RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 10, Page 718-726 | Article No. 80
DOI: 10.4898/jenerv2i10.a80
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

JENER Journal
JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research

The Effectiveness of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in Achieving the Desired School Outcomes in the Public Elementary Schools in Ocampo District, Division of Camarines Sur

Bayani R. Navarro[1]

[1]School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: October 2026

Keywords:
Transformational School Leadership; Philippines; School-Based Survey; Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance; Teacher Perceptions

ABSTRACT

The study described school heads' transformational leadership practices and respondent-rated school outcomes in public elementary schools in Ocampo District during school year 2025–2026. Forty respondents completed a modified, validated questionnaire analyzed using weighted means, ranks, measures of dispersion, Kendall's W and chi-square. The overall rating for transformational leadership practices was 4.55 (Very Much Practiced), with individualized consideration highest at 4.64 and intellectual stimulation lowest at 4.46. The reported mean for perceived effectiveness across desired school outcomes was 4.60 (Very Much Effective); increased decision-making had the highest domain rating (4.71), whereas enhanced learners' achievements was lowest (4.42). The study reports perceptions and agreement in ordered indicators; no causal relationship with objectively measured achievement was established.

1. Introduction

In the Philippine basic education system, transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes is situated at the intersection of classroom practice, school policy and local resource conditions. The way educational practices are organized within a district cannot be inferred from national policy statements alone; information on local implementation and the views of the personnel responsible for delivery is also necessary. The study therefore focused on public elementary schools in Ocampo District, Division of Camarines Sur, a setting in which the routines supporting idealized influence, individualized consideration and school culture and climate can vary across schools.

The phenomenon examined by the study involves more than the presence of a program or institutional requirement. What respondents recognize as frequent, substantial or effective practice may depend on exposure, school size, resource access, the specific indicator being rated and the standards used for judging it. For this reason, evidence about transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes must distinguish the extent of reported implementation from measurable changes in teachers' work or learners' outcomes. The ratings obtained in a cross-sectional questionnaire provide one form of evidence, but not every form required for a causal claim.

The study organized its inquiries around substantive domains rather than a single unqualified effectiveness score. The domains included idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration. Considering these areas separately makes it possible to identify strengths and weaknesses that may be hidden by a favorable overall mean. It also allows school leaders to direct follow-up observation and support toward specific activities instead of treating all facets of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes as interchangeable.

A second analytical concern was whether respondent groups ranked the indicators similarly. Concordance across group rankings addresses the consistency of priorities or perceptions, not the magnitude of implementation or a relationship between an intervention and an educational outcome. Accordingly, the study treated means and ranks as descriptive indicators while interpreting the significance tests within the narrower meaning of Kendall's coefficient of concordance.

The study is also relevant to established educational guidance. The relevant work by Department of Education, 2020 sets out a policy or research framework against which reported practices may be considered. Such guidance offers analytical context without transforming survey responses into direct observational evidence. The research questions therefore concerned the extent of practices in the specified setting, respondent-group agreement about their ordering, and implications for local educational improvement.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and setting

The study adopted a descriptive–evaluative–correlational questionnaire survey. It investigated transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes in public elementary schools in Ocampo District, Division of Camarines Sur during the study period. The design was observational. Although the term "correlational" appeared in the design description, the inferential results reported in the study primarily concerned agreement among ranked indicators; the resulting statistics did not estimate causal effects or the strength of a learner-level association.

2.2 Participants and sampling

The reported study participants consisted of 40 respondents. Respondents were grouped by the school classifications or school groupings shown in the results. Survey estimates should be read in light of the actual respondent composition rather than as

probability-sample estimates for all Philippine schools. Where the study did not provide distinct pupil assessments or repeated measures, teachers' accounts of student development were interpreted as perceptions.

2.3 Instrument and procedure

The study used a structured questionnaire or researcher-made rating scale encompassing the stated domains of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes. Item-level statements were evaluated through the verbal-response categories and weighted-mean interpretation bands displayed with the study tables. The study described instrument preparation and administration through participating schools and used grouped ratings to address the research questions. Reported validity, reliability and response-handling details were not independently reconstructed or substituted where documentation was incomplete.

2.4 Data treatment and interpretation

The study reported frequency, percentage, standard deviation, weighted mean, ranks, Kendall's W and chi-square. Weighted means described central tendencies in ordinal rating responses, while reported ranks established the relative order of indicators. Kendall's W described concordance in ranks across the specified school groups; related chi-square results were treated according to the reported thresholds. No new significance calculations, sample-based confidence intervals or unreported multivariable estimates were introduced. Tables reproduce printed figures, including any discrepancies requiring verification.

2.5 Ethical and reporting considerations

The study was reported using aggregated responses. Individual-level datasets, consent documentation, and institutional ethics reference numbers were not reproduced in the available study chapters, and none is supplied here as though verified. Interpretation avoids identifying individual teachers or learners and refrains from attributing perceived outcomes to the surveyed practices without appropriate longitudinal or comparative evidence.

3. Results

The tables present the numerical entries and response-scale labels reported for each domain. Domain-level means describe respondent ratings; significance tests refer to group rank concordance.

Table 1. The Extent of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in terms of Idealized Influence

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. Shows honesty and high moral principles in all dealings with the faculty and the community.	4.55	VMP	8	4.50	VMP	6.5	4.60	VMP	2	4.55	VMP	5
2. Puts the needs of the teachers and learners above their own personal interests or comfort.	4.50	VMP	9	4.50	VMP	6.5	4.50	VMP	4.5	4.50	VMP	8.5
3. Talks clearly and passionately about the school's goals and what the school stands for.	4.65	VMP	4.5	4.60	VMP	2.5	4.60	VMP	2	4.62	VMP	2
4. Acts as an example of how a professional teacher and leader should behave.	4.65	VMP	4.5	4.70	VMP	1	4.40	MP	7.5	4.58	VMP	4
5. Makes teachers feel proud to be part of the school team and the district.	4.70	VMP	2	4.60	VMP	2.5	4.50	VMP	4.5	4.60	VMP	3
6. Practices what they preach by making sure their actions always match their words.	4.65	VMP	4.5	4.50	VMP	6.5	4.40	MP	7.5	4.52	VMP	6.5
7. Reminds everyone of the importance of working together toward a shared goal for the school.	4.80	VMP	1	4.50	VMP	6.5	4.60	VMP	2	4.63	VMP	1
8. Stays calm and gives everyone confidence even when the school faces difficult problems.	4.65	VMP	4.5	4.50	VMP	6.5	4.40	MP	7.5	4.52	VMP	6.5
9. Creates a deep sense of trust by being fair, and responsible for their decisions.	4.60	VMP	7	4.50	VMP	6.5	4.40	MP	7.5	4.50	VMP	8.5
Average	**4.64**	**VMP**		**4.54**	**VMP**		**4.49**	**MP**		**4.56**	**VMP**	

Legend:

Scale	Interpretation	
4.50-5.00	Very Much Practiced	(VMP)
3.50-4.49	Much Practiced	(MP)
2.50-3.49	Practiced	(P)

Wx = Weighted Mean
Int = Interpretation
R = Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes, including operational aspects associated with idealized influence. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of idealized influence would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 2. The Extent of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in terms of Inspirational Motivation

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. Articulates a compelling vision of what the school can achieve in the future.	4.65	VMP	7	4.40	MP	8	4.50	VMP	4.5	4.52	VMP	8
2. Sets high yet attainable expectations for both teachers and learners.	4.60	VMP	9.5	4.40	MP	8	4.50	VMP	4.5	4.50	VMP	9
3. Encourages the staff to envision a better future for the Ocampo District.	4.75	VMP	3	4.60	VMP	3	4.50	VMP	4.5	4.62	VMP	2.5
4. Uses encouraging words to keep the faculty motivated during busy school seasons.	4.75	VMP	3	4.70	VMP	1	4.40	MP	8	4.62	VMP	2.5
5. Provides a clear sense of direction that makes teachers feel their work is important.	4.60	VMP	9.5	4.50	VMP	5.5	4.60	VMP	1.5	4.57	VMP	4
6. Expresses confidence that the school's goals will be reached through teamwork.	4.65	VMP	7	4.60	VMP	3	4.40	MP	8	4.55	VMP	5.5
7. Talks optimistically about the potential of every learner to succeed.	4.70	VMP	5	4.30	MP	10	4.60	VMP	1.5	4.53	VMP	7
8. Challenges teachers to step out of their comfort zones to improve school performance.	4.65	VMP	7	4.40	MP	8	4.30	MP	10	4.45	MP	10
9. Promotes a can-do attitude even when resources or facilities are limited.	4.75	VMP	3	4.50	VMP	5.5	4.40	MP	8	4.55	VMP	5.5
10. Highlights the positive impact that teachers have on the lives of the learners.	4.90	VMP	1	4.60	VMP	3	4.50	VMP	4.5	4.67	VMP	1
Average	**4.70**	**VMP**		**4.50**	**VMP**		**4.47**	**MP**		**4.56**	**VMP**	

Legend:

Scale	Interpretation	
4.50-5.00	Very Much Practiced	(VMP)
3.50-4.49	Much Practiced	(MP)
2.50-3.49	Practiced	(P)
1.50-2.49	Fairly Practiced	(FP)
1.00-1.49	Not At All	(NA)

Wx = Weighted Mean
Int = Interpretation
R = Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes, including operational aspects associated with inspirational motivation. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of inspirational motivation would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 3. The Extent of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in terms of Intellectual Stimulation

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. Encourages teachers to look at old school problems in new and creative ways.	4.50	VMP	10	4.50	VMP	2.5	4.20	MP	10.5	4.40	MP	9
2. Asks for suggestions on how to improve classroom instruction and school programs.	4.55	VMP	8	4.40	MP	6.5	4.40	MP	6	4.45	MP	6.5
3. Promotes the use of innovative teaching strategies to better engage learners.	4.60	VMP	5.5	4.40	MP	6.5	4.40	MP	6	4.47	MP	5
4. Challenges the "we have always done it this way" mindset to foster growth.	4.50	VMP	10	4.10	MP	10.5	4.30	MP	8.5	4.30	MP	11
5. Supports teachers who want to try new methods, even if they might fail at first.	4.75	VMP	1	4.10	MP	10.5	4.50	VMP	3.5	4.45	MP	6.5
6. Invites faculty members to participate in solving administrative or school-wide issues.	4.50	VMP	10	4.50	VMP	2.5	4.50	VMP	3.5	4.50	VMP	4
7. Stimulates critical thinking by asking why and how during meetings.	4.60	VMP	5.5	4.30	MP	9	4.20	MP	10.5	4.37	MP	10
8. Encourages teachers to use the learners' data to evaluate their teaching practices.	4.65	VMP	3	4.50	VMP	2.5	4.70	VMP	1	4.62	VMP	1
9. Organizes learning circles where teachers are pushed to share	4.60	VMP	5.5	4.40	MP	6.5	4.30	MP	8.5	4.43	MP	8

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes, including operational aspects associated with intellectual stimulation. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of intellectual stimulation would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 4. The Extent of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in terms of Individualized Consideration

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. Listens attentively to the personal and professional concerns of teachers.	4.75	VMP	5.5	4.70	VMP	3	4.30	MP	9	4.58	VMP	7
2. Treats each staff member as an individual rather than just a member of a group.	4.85	VMP	1.5	4.70	VMP	3	4.60	VMP	4.5	4.72	VMP	3
3. Recognizes the specific strengths and talents of each teacher in the school.	4.85	VMP	1.5	4.80	VMP	1	4.70	VMP	2	4.78	VMP	1
4. Provides personalized coaching or mentoring to help teachers reach their full potential.	4.65	VMP	8	4.50	VMP	7.5	4.50	VMP	7	4.55	VMP	8
5. Shows genuine concern for the well-being and work-life balance of the faculty.	4.75	VMP	5.5	4.60	VMP	5.5	4.70	VMP	2	4.68	VMP	4
6. Assigns tasks based on a teacher's unique skills and professional interests.	4.70	VMP	7	4.50	VMP	7.5	4.60	VMP	4.5	4.60	VMP	6
7. Spends time checking in on teachers to see how they are doing with their workloads.	4.50	VMP	9	4.30	MP	9	4.50	VMP	7	4.43	MP	9
8. Acknowledges the individual achievements and milestones of teachers and learners.	4.80	VMP	3.5	4.70	VMP	3	4.70	VMP	2	4.73	VMP	2
9. Offers support to teachers who are struggling with their specific classroom challenges.	4.80	VMP	3.5	4.60	VMP	5.5	4.50	VMP	7	4.63	VMP	5
Average	**4.74**	**VMP**		**4.60**	**VMP**		**4.57**	**VMP**		**4.64**	**VMP**	

Legend:

Scale	Interpretation	
4.50-5.00	Very Much Practiced	(VMP)
3.50-4.49	Much Practiced	(MP)
2.50-3.49	Practiced	(P)
1.50-2.49	Fairly Practiced	(FP)
1.00-1.49	Not At All	(NA)

Wx = Weighted Mean
Int = Interpretation
R = Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes, including operational aspects associated with individualized consideration. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of individualized consideration would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 5. The Summary of the Extent of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. Idealized influence	4.64	VMP	3	4.54	VMP	2	4.49	MP	2	4.56	VMP	2.5
2. Inspirational motivation	4.70	VMP	2	4.50	VMP	3	4.47	MP	3	4.56	VMP	2.5
3. Intellectual stimulation	4.60	VMP	4	4.37	MP	4	4.41	MP	4	4.46	MP	4
4. Individualized consideration	4.74	VMP	1	4.60	VMP	1	4.57	VMP	1	4.64	VMP	1
Average	**4.67**	**VMP**		**4.50**	**VMP**		**4.49**	**MP**		**4.55**	**VMP**	

Legend:

Scale	Interpretation	
4.50-5.00	Very Much Practiced	(VMP)
3.50-4.49	Much Practiced	(MP)
2.50-3.49	Practiced	(P)
1.50-2.49	Fairly Practiced	(FP)
1.00-1.49	Not At All	(NA)

Wx = Weighted Mean
Int = Interpretation
R = Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The summary consolidates the domain-level ratings and makes visible the relative standing of major components of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes. The relative order of these reported domains is more informative for local prioritization than the overall mean alone, because the domains may involve distinct resources and implementation processes.

An apparently favorable average does not mean every school implemented each activity equally or that learners experienced the same educational benefits. The reported categories reflect a survey scale; they should not be read as externally verified proficiency standards or comparable units of learning gain.

The practical use of this finding is diagnostic. Components with lower ratings, including potential constraints affecting teacher motivation and engagement, may warrant closer monitoring, better implementation documentation and targeted professional support before a district-level improvement claim is made.

Table 6. The Test of Significant Agreement on the Rank Orders of the Extent of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads

Indicator	Idealized influence	Inspirational motivation	Intellectual stimulation	Individualized consideration
Summation of Squared Deviation	194	234	425	372
Number of Indicators	9	10	11	9
Coefficient of Concordance (W)	0.36	0.32	0.43	0.69
Computed Chi Square (X^2)	8.64	8.64	12.90	16.56
Degree of Freedom	8	9	10	8
Tabular X^2 Value with				
0.050	15.51	16.92	18.31	15.51
0.025	18.17	19.68	20.48	18.17
0.010	20.09	21.67	23.21	20.09
0.005	21.96	23.59	25.19	21.96
0.001	26.12	27.88	29.59	26.12
Decision of H_o	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Rejected
Significance of Agreement	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	0.05

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

This table addresses the study question concerning agreement in the ordering of the reported indicators. The statistical decision must be understood alongside the coefficient, chi-square value, number of ranked cases and stated significance level; it does not evaluate how strongly transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes changed in practice.

Concordance among school-group rank profiles is analytically different from agreement among all individual respondents. Particularly when some groups are smaller, highly similar aggregate rankings can coexist with unreported within-group variation. Conversely, a nonsignificant concordance result does not establish the absence of an educational practice.

The immediate implication is to examine whether the observed group differences reflect school circumstances, access to support or indicator interpretation. Follow-up work on learner achievement could use school-level records, interviews, observation protocols or direct learner measures, depending on the outcome being investigated.

Table 7. The Extent of the Effectiveness of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in Achieving the Desired School Outcomes along I

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. The teachers demonstrate enthusiasm in performing their teaching responsibilities.	4.45	ME	7.5	4.60	VME	6.5	4.60	VME	5	4.55	VME	7.5
2. The teachers actively participate in school improvement initiatives and programs.	4.55	VME	5	4.90	VME	1	4.70	VME	2.5	4.72	VME	1
3. The teachers show commitment to achieving the school's vision and mission.	4.60	VME	2.5	4.70	VME	3	4.50	VME	7.5	4.60	VME	4.5
4. The teachers willingly go beyond minimum job requirements to help the learners succeed.	4.35	ME	9	4.60	VME	6.5	4.40	ME	9	4.45	ME	9
5. The teachers actively engage in continuous professional development activities.	4.55	VME	5	4.60	VME	6.5	4.60	VME	5	4.58	VME	6
6. The teachers take initiative to improve classroom environments without being prompted.	4.55	VME	5	4.40	ME	9	4.70	VME	2.5	4.55	VME	7.5
7. The teachers report a higher sense of job satisfaction under the current leadership.	4.45	ME	7.5	4.70	VME	3	4.90	VME	1	4.68	VME	2
8. The teachers strive to meet the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) targets.	4.65	VME	1	4.60	VME	6.5	4.60	VME	5	4.62	VME	3
9. The teachers maintain high energy levels throughout the school year.	4.60	VME	2.5	4.70	VME	3	4.50	VME	7.5	4.60	VME	4.5
Average	**4.53**	**VME**		**4.64**	**VME**		**4.61**	**VME**		**4.59**	**VME**	

Legend:

Scale	Interpretation	
4.50-5.00	Very Much Effective	(VME)
3.50-4.49	Much Effective	(ME)
2.50-3.49	Effective	(E)
1.50-2.49	Fairly Effective	(FE)

Wx - Weighted Mean
Int - Interpretation
R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes, including operational aspects associated with decision-making. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of decision-making would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 8. The Extent of the Effectiveness of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in Achieving the Desired School Outcomes along E

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. The learners show improvement in academic performance and learning outcomes.	4.40	ME	2.5	4.60	VME	1.5	4.50	VME	7	4.50	VME	2.5
2. The learners demonstrate mastery of essential learning competencies.	4.05	ME	10	4.20	ME	9.5	4.40	ME	9.5	4.22	ME	10
3. The learners actively participate in curricular and co-curricular activities.	4.40	ME	2.5	4.40	ME	4.5	4.60	VME	4	4.47	ME	4.5
4. The learners exhibit positive values and character development.	4.40	ME	2.5	4.30	ME	7	4.70	VME	1.5	4.47	ME	4.5
5. The learners show increased interest and engagement in learning activities.	4.40	ME	2.5	4.30	ME	7	4.50	VME	7	4.40	ME	7
6. The learners demonstrate positive behavior and discipline within the school premises.	4.35	ME	6	4.40	ME	4.5	4.60	VME	4	4.45	ME	6
7. Increases the school's overall passing rate in national or district-level assessments.	4.35	ME	6	4.20	ME	9.5	4.50	VME	7	4.35	ME	8
8. The learners attend classes more regularly, resulting in lower absenteeism and dropout rates.	4.30	ME	8	4.50	VME	3	4.70	VME	1.5	4.50	VME	2.5
9. The learners display a genuine love for learning and curiosity in various subject areas.	4.20	ME	9	4.30	ME	7	4.40	ME	9.5	4.30	ME	9
10. The learners win awards or recognition in academic and non-academic competitions.	4.35	ME	6	4.60	VME	1.5	4.60	VME	4	4.52	VME	1
Average	**4.32**	**ME**		**4.38**	**ME**		**4.55**	**VME**		**4.42**	**ME**	

Legend:

Scale	Interpretation	
4.50-5.00	Very Much Effective	(VME)
3.50-4.49	Much Effective	(ME)
2.50-3.49	Effective	(E)
1.50-2.49	Fairly Effective	(FE)

Wx = Weighted Mean
Int = Interpretation
R = Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes, including operational aspects associated with collaboration and teamwork. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of collaboration and teamwork would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 9. The Extent of the Effectiveness of the transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in Achieving the Desired School Outcomes along I

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. The teachers are involved in school planning and goal-setting processes.	4.60	VME	8.5	4.90	VME	4.5	4.60	VME	5.5	4.70	VME	5
2. The teachers participate in developing school policies and procedures.	4.60	VME	8.5	4.80	VME	10	4.60	VME	5.5	4.67	VME	9
3. The teachers contribute ideas and suggestions for school improvement.	4.70	VME	4	4.90	VME	4.5	4.80	VME	2	4.80	VME	1
4. The teachers are consulted on important decisions affecting instruction and learning.	4.70	VME	4	4.90	VME	4.5	4.40	ME	10.5	4.67	VME	9
5. The teachers feel their opinions and inputs are valued and considered by the school head.	4.75	VME	1	4.90	VME	4.5	4.60	VME	5.5	4.75	VME	4
6. The school head allows teachers to have a say in the selection of instructional materials for learners.	4.60	VME	8.5	4.90	VME	4.5	4.80	VME	2	4.77	VME	2.5
7. The school head delegates important responsibilities to teachers based on their expertise.	4.55	VME	11	4.90	VME	4.5	4.60	VME	5.5	4.68	VME	6
8. The school head considers the suggestions of the faculty before finalizing school schedules.	4.70	VME	4	4.80	VME	10	4.80	VME	2	4.77	VME	2.5
9. The school head provides a platform	4.70	VME	4	4.80	VME	10	4.50	VME	8.5	4.67	VME	9

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes, including operational aspects associated with school culture and climate. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of school culture and climate would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 10. The Extent of the Effectiveness of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in Achieving the Desired School Outcomes along I

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. Teachers work collaboratively in planning and implementing lessons.	4.55	VME	8	4.80	VME	2	4.60	VME	4.5	4.65	VME	2.5
2. Teachers share best practices and learning resources with colleagues.	4.50	VME	9	4.70	VME	6	4.70	VME	1.5	4.63	VME	5.5
3. Teachers support one another in addressing instructional challenges.	4.60	VME	6.5	4.70	VME	6	4.60	VME	4.5	4.63	VME	5.5
4. Teachers participate actively in Learning Action Cells (LACs) and professional learning communities.	4.80	VME	1	4.80	VME	2	4.70	VME	1.5	4.77	VME	1
5. Teachers demonstrate a strong sense of teamwork and collective responsibility for student learning.	4.75	VME	2	4.80	VME	2	4.30	ME	9	4.62	VME	8
6. The school head coordinates across different grade levels to ensure a smooth transition for learners.	4.65	VME	4.5	4.70	VME	6	4.60	VME	4.5	4.65	VME	2.5
7. The school builds strong partnerships with parents and the community.	4.60	VME	6.5	4.70	VME	6	4.60	VME	4.5	4.63	VME	5.5
8. The school head formulates group goals that encourage teachers to help one another succeed.	4.65	VME	4.5	4.60	VME	9	4.50	VME	7.5	4.58	VME	9
9. The school celebrates the successes of the entire school team rather than just individuals.	4.70	VME	3	4.70	VME	6	4.50	VME	7.5	4.63	VME	5.5
Average	**4.64**	**VME**		**4.72**	**VME**		**4.57**	**VME**		**4.64**	**VME**	

Legend:

Scale	Interpretation	
4.50-5.00	Very Much Effective	(VME)
3.50-4.49	Much Effective	(ME)

Wx = Weighted Mean
Int = Interpretation
R = Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes, including operational aspects associated with idealized influence. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of idealized influence would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 11. The Extent of the Effectiveness of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in Achieving the Desired School Outcomes along P

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. The school maintains an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect among teachers.	4.65	VME	7	4.80	VME	4.5	4.30	ME	5.5	4.58	VME	7
2. The school promotes a culture of continuous improvement and innovation.	4.55	VME	8	4.60	VME	8	4.70	VME	2	4.62	VME	5
3. The school provides a safe, inclusive, and supportive learning environment for all.	4.70	VME	4	4.80	VME	4.5	4.80	VME	1	4.77	VME	1.5
4. The school celebrates achievements and recognizes outstanding performance.	4.80	VME	1	4.90	VME	2	4.60	VME	3	4.77	VME	1.5
5. The school fosters a strong sense of community and belonging among all stakeholders.	4.70	VME	4	4.70	VME	6.5	4.50	VME	4	4.63	VME	3.5
6. The school reduces stress and anxiety by providing a supportive and non-threatening workspace.	4.70	VME	4	4.90	VME	2	4.20	ME	7.5	4.60	VME	6
7. The school inspires a sense of belongingness where everyone feels like a valued member of the school.	4.70	VME	4	4.70	VME	6.5	4.20	ME	7.5	4.53	VME	8
8. The school promotes open communication where concerns are addressed without fear of being judged.	4.70	VME	4	4.90	VME	2	4.30	ME	5.5	4.63	VME	3.5
Average	**4.69**	**VME**		**4.79**	**VME**		**4.45**	**ME**		**4.64**	**VME**	

Legend:

Scale	Interpretation	
4.50-5.00	Very Much Effective	(VME)
3.50-4.49	Much Effective	(ME)
2.50-3.49	Effective	(E)
1.50-2.49	Fairly Effective	(FE)
1.00-1.49	Not At All	(NA)

Wx = Weighted Mean
Int = Interpretation
R = Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes, including operational aspects associated with inspirational motivation. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of inspirational motivation would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 12. The Summary of the Extent of the Effectiveness of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the School Heads in Achieving the Desired School O

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R	Wx	Int	R
1. Improved teachers' motivation and engagement	4.53	VME	4	4.64	VME	4	4.61	VME	1	4.59	VME	4
2. Enhanced learners' achievements	4.32	ME	5	4.38	ME	5	4.55	VME	4	4.42	ME	5
3. Increased decision making	4.65	VME	2	4.87	VME	1	4.60	VME	2	4.71	VME	1
4. Improved collaboration and teamwork	4.64	VME	3	4.72	VME	3	4.57	VME	3	4.64	VME	2.5
5. Positive school culture and climate	4.69	VME	1	4.79	VME	2	4.45	ME	5	4.64	VME	2.5
Average	**4.57**	**VME**		**4.68**	**VME**		**4.56**	**VME**		**4.60**	**VME**	

Legend:

Scale	Interpretation	
4.50-5.00	Very Much Effective	(VME)
3.50-4.49	Much Effective	(ME)
2.50-3.49	Effective	(E)
1.50-2.49	Fairly Effective	(FE)
1.00-1.49	Not At All	(NA)

Wx – Weighted Mean
Int – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The summary consolidates the domain-level ratings and makes visible the relative standing of major components of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes. The relative order of these reported domains is more informative for local prioritization than the overall mean alone, because the domains may involve distinct resources and implementation processes.

An apparently favorable average does not mean every school implemented each activity equally or that learners experienced the same educational benefits. The reported categories reflect a survey scale; they should not be read as externally verified proficiency standards or comparable units of learning gain.

The practical use of this finding is diagnostic. Components with lower ratings, including potential constraints affecting intellectual stimulation, may warrant closer monitoring, better implementation documentation and targeted professional support before a district-level improvement claim is made.

Table 13. The Test of Significant Agreement on the Rank Orders of the Extent of the Effectiveness of the Transformational Leadership Practices of the Schoo

Indicator	Improved teachers' motivation and engagement	Enhanced learners' achievements	Increased decision making	Improved collaboration and teamwork	Positive school culture and climate
Summation of Squared Deviation	179.50	409	198	163	130
Number of Indicators	9	10	11	9	8
Coefficient of Concordance (W)	0.33	0.55	0.20	0.30	0.34
Computed Chi Square (X^2)	7.92	14.85	6.00	7.20	7.14
Degree of Freedom	8	9	10	8	7
Tabular X^2 Value with					
0.050	15.51	16.92	18.31	15.51	14.07
0.025	18.17	19.68	20.48	18.17	16.01
0.010	20.09	21.67	23.21	20.09	18.48
0.005	21.96	23.59	25.19	21.96	20.28
0.001	26.12	27.88	29.59	26.12	24.32
Decision of H_o	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Significance of Agreement	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

This table addresses the study question concerning agreement in the ordering of the reported indicators. The statistical decision must be understood alongside the coefficient, chi-square value, number of ranked cases and stated significance level; it does not evaluate how strongly transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes changed in practice.

Concordance among school-group rank profiles is analytically different from agreement among all individual respondents. Particularly when some groups are smaller, highly similar aggregate rankings can coexist with unreported within-group variation. Conversely, a nonsignificant concordance result does not establish the absence of an educational practice.

The immediate implication is to examine whether the observed group differences reflect school circumstances, access to support or indicator interpretation. Follow-up work on individualized consideration could use school-level records, interviews, observation protocols or direct learner measures, depending on the outcome being investigated.

4. Discussion

Taken together, the findings suggest a differentiated profile of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes within public elementary schools in Ocampo District, Division of Camarines Sur. Some domains were rated more favorably than others, but the study's comparisons concerned respondents' evaluations of program activity or practice. The interpretation should therefore emphasize the organization and visibility of those practices rather than unobserved changes in educational outcomes.

The domains must also be considered conceptually. For example, idealized influence and school culture and climate involve different operational demands even when they appear in the same questionnaire. An overall rating cannot establish that schools have equivalent capacity, resources or instructional conditions. Follow-up should identify the precise activities behind each item and test whether respondents applied a shared meaning to the measurement scale.

The study's rank-concordance analysis makes an additional contribution by examining alignment in the order assigned to indicators. Kendall's W is sensitive to patterns of ranking among the selected groups; it does not assess causation, pupil-level correlations or improvements over time. A statistically significant result should therefore be explained as concordance of ordered profiles, while nonsignificant outcomes should not be called evidence that a practice was ineffective.

The cited scholarship and policy provide context but should not be treated as validating the local mean scores. Guidance from Department of Education, 2020, Desimone, 2009 highlights the importance of clearly specified practices, appropriate pedagogical support or relevant educational standards. Applying such guidance requires attention to local implementation, documentation and direct assessment rather than reliance on favorable response categories alone.

Implications for school administrators include establishing observable criteria for high-priority activities, checking participation and resource access across schools, and using professional conversations to determine why some dimensions received lower assessments. If the objective is to understand effects on actual teacher or learner performance, a subsequent design should add independent outcome data, repeated observations and an appropriate comparison framework.

The main limitations arise from the local scope of the respondents, reliance on reported ratings, the unequal or limited respondent groups in some analyses, and incomplete access to item-level observations for independent verification. In addition, the underlying survey cannot by itself separate the contribution of school culture and climate from other school, family, learner or policy influences. The conclusions therefore remain descriptive and context-specific; extension beyond the study setting requires additional evidence.

5. Conclusion

The study documented the reported status of transformational school leadership and desired school outcomes in public elementary schools in Ocampo District, Division of Camarines Sur. Its domain-level results and agreement tests offer an account of local respondent perceptions, areas of comparatively stronger implementation and aspects warranting closer attention. Reported means and statistical decisions were retained as presented, without reinterpretation as experimental effects.

The findings support evidence-informed review of idealized influence, teacher motivation and engagement and school culture and climate. Implementation monitoring, clearer criteria for rating performance, and direct observational or learner-level evidence are suitable priorities for further research. The study does not demonstrate that an individual practice caused an improvement in school, teacher or learner outcomes.

References

[1] Department of Education. (2020). DO 24, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf

[2] Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. Educational Researcher, 38(3), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140