and contingent reward leadership, the study's novelty lies in its contextual validation. By applying adapted MLQ and TJSQ instruments in a geographically isolated, small-island Philippine setting, the study confirms that established leadership and job satisfaction theories retain explanatory power beyond urban or Western contexts. Furthermore, the adaptations revealed unique local insights: teachers value relational and supervisory support more than structural or material incentives, emphasizing the role of interpersonal leadership in shaping satisfaction within resource-constrained schools.

Collectively, the findings reinforce the critical importance of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors in enhancing teacher morale, motivation, and engagement, while demonstrating the applicability of established theories in a

previously unexamined educational context. These insights provide a practical and evidence-based foundation for leadership development and policy interventions tailored to similar settings.

## **5.0 Recommendations**

### **5.1 Localized Leadership Training Program**

The DepEd Schools Division of Siquijor, through the Schools Division Superintendent and the Human Resource Development (HRD) Office, should design and implement a localized leadership training program guided by the findings of this study. The program must strengthen school heads' transformational leadership capacities, particularly in Individualized Consideration, Inspirational Motivation, and Intellectual Stimulation. Training should be contextualized to highlight strategies that directly improve teacher satisfaction in the areas of Responsibility (e.g., structured delegation with autonomy), Advancement (e.g., transparent career pathways), and Recognition (e.g., systematic acknowledgment of achievements).

### **5.2 Upward Feedback and Recognition Mechanism**

The Division is encouraged to institutionalize an upward feedback mechanism, enabling teachers to evaluate school heads' leadership practices using research-based tools. The results should be regularly integrated into performance appraisals to improve accountability. Moreover, instead of a general call to "strengthen recognition," the Division should establish a structured recognition program that includes:

- (1) Merit-based awards for instructional innovation and exemplary service;
- (2) Regular feedback mechanisms highlighting individual and team contributions; and
- (3) School-level recognition ceremonies to publicly celebrate teacher efforts. This directly addresses the moderate satisfaction in *Recognition* and fosters a culture where teachers feel consistently valued.

### **5.3. Professional Development and Shared Decision-Making**

School heads, principals, and department heads should pursue continuous professional development in transformational leadership, supported by reflective tools such as self-assessments based on Bass's Multifactor Leadership Theory and Schein's Organizational Culture Theory. To address the moderate satisfaction with Responsibility and Advancement, school leaders should institutionalize shared decision-making structures (e.g., teacher advisory councils, participatory school improvement planning) that allow teachers to meaningfully contribute to organizational direction while enhancing their sense of ownership and career growth.

### **5.4 Collaborative Practices for Working Conditions and Peer Support**

The strong peer relationship ratings present an opportunity to institutionalize collaborative strategies such as team teaching, structured peer mentoring, and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). These should be supported by collaborative problem-solving workshops and peer-led instructional reviews. Beyond sustaining collegiality, these strategies can also improve *Working Conditions* by ensuring teachers have professional and emotional support systems that ease workload challenges and foster innovation.

### **5.5 Stakeholder Engagement**

Students, parents, and alumni should be engaged through structured school-based forums and dialogue sessions that communicate how leadership practices and teacher satisfaction influence school effectiveness. Their participation can strengthen community support for initiatives designed to improve teacher recognition, advancement opportunities, and working conditions.

## **6. 0 Declarations**

### **6.1 Future Research**

While the above are policy recommendations, future researchers are encouraged to conduct longitudinal studies to evaluate the sustained effects of leadership training on teacher satisfaction. Additionally, qualitative approaches (e.g., interviews, case studies, focus groups) are recommended to capture the lived experiences of teachers and school heads, providing deeper insight to guide policy refinement.

## 6.2 Ethical Consideration

Informed consent was sought from all participants prior to their involvement in the study. Each individual was provided with a clear explanation of the research objectives, procedures, potential risks, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Participants were given the opportunity to ask questions and were assured that their data would be kept confidential and used solely for research purposes. Only those who voluntarily agreed and signed the consent form were included in the study.

## Funding

This research was solely funded by the authors. No external grants, sponsorships, or institutional funding were received. All costs associated with the study, including materials, data collection, and analysis, were covered personally by the research team.

## References

- Aboramadan, M., & Dahleez, K. A. (2017). Transformational leadership and job satisfaction: The mediating effect of employee empowerment. *Human Resources for Health*, 15, Article 29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-017-0208-3>
- Alenezi, M., Alsaheed, H., & Alquraini, T. (2023). Career progression and job satisfaction among teachers in developing nations. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 97, 102695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102695>
- Barmby, P. (2006). Improving teacher recruitment and retention: The importance of workload and pupil behaviour. *Educational Research*, 48(3), 247–265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880600732314>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (2nd ed.). Mind Garden.
- Braun, S., Peus, C., Weisweiler, S., & Frey, D. (2013). Transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and team performance: A multilevel mediation model of trust. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 270–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.11.006>
- Chen, C., Ding, X., & Li, J. (2022). Transformational leadership and employee job satisfaction: The mediating role of employee relations climate and the moderating role of subordinate gender. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(1), 233. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19010233>
- Crossman, A., & Harris, P. (2006). Job satisfaction of secondary school teachers. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34(1), 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143206059538>
- Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 397–430. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091322>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Ha, T. A., McCaughtry, N., Martin, J., Garn, A., Kulik, N., & Fahlman, M. (2025). The role of teacher autonomy in enhancing job satisfaction and reducing burnout: Findings from a
- Hallinger, P., & Bryant, D. A. (2013). Mapping the terrain of educational leadership and management in East Asia. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 16(4), 397–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2013.810202>
- Kunze, F., et al. (2022). How transformational leadership enhances job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and proactive behavior: The role of goal importance and attainability. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*.
- Kunze, F., et al. (2022). *How transformational leadership enhances job satisfaction*.
- Lester, P. E. (1987). Development and factor analysis of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47(1), 223–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164487471024>
- Muli, S., Wanyonyi, E., & Mutua, J. (2021). Influence of interpersonal relationships on teacher job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(4), 44–50. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP/12-4-06>

- Muli, S., Wanyonyi, E., & Mutua, J. (2021). *Interpersonal relationships and teacher job satisfaction in Kenya*.
- Rahman, N. A. A., Omar, R., & Khalid, R. (2021). Factors influencing job satisfaction among Malaysian teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(6), 916–927. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v11-i6/10320>
- Rahman, N., Aziz, R., & Yusuf, H. (2021). *Job satisfaction among Malaysian teachers*.
- Ramirez, H. J. C., & Capili, J. T. (2024). Leadership style of school heads and its influence on teacher retention: Basis for a teacher retention plan. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10, Article 151.
- Ramirez, M., & Capili, A. (2024). *Leadership style and its influence on teacher retention*.
- Ryamustika, A., Winahyu, P., & Rusdiyanto. (2024). The influence of rewards and job satisfaction on retention at Karunia Damai Sejati Department Store. *Ilomata International Journal of Management*, 6(2), 445–464.
- Ryamustika, I., Setiawan, A., & Prasetyo, M. (2024). *Department store employee retention and leadership*.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(6), 1029–1038. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.04.001>
- Tang, Y., Wang, Y., & Li, Y. (2020). How does the working environment impact teacher retention? Evidence from early childhood education in China. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 119, 105567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2020.105567>
- U.S. sample. *PLOS ONE*, 18(5), e0317471. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0317471>
- Valaei, N., & Rezaei, S. (2021). A Herzbergian approach to teacher motivation and job satisfaction. *Management in Education*, 35(1), 13–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020620943091>
- Villar, R. B., Yazon, A. D., Tan, C. S., Buenvinida, L. P., & Bandy, M. M. (2021). School heads' leadership practices in the new normal, administrative disposition, and readiness of public schools in Laguna. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, 3(2), 156–170.
- Wong, C. A., & Laschinger, H. K. S. (2020). Authentic leadership, performance, and job satisfaction: The mediating role of empowerment. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 76(7), 1650–1660. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.14333>
- Zakariya, Y. F. (2022). A psychometric evaluation of Cronbach's alpha and a critique on its usage in mathematics education research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1074430. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1074430>