



PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS IN RELATION TO SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT IN SELECTED PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN CEBU CITY

Liza Chua

uc.lchua@gmail.com

St. Paul University Surigao

ORCID: 0000-0003-2489-2608

Glenn R. Andrin

drandringlenn@gmail.com

St. Paul University Surigao

ORCID: 0000-0002-3008-5661

Anna Kathrina O. Watin

oaminal.watin@gmail.com

St. Paul University Surigao

ORCID: 0000-0002-4689-9184

Melvin M. Niñal

melvin.ninal@spus.edu.ph

St. Paul University Surigao

ORCID: 0000-0002-8140-5012

Pablita C. Ravelo

pablita@polaristransport.com

St. Paul University Surigao

ORCID: 0000-0003-3868-9918

Earl Dave V. Rocha

earl.uc@gmail.com

St. Paul University Surigao

ORCID: 0000-0002-7286-1673

Article history:

Received: July 6th 2021
Accepted: August 7th 2021
Published: September 16th 2021

Abstract:

Principals are considered the pilots in attaining to what the school has envisioned to succeed. Highly effective school principals are vital in initiating, innovating, implementing and sustaining the school success (Tucker & Coddling, 2002). Leithwood et. al. (2008) averred that as leaders, they significantly impact the overall organizational performance. While the crucial functions of principals across the globe have remained unmodified over the years, their essential roles have shifted drastically (Hull, 2012). From building managers, carrying out regulations, adhering to district rules, and avoiding mistakes, they shifted to being instructional leaders equipped with skills in developing a team of teachers, who bestow effective instruction to students (Krasnoff et. al., 2015).

Keywords: Principals, leadership, employment

INTRODUCTION

Principals are considered the pilots in attaining to what the school has envisioned to succeed. Highly effective school principals are vital in initiating, innovating, implementing and sustaining the school success (Tucker & Coddling, 2002). Leithwood et. al. (2008) averred that as leaders, they significantly impact the overall organizational performance. While the crucial functions of principals across the globe have remained unmodified over the years, their essential roles have shifted drastically (Hull, 2012). From building managers, carrying out regulations, adhering to district rules, and avoiding mistakes, they shifted to being instructional leaders equipped with skills in developing a team of teachers, who bestow effective instruction to students (Krasnoff et. al., 2015).

In the Philippine context, the increase in the size of schools at all levels attributed to its ever-growing population, enlarged curriculum due to the implementation of K to 12 Curriculum, employment of more teachers are among the factors that adversely affect of effectiveness of school principals' leadership. These existing challenges made the duties of a school principal even more complicated. Likewise, some of the principals in the entire archipelago may have less experience since the seasoned principals were no longer available for other schools. This scenario is similarly true in Cebu City where few schools are encountering more difficulties and conflicts than others which this can be ascribed to the principals' level of leadership effectiveness

Grant (2011) ilucidated that as the responsibilities of principals rise in complexity and quantity along with the accountability pressure for improved student learning, they tend to experience difficulty in leading the school. Hence, school principals must be armed with leadership skills, strategies and appropriate behavior to meet the tumultuous challenges in school (Yukl,2008). Effective school principals assume an active role in instructional and organizational processes of schools (Demoss, 2002; Mulford & Moreno, 2006).

Researchers investigated that highly effective school principals can raise the achievement of students while ineffective school principals lower students' achievements (Branch et al., 2013). Effective school principals can influence the school outcomes through their: motivation and recruitment of caliber teachers (Hornig et. al., 2010), effective allocation of resources; ability to specify and articulate school vision including the specific goals (Porter et. al., 2008); and development and initiatives on organizational structures that support instruction and learning (Knapp et. al., 2010).

This study aims to determine the principals' leadership effectiveness in relation to school's achievement. Specifically, it intends to determine the following: respondents' profile in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment and number of years in teaching; level of effectiveness of the principal as assessed by the teacher respondents in the context of instructional program, staff personnel administration; student personnel administration; financial and physical resources, and school community relations; and level of school achievement as measured by the National Achievement Test (NAT) result. Thereafter, this study likewise intends to ascertain the: relationship between the respondents' profile and their perceived leadership effectiveness of the principal; relationship between the principals' leadership effectiveness and school achievement; and the variance on the five dimensions of principals' leadership effectiveness.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed quantitative method utilizing convenient-purposive sampling technique in the selection of the respondents. This study adhered to the descriptive-normative design, a fact-finding investigation with sufficient interpretation (Creswell, 2009). It made use of documentary analysis since the data on the school performance based on NAT results were already made available on file at the administrators' offices. The Principals' Leadership Effectiveness Inventory (PLEI) by Ibukun et. al. (2011) was adopted to aid the teacher respondents in assessing the principal's leadership effectiveness.

This study involved a total of 691 respondents, who were the teachers from the 12 selected public schools in Cebu City as follows: Banilad Elementary School, Barrio Luz Elementary School, Basak Community Elementary School, Camp LapuLapu Elementary School, Camputhaw Elementary School, Don Vicente Rama Memorial Elementary School, Labangon Bliss Elementary School, Mabolo Elementary School, Pardo Elementary School, San Nicolas Elementary School, Tejero Elementary School, and Zapatera Elementary School.

Descriptive statistics were utilized in the presentation and analysis of the teacher respondents' profile and their assessment of the principals' leadership effectiveness. Moreover, the Chi-square was used to ascertain the significant degree of relationship between profile and perceived leadership effectiveness. The used the Pearson r Product Moment Correlation aided in establishing the significant degree of relationship between perceived principals' leadership effectiveness and school achievement. Likewise, ANOVA was used to ascertain the significant degree of variance on the five dimensions of leadership effectiveness.

Before the administration of the instrument, the permit to conduct the study was secured from the Department of Education in Cebu City. Armed with the permit, the researcher made an arrangement with the administrators of the school vis-à-vis the data and venue of the administration of the questionnaires. On the scheduled date, the researcher administered the questionnaire. Retrieval of documents was done immediately after the administration. In some cases, arrangement on a case-to-case basis was made by the administrators.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondents' Profile

The table 1 below depicts the demographics of the teacher respondents with respect to their school affiliation, age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment and lenght of service.

Table 1. Respondents' Profile

Variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
School	Pardo Elementary School	115	16.64 %
	Don Vicente Rama Memorial Elementary School	89	12.88 %
	Tejero Elementary School	79	11.43 %
	San Nicolas Elementary School	67	9.70 %
	Basak Community School	63	9.12 %
	Labangon Bliss Elementary School	59	8.54 %
	Zapatera Elementary School	56	8.10 %
	Barrio Luz Elementary School	51	7.38 %
	Camp Lapu-lapu Elementary School	42	6.08 %
	Camputhaw Elementary School	28	4.05 %
	Banilad Elementary School	24	3.47 %
	Mabolo Elementary School	18	2.60 %
Age (in years)	18 - 24	26	3.76 %
	25 - 31	97	14.04 %
	32 - 38	180	26.05 %
	39 - 45	174	25.18 %
	46 - 52	126	18.23 %
	53 - 59	67	9.70 %
Sex	60 - 66	21	3.04 %
	Female	632	91.46 %
Civil Status	Male	59	8.54 %
	Single	124	17.95 %
	Married	524	75.83 %
	Widow/Widower	32	4.63 %
Highest Educational Attainment	Annulled/Separated	11	1.59 %
	Bachelor's Degree	482	69.75 %
	Master's Degree	191	27.64 %
Length of Service (in years)	Doctorate Degree	18	2.60 %
	Less than a year	6	0.87 %
	1 - 5	122	17.66 %
	6 - 10	141	20.41 %
	11 - 15	122	17.66 %
	16 - 20	140	20.26 %
21 - 25	79	11.43 %	
More than 25	81	11.72 %	

(n = 691)

Among the 12 selected schools, Pardo Elementary School has the most number of respondents (16.64%), while Mabolo Elementary School has the least respondents of 2.60%. The majority of the respondents were female (91.46%), and married (75.83%). With respect to the respondents' educational qualification, 69.75% of the total respondents obtained bachelor's degree as their highest attainment, while only 2.60% has the doctorate. Regarding the length of service, a majority of the teachers (20.41%) have served 6 to 10 years in their respective schools.

Principals' Leadership Effectiveness in Instructional Program

As assessed by the teacher respondents, the table 2 illustrates the principals' level of leadership effectiveness in terms of instructional program.

Table 2. Level of Principals' Leadership Effectiveness in Instructional Program

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Offering assistance to teachers in the location of teaching materials.	3.22	Effective
2. Helping teachers to develop new instructional materials.	3.15	Effective
3. Offering assistance to teachers in the selection of textbooks for students.	3.09	Effective
4. Coordinating the general instructional activities of teachers.	3.36	Highly Effective
5. Coordinating the presentation of social programs for slow learners.	3.25	Effective
Aggregated Mean	3.21	Effective

n = 691

Legend: 1.00 - 1.75 = Highly Ineffective
 1.76 - 2.50 = Ineffective
 2.51 - 3.25 = Effective
 3.26 - 4.00 = Highly Effective

As depicted on the table, the principals' level of leadership effectiveness pertaining to instructional program has an aggregated mean of 3.21 which is interpreted as effective. This implies that the principals had an exquisite performance in offering assistance to the teacher vis-a-vis in the designing or planning, implementing, and evaluating the changes in the instructional services and programs of the school. Few studies have investigated the teachers' perspectives on characteristics of principals' instructional leadership and its impacts on teachers. The study of Blase and Blase (2000) revealed two emergent themes of effective instructional leadership: promoting professional growth and talking with teachers to promote reflection.

Principals' Leadership Effectiveness in Staff Personnel Administration

As assessed by the teacher respondents, the table 3 underscores the principals' level of leadership effectiveness in terms of staff personnel administration.

Table 3. Level of Principals' Leadership Effectiveness in Staff Personnel Administration

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1 Ensuring that teacher understands their limit to independent action.	3.38	Highly Effective
2 Accepting responsibility for the work he/she delegates to staff.	3.44	Highly Effective
3 Allowing teachers a measure of authority in doing their duties.	3.46	Highly Effective
4 Viewing teacher's attendance to class as critical.	3.67	Highly Effective
5 Checking who does his/her work.	3.54	Highly Effective
6 Assisting staff with personal problems.	3.26	Highly Effective
7 Recruiting staff.	3.23	Effective
Aggregated Mean	3.43	Highly Effective

n = 691

Legend: 1.00 - 1.75 = Highly Ineffective
 1.76 - 2.50 = Ineffective
 2.51 - 3.25 = Effective
 3.26 - 4.00 = Highly Effective

As underscored in table 3, the staff personnel administration leadership effectiveness of the principals accumulated an aggregated mean of 3.43 with an interpretation of highly effective. This implicates that the principals managed and supervised well the school personnel. The principals had able to establish a healthy relationship and ambiance among the personnel in their administration. Beycioglu (2014) elucidated that for a successful manning of school, an educational leader must stimulate a lively environment and employ dynamic approach with teachers. The school head should assume the role of chief source of assistance and inspiration through his guidance, instruction, stimulation, and advice (Ibukun et. al., 2011).

Principals' Leadership Effectiveness in Student Personnel Administration

The table 4 presents the principals' level of leadership effectiveness in terms of student personnel administration as assessed by the teacher respondents.

Table 4. Level of Principals' Leadership Effectiveness in Student Personnel Administration

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Helping teachers to monitor student's progress through examinations.	3.47	Highly Effective
2. Discussing with student regularly concerning their welfare.	3.31	Highly Effective
3. Making himself/herself available for consultation with students.	3.33	Highly Effective
4. Ensuring that students who come late are disciplined.	3.30	Highly Effective
5. Ensuring the orientation of new students in his/her school.	3.33	Highly Effective
6. Showing concern on school performance in examinations.	3.56	Highly Effective
Aggregated Mean	3.38	Highly Effective

n = 691

Legend: 1.00 - 1.75 = Highly Ineffective
 1.76 - 2.50 = Ineffective
 2.51 - 3.25 = Effective
 3.26 - 4.00 = Highly Effective

Results revealed the principals' leadership effectiveness in the context of student personnel administration gained an aggregated mean of 3.8 which is interpreted as highly effective. All its indicators were likewise rated as highly effective. Vivid enough, this can be implied that the principals have fulfilled their responsibilities well in consonance with supervising teachers towards student's progress monitoring, accommodating, disciplining and consulting students regularly concerning their welfare. Studies have investigated that highly effective principals can ameliorate a typical student's achievement in their schools within two to seven months of submitting to school and learning in a school

year. In juxtaposition ineffective principals can deteriorate student’s achievement by the same amount (Branch et al. , 2013).

Principals’ Leadership Effectiveness in Financial and Physical Resources

The table 5 portrays the principals' level of leadership effectiveness in terms of financial and physical resources as assessed by the teacher respondents.

Table 5. Level of Principals’ Leadership Effectiveness in Financial and Physical Resources

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Evaluating the use of physical resources in his/her school.	3.51	Highly Effective
2. Evaluating the use of financial resources in his/her school.	3.52	Highly Effective
3. Obtaining revenue from suitable quarters for his/her school.	3.47	Highly Effective
4. Coordinating money spending to avoid unnecessary expenses.	3.52	Highly Effective
5. Making budget estimates for his/her school.	3.54	Highly Effective
6. Providing immediate replacements to damaged classroom equipment.	3.24	Effective
Aggregated Mean	3.47	Highly Effective

n = 691

Legend:

1.00 - 1.75 = Highly Ineffective

1.76 - 2.50 = Ineffective

2.51 - 3.25 = Effective

3.26 - 4.00 = Highly Effective

The financial and physical resources leadership effectiveness of the principals accumulated a composite mean of 3.47 which can be deduced as highly effective.. The table also revealed that making budget estimates for the school is perceived as highly effective with the highest weighted mean value of 3.54. However, in the context of providing an immediate replacement to damaged classroom equipment was given the least weighted mean value of 3.24 which can still be deduced as effective. Based on this statistics, it can be implied that the principals have fulfilled their role of supervising the physical and financial resources of school. Seashore et al. (2010) reiterated that these crucial responsibilities include purchasing and requisitioning materials and supplies, accounting for school resources, and keeping an inventory of school resources and property.

Principals’ Leadership Effectiveness in School Community Relations

As assessed by the teacher respondents, the table 6 illustrates the principals' level of leadership effectiveness in terms of instructional program.

Table 6. Level of Principals’ Leadership Effectiveness in School Community Relations

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Ensuring good rapport on school-community relations.	3.44	Highly Effective
2. Planning meetings for good relations.	3.50	Highly Effective
3. Understanding of the values of the society in which his/her school operates.	3.42	Highly Effective
4. Listening to advice from members of the society.	3.31	Highly Effective
5. Ensuring regular evaluation of school-community relations of his/her school.	3.40	Highly Effective
6. Involving the community in school projects.	3.50	Highly Effective
Aggregated Mean	3.43	Highly Effective

n = 691

Legend: 1.00 - 1.75 = Highly Ineffective

1.76 - 2.50 = Ineffective

2.51 - 3.25 = Effective

3.26 - 4.00 = Highly Effective

The table 6 illustrates the composite mean of 3.43 which can be deduced as highly effective pertaining to principals' leadership effectiveness in school community relations. All of the indicators were perceived as highly effective by the teacher respondent. These findings implicate that the principals have studied and established understanding on the community in which their school were situated. They initiated and developed cooperation adhering to a democratic procedure. They possessed the needed organizational ability in leading, and understood the existence of unlimited physical and human resources in each community that can be used and organized gearing to the facilitation of effective school-community relation. Ibukun et. al. (2011) asserted that the principals have the responsibilities of informing the community regarding the achievements, needs, and conditions of the school in a regular basis. Furthermore, they should endeavor to maintain student participation in planning and organizing phases of the activities/programs relevant to school community relations.

Schools’ National Achievement Test Results

Table 7 shows the mean performance scores in the National Achievement Test of the selected schools.

Table 7. NAT Performance of the Selected Schools

o.	School	Mean Performance Scores (MPS)					Ave. MPS	Rank
		Filipino	Math	English	Science	AP		
1	Pardo Elementary School	78.31	77.26	73.79	77.00	54.96	72.26	1
2	Labangon Bliss Elementary School	76.67	52.92	79.13	44.14	76.40	65.85	2
3	Barrio Luz Elementary School	71.05	64.91	66.75	62.51	53.74	63.79	3
4	Mabolo Elementary School	71.30	69.41	63.88	55.17	52.82	62.52	4
5	Zapatera Elementary School	70.59	54.90	57.08	48.88	48.78	56.05	5
6	Camp Lapu-lapu Elementary School	68.59	56.05	58.19	48.97	46.82	55.72	6
7	Basak Community School	65.41	56.31	50.87	46.38	50.02	53.80	7
8	Don Vicente Rama Mem. Elem. School	66.56	50.60	55.11	47.91	44.06	52.85	8
9	Banilad Elementary School	66.31	53.17	51.40	42.77	41.05	50.94	9
10	San Nicolas Elementary School	63.75	55.39	47.92	43.22	43.90	50.84	10
11	Camputhaw Elementary School	65.82	43.53	51.17	48.00	40.12	49.73	11
12	Tejero Elementary School	62.03	42.14	46.04	40.27	43.11	46.72	12
	Ave. MPS	68.87	56.38	58.44	50.44	49.6	56.76	
	Rank	1	3	2	4	5		

The table reveals that the composite mean performance scores of the 12 selected schools is 56.76. Among the 12 schools, Pardo Elementary School has the highest average mean performance score of 72.26; while Tejero Elementary School has the lowest average mean performance score of 46.72. Regarding the specific subjects, Filipino has the highest mean performance score of 68.87, and Araling Panlipunan has the lowest mean performance score of 49.65 in the overall ranking. Additionally, the table reveals that Pardo Elementary School is the top performing school in Filipino, Math and Science subjects with mean performance scores of 78.31, 77.26 and 77, respectively. Labangon Bliss Elementary School scores the highest in English and Araling Panlipunan, with MPS values of 79.13 and 76.40, respectively. Tejero Elementary School is consistent as low performing school in the subjects of Filipino, Math, English and Science having mean scores of 62.03, 42.14, 46.04 and 40.27, respectively; while Camputhaw is lowest in Araling Panlipunan with a mean score of 40.12.

Test of Significant Degree of Relationship of the Profile of the Teachers- Respondents and Principal’s Leadership Effectiveness

The table 8 underscores the significant degree of relationship between the profile and the principal’s leadership effectiveness in the context of instructional program

Table 8. Test of Relationship between the Profile of theTeacher Respondents and Principal’s Leadership Effectiveness in the Context of Instructional Program

Variables	Computed Chi-Square	df	Critical value	Significance	Result
A. Instructional Program and					
School	128.183	33	47.400	Significant	Reject Ho
Age	31.470	18	28.869	Significant	Reject Ho
Sex	3.359	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	11.434	9	16.919	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Qualification	2.707	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	24.680	18	28.869	Not Significant	Accept Ho

As presented, the computed Chi-square values of 128.183 at 33 df for school and 31.470 at 18 df for age, respectively result in the rejection of the null hypothesis. Thus, there is a significant degree of relationship between school and instructional program, and between age and instructional program. However, there is no significant relationship between gender, civil status, educational qualification, and the length of service in the context of pnsructional program. As investigated by experts, the relationship between principals’ leadership effectiveness and age is still ambiguous since empirical findings have been mixed over years (Ibukun et. al., 2011). Nevertheless, there waso one study which have bestowed proofs and found that age has no bearing and cannot affect the principals’ leadership and their performance and fulfillment of their responsibilities (Halawah, 2005).

Table 9 displays the significant degree of relationship between the profile and the principal’s leadership effectiveness in the context of staff personnel administration.

Table 9. Test of Relationship between the Profile of the Teacher Respondents and Principal’s Leadership Effectiveness in the Context of Staff Personnel Administration

Variables	Computed Chi-Square	Df	Critical value	Significance	Result
B. Staff Personnel Administration and					
School	107.164	33	47.400	Significant	Reject Ho
Age	33.959	18	28.869	Significant	Reject Ho
Sex	3.863	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	10.781	9	16.919	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Qualification	4.487	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	19.088	18	28.869	Not Significant	Accept Ho

The computed Chi-square values of 107.164 at 33 df for School, and 33.959 at 18 df for age result in the rejection of the null hypothesis. Thus, there is a significant degree of relationship between school and staff personnel administration, and between age and staff personnel administration. Other variables such as gender, civil status, educational qualification and length of service do not result in the rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is no significant degree of relationship among these variables. The Okolo (2001) on evaluating the performance of primary school principals in Nigeria revealed that age has bearing and tend to affect the school leaders’ administrative performance. However, Kiboss and Jemiryott (2014) asserted that the older school leaders or the experienced principals seemed to encounter less difficulties in conformity with administrative responsibilities since have generally spent more years on the job and have been exposed to the intricacies of the different administrative tasks.

Table 10 displays the significant degree of relationship between the profile and the principal’s leadership effectiveness in the context of Student Personnel Administration

Table 10. Test of Relationship between the Profile of the Teacher Respondents and Principal’s Leadership Effectiveness in the Context of Student Personnel Administration

Variables	Computed Chi-Square	Df	Critical value	Significance	Result
C. Student Personnel Administration and					
School	127.248	33	47.400	Significant	Reject Ho
Age	36.755	18	28.869	Significant	Reject Ho
Sex	3.228	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	10.506	9	16.919	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Qualification	3.225	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	17.051	18	28.869	Not Significant	Accept Ho

In the context of Student Personnel Administration of the Principals’ Leadership Effectiveness, Table 10 shows the results from the test of significant degree of relationship. The computed Chi-square value of 127.248 at 33 df results in the rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is a significant degree of relationship between School and Student Personnel Administration. Moreover, there is also a significant degree of relationship between Age and Student Personnel Administration as indicated in the Chi-square value of 36.755 at 18 df. Other variables like gender, civil status, educational qualification and length of service resulted in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Nogay and Beebe (2008) found in their study that female principals demonstrate more superior performance than male principals. Likewise, Lumby and Azaola (2014) confirmed that women performed and fulfilled their duties better than men in their principalship. Bolanle (2013) noted that male principals’ performances were significantly ahead of women being a democratic leaders.

Table 11 reveals the significant degree of relationship between the profile and the principal’s leadership effectiveness in the context of Staff Personnel Administration

Table 11 Test of Relationship between the Profile of the Teacher Respondents and Principal’s Leadership Effectiveness in the Context of Financial and Physical Resources

Variables	Computed Chi-Square	df	Critical value	Significance	Result
D. Financial and Physical Resources					
School	83.759	33	47.400	Significant	Reject Ho
Age	31.311	18	28.869	Significant	Reject Ho
Sex	5.634	3	7.815	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Civil Status	10.118	9	16.919	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Educational Qualification	3.174	6	12.592	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Length of Service	21.979	18	28.869	Not Significant	Accept Ho

Table 13 shows the degree of relationship between the respondents’ profile and the principals’ leadership effectiveness in the context of financial and physical resources. The results revealed that the computed Chi-square values of 83.759 at 33 df for school, and 31.311 at 18 df for age resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis. Hence, there is a significant relationship between school and financial and physical resources, and between age and financial

and physical resources. However, there is no significant relationship established among gender, civil status, educational qualification and length of service, and the effectiveness of the principal to lead the financial and physical resources of the school.

The study carried out by Barter (2001), results disclosed a group of teachers evaluated the female and male principals as equal in thier capabilities, abilities, and personal qualities. Additionally, a comparative study conducted by Adigwu (2004) on the performance of male and female principals in Nigeria, Africa. It unveiled that pertaining to their supervisory roles, both male and female principals acculated above average performance. The male principals' mean average performance was just a few points above the performance of female principals. It was therefore deduced that male principals tend to perform better in supervisory duties as compared to their female principals. This can be implied that it could be due to the notion that the male principals are deemed to possess more control over teachers and students.

Table 12 displays the significant degree of relationship between the profile and the principal’s leadership effectiveness in the context of School – Community Relations

Table 12. Test of Relationship between the Profile of the Teacher Respondents and Principal’s Leadership Effectiveness in the Context of School-Community Relations

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Computed Chi-Square</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Critical value</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Result</i>
E. School Community Relations					
<i>School</i>	<i>106.092</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>47.400</i>	<i>Significant</i>	<i>Reject Ho</i>
<i>Age</i>	<i>31.315</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>28.869</i>	<i>Significant</i>	<i>Reject Ho</i>
<i>Sex</i>	<i>13.652</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>7.815</i>	<i>Significant</i>	<i>Reject Ho</i>
<i>Civil Status</i>	<i>15.141</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>16.919</i>	<i>Not Significant</i>	<i>Accept Ho</i>
<i>Educational Qualification</i>	<i>4.027</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>12.592</i>	<i>Not Significant</i>	<i>Accept Ho</i>
<i>Length of Service</i>	<i>27.838</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>28.869</i>	<i>Not Significant</i>	<i>Accept Ho</i>

In Table 12, the significant degree of relationship between the respondents' profile and the principals' leadership effectiveness regarding school-community relations is revealed. The computed Chi-square values of 106.092 at 33 df for school, 31.315 at 18 df for age, and 13.652 at 3 df for age revealed that the null hypothesis is rejected. The results can be concluded that there is a significant degree of relationship between the principals' effectiveness to lead school-sommunity relations, and the variables investigated. Conversely, there is no significant relationship between the principals' leadership effectiveness in the context of school-community relations, and the variables such as civil status, educational qualification, and length of service. Griffith (2004) argued that experience in leading people is one of the major influences on the kind of principal one is today. In a study by Okolo (2001) on on evaluating the performance of primary school principals in Nigeria, results disclosed that there was, indeed, a significant difference between the performance of primary school leaders in Nigeria with experience duration of 4 to 11 years and those with experience of 20 years and above. Hence, it can be inferred that experience essenatially contributes to difference in school leaders' performances. The Eyike (2001) underscored that principals who underwent in-service trainings and completed them appeared to be more effective compared those who did not. With this, it must be implied that principals who are professionally trained perform their responsibilities better than non-professionals.

Test of Significant Degree of Correlation Between the Principal’s Leadership Effectiveness and School Performance

Table 13 exhibits the significant degree of correlation between the principal’s leadership effectiveness and school performance

Table 13. Test of Relationship between the Principal’s Leadership Effectiveness and School Performance

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Computed Pearson r</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Critical Value</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Result</i>
Principal's Leadership Skills Effectiveness	0.107333	10	0.576	Not Significant	Accept Ho
School Performance					

It is illustrated in Table 15 that the null hypothesis is accepted. This is because computed r-value of 0.107333 is less than the critical r-value with ten df at 0.05 significance level is 0.576. Hence, there is no significant relationship between the principals' leadership effectiveness as perceived by the respondents, and the school performance. Nevertheless, since the principals are considered the pilots in attaining to what the school has envisioned to succeed, Ibukun et. al. (2011) negated that the success of one school along with the improvement of students' learning depends with the effectiveness of the principals' leadership. McKinney et. al. (2015) argued that principals' leadership has bearing on the success of the schools and students. Effective principals tend to have a greater impact on the achievement of student outcomes among high-poverty, minority schools, and low-achieving than principals at less challenging schools (Louis et al., 2010; Leithwood et al., 2004).

Test of Significant Degree of Variance on the Five Dimensionsof the Principal’s Leadership Skills Effectiveness

Table 14 exhibits the significant degree of variance on the five dimensions of the principal’s leadership skills effectiveness

Table 14. Test of Variance among the Five Dimensions of the Principal’s Leadership Skills Effectiveness

Variable	Df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-value	P-value	Significance	Results
A. Instructional Program							
Between Groups	4	28.571	7.143	15.31	0.000	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Groups	3441	1605.378	0.467				
Total	3445	1633.949					
B. Staff Personnel Administration							
Between Groups	6	100.558	16.760	41.23	0.000	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Groups	4796	1949.434	0.406				
Total	4802	2049.991					
C. Student Personnel Administration							
Between Groups	5	38.963	7.793	17.91	0.000	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Groups	4126	1795.109	0.435				
Total	4131	1834.072					
D. Financial and Physical Resources							
Between Groups	5	44.097	8.819	20.37	0.000	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Groups	4116	1781.716	0.433				
Total	4121	1825.813					
E. School Community Relations							
Between Groups	5	17.906	3.581	8.26	0.000	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Groups	4126	1788.175	0.433				
Total	4131	1806.081					

The results showed in table 16 that the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is no significant degree of variance on the five dimensions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness with the computed F-values at 0.05 significance level for instructional program, staff personnel administration, student personnel administration, financial and physical resources, and school-community relations are 15.31, 41.23, 17.91, 20.37, and 8.26, respectively. Thus, it could be deduced that the teacher respondents perceived that their principals have performed and fulfilled well their duties and functions across all areas of instructional program, staff personnel administration, student personnel administration, financial and physical resources, and school-community relations. None of these areas of principals’ responsibilities was forsaken.

CONCLUSION

Anchored on the findings of the study, it is, therefore, concluded that principals' leadership are found to be effective among public elementary school teachers in Cebu City. These teachers respondents perceived the principals of public elementary school in Cebu City exude leadership prowess in the areas of instructional program, staff personnel administration, student personnel administration, financial and physical resources, and school-community relations. The principals of public elementary school in Cebu City were manifested with knowledge, expertise, capability, and ability to give improvised solutions to problems in school.

REFERENCES CITED

1. Adigwu, O. C. (2004). A comparative analysis of administrative performance of male and female principals in selected schools. *Thesis). University of Benin, Nigeria.*
2. Barter, A. L. (2001). The status of women in school administration. Educational Horizons. Spring.
3. Beycioglu, K. (Ed.). (2014). Multidimensional perspectives on principal leadership effectiveness. *IGI Global.*
4. Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers’ perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of educational administration.*
5. Bolanle, A. O. (2013). Principals' Leadership Skills and School Effectiveness: The Case of South Western Nigeria. *World Journal of Education, 3(5), 26-33.*
6. Branch, G. F., Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2013). School leaders matter. *Education Next, 13(1), 62-69.*
7. Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: Qualitative and mixed methods approaches. *London and Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.*
8. Demoss, K. (2002). Leadership styles and high-stakes testing: Principals make a difference. *Education and Urban Society, 35(1), 111-132.*
9. Eyike, R. E. (2001). An evaluation of secondary school principals in Edo State. *Thesis): University of Benin, Nigeria.*
10. Grant, C. (2011). The Relationship between Distributed Leadership and Principal's Leadership Effectiveness in North Carolina.

11. Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of educational administration*.
12. Halawah, I. (2005). The relationship between effective communication of high school principal and school climate. *Education, 126*(2).
13. Horng, E., Kalogrides, D., & Loeb, S. (2009). Principal Preferences and the Unequal Distribution of Principals across Schools. Working Paper 36. *National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research*.
14. Hull, J. (2012). The principal perspective: Full report. *Center for Public Education*.
15. Ibukun, W. O., Oyewole, B. K., & Abe, T. O. (2011). Personality characteristics and principal leadership effectiveness in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 6*(2), 247-262.
16. Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of applied psychology, 85*(5), 751. Retrieved on March 2017 from <https://goo.gl/Qb2sFn>
17. Kiboss, J. K., & Jemiryott, H. K. S. (2014). Relationship between principals' leadership styles and secondary school teachers' job satisfaction in Nandi South District, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Human Development, 3*(2), 493-509.
18. Knapp, M. S., Copland, M. A., Honig, M. I., Plecki, M. L., & Portin, B. S. (2010). Learning-focused leadership and leadership support: Meaning and practice in urban systems. *Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy-University of Washington*.
19. Krasnoff, B., Leong, M., & Siebersma, M. (2015). Leadership qualities of effective principals. *Education Northwest, 1-10*.
20. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School leadership and management, 28*(1), 27-42.
21. Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S.E. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: *Final report of research findings*. Retrieved from Wallace Foundation website: <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-StudentLearning.aspx>
22. Lumby, J., & Azaola, M. C. (2014). Women principals in South Africa: Gender, mothering and leadership. *British educational research journal, 40*(1), 30-44.
23. McKinney, C. L., Labat Jr, M. B., & Labat, C. A. (2015). Traits possessed by principals who transform school culture in national blue ribbon schools. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 19*(1), 152.
24. Mulford, B., & Moreno, J. M. (2006, September). Sinking ships, emerging leadership: A true story of sustainability (or the lack thereof). In *The Educational Forum* (Vol. 70, No. 3, pp. 204-214). Taylor & Francis Group.
25. Nogay, K., & Beebe, R. J. (2008). Gender and perceptions: Females as secondary principals. *Journal of School Leadership, 18*(6), 583-602.
26. Okolo, W. O. (2001). An evaluation of the performance of primary school headmasters in Oredo LGA of Edo State.(M. Ed. Thesis). *University of Benin, Nigeria*.
27. Porter, A. C., Murphy, J., Goldring, E., Elliott, S. N., Polikoff, M. S., & May, H. (2008). Vanderbilt assessment of leadership in education: Technical manual, Version 1.0. *Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University*
28. Seashore, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings.
29. Tucker, M. S., & Coddling, J. B. (2002). Preparing principals in the age of accountability. *The principal challenge: Leading and managing schools in an era of accountability, 1-40*.
30. Yukl, G. (2008). How leaders influence organizational effectiveness. *The leadership quarterly, 19*(6), 708-722.