

Organizational Leadership Styles of Program Heads and the Performance of the Faculty of Select Higher Education Institution in Ortigas-Cainta: Basis for Organizational Leadership Enhancement Program

Franz V. Jaminit, DBA

Chairperson, College of Hospitality, Tourism, and Culinary Management, Siena College of Taytay

Publication history: Received: June 2, 2026; Revised: July 8, 2026; Accepted: July 12, 2026

Email of Corresponding Author: franz.jaminit@sct.edu.ph

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between the organizational leadership styles of program heads and the performance of faculty members in a selected higher education institution in Ortigas-Cainta as the basis for the development of an Organizational Leadership Enhancement Program. Specifically, the study determined the demographic profile of the respondents, identified the leadership styles of program heads based on self-assessment and faculty perceptions, assessed the level of faculty performance, examined significant differences in leadership style and faculty performance across demographic variables, and determined the relationship between organizational leadership styles and faculty performance. The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design involving 102 respondents composed of five program heads and ninety-seven faculty members selected through total population sampling. Data were gathered using the adapted Leadership Style Survey by Clark (2004) and the institution's Faculty Performance Evaluation Tool, both of which underwent validity and reliability testing prior to data collection. Statistical tools such as frequency and percentage distribution, weighted mean, t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Pearson's correlation coefficient were utilized to analyze the data at the 0.05 level of significance. Findings revealed that democratic leadership emerged as the dominant organizational leadership style based on both the program heads' self-assessment and the faculty members' perceptions. Faculty members rated their overall performance as Exceeds Expectations, a finding that was likewise supported by the program heads' evaluation. The study further revealed no significant differences in leadership style based on sex and no significant differences in faculty performance when grouped according to age, sex, designation, years of experience, and employment status. However, a significant difference was found in faculty performance when grouped according to educational attainment. Moreover, the findings established a positive and significant relationship between the organizational leadership styles of program heads and faculty performance, indicating that effective leadership contributes to enhanced instructional performance and professional effectiveness. Based on these findings, an Organizational Leadership Enhancement Program was proposed to strengthen leadership competencies, sustain faculty excellence, and promote continuous professional development toward improved institutional effectiveness and educational quality.

Keywords: Organizational Leadership Styles, Democratic Leadership, Faculty Performance, Program Heads, Higher Education Institution, Organizational Leadership Enhancement Program, Descriptive-Correlational Research.

Introduction

Leadership has long been recognized as one of the most influential factors in determining organizational effectiveness, employee engagement, and overall institutional performance. In higher education institutions (HEIs), program heads serve as frontline academic leaders responsible for supervising faculty members, ensuring instructional quality, implementing institutional policies, and fostering an environment that supports professional growth and student success. As educational institutions continue to respond to rapid technological advancements, evolving learner needs, and increasing demands for quality assurance, the leadership styles demonstrated by academic administrators have become critical determinants of organizational success. Effective leadership not only enhances faculty motivation and collaboration but also strengthens institutional capacity to achieve its academic mission and strategic goals (Northouse, 2022).

The quality of leadership exercised by academic administrators significantly influences faculty performance, organizational commitment, and instructional effectiveness. Faculty members rely on their immediate supervisors for professional guidance, performance feedback, motivation, and opportunities for continuous development. Consequently, the leadership style adopted by program heads shapes the working environment and affects faculty productivity, job satisfaction, and commitment to institutional objectives. Research has consistently demonstrated that transformational and democratic leadership styles positively influence employee performance by encouraging participation, innovation, trust, and professional collaboration (Khajeh, 2018; Nguyen et al., 2023). Conversely, highly authoritarian leadership may hinder communication, reduce employee motivation, and negatively affect organizational climate.

The classical leadership framework developed by Kurt Lewin remains relevant in understanding organizational leadership behavior. Lewin identified three fundamental leadership styles—autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire—which continue to serve as the foundation of contemporary leadership theories. Democratic leadership encourages shared decision-making, participation, and collaboration; autocratic leadership centralizes authority and decision-making; while laissez-faire leadership provides greater autonomy to subordinates with minimal supervision (Northouse, 2022). Although modern leadership theories have expanded beyond these classifications, these leadership styles remain widely utilized in organizational and educational research because they provide a practical framework for evaluating managerial behaviors and their influence on employee performance.

Faculty performance represents one of the most important indicators of institutional effectiveness in higher education. It encompasses instructional delivery, classroom management, assessment practices, technology integration, professionalism, research productivity, and student engagement. According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2023), strong instructional leadership directly contributes to improved teaching quality and organizational effectiveness by fostering collaborative professional learning communities and continuous instructional improvement. Similarly, UNESCO (2024) emphasized that effective educational leadership promotes teacher development, innovation, and resilience, ultimately improving student learning outcomes and institutional performance.

Recent empirical studies have further strengthened the evidence linking leadership and faculty performance. Nguyen et al. (2023) found that participative leadership significantly improved faculty engagement, organizational commitment, and instructional innovation among university instructors. Likewise, Al Khajeh (2018) reported that leadership style significantly predicts organizational performance, with democratic leadership producing the strongest positive influence on employee productivity and organizational effectiveness. Furthermore, a systematic review by Cortellazzo et al. (2019) concluded that effective leadership fosters organizational adaptability, employee empowerment, and innovation, which are increasingly necessary in knowledge-based organizations such as higher education institutions.

Despite extensive literature examining educational leadership, relatively few studies have explored the relationship between organizational leadership styles of program heads and faculty performance within private higher education institutions in the Philippines. Most existing local studies focus primarily on transformational leadership, instructional leadership, or school principals in basic education, leaving limited empirical evidence regarding academic program heads in tertiary institutions. Moreover, institutional contexts differ considerably in terms of organizational culture, governance structures, faculty composition, and performance evaluation systems. These contextual differences necessitate localized investigations to determine how leadership styles influence faculty performance within specific higher education environments.

The selected higher education institution in Ortigas-Cainta operates within a dynamic academic environment that requires program heads to balance administrative responsibilities, faculty supervision, curriculum implementation, quality assurance, and student-centered instruction. Understanding the prevailing leadership styles practiced by these academic leaders and determining how these styles relate to faculty performance may provide valuable insights for institutional leadership development and organizational improvement. The findings may also guide administrators in designing evidence-based interventions that strengthen leadership competencies while sustaining faculty excellence.

Hence, this study sought to determine the organizational leadership styles of program heads and the performance of the faculty in a selected higher education institution in Ortigas-Cainta. Specifically, it examined the dominant leadership styles of program heads, assessed faculty performance across major instructional dimensions, determined significant differences based on selected demographic variables, and established the relationship between organizational leadership styles and faculty performance. Ultimately, the findings served as the basis for the development of an Organizational Leadership Enhancement Program designed to strengthen leadership effectiveness, improve faculty performance, and promote continuous organizational development within higher education institutions.

Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research approach using a descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive method was utilized to determine the organizational leadership styles of program heads and the level of faculty performance, while the correlational design examined the significant relationship between these variables without manipulating any of the study conditions. This design was deemed appropriate because it enabled the researcher to describe existing conditions and determine whether organizational leadership styles are significantly associated with faculty performance in the selected higher education institution.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in a selected private higher education institution in Ortigas-Cainta, Rizal. The institution was selected because it employs a structured academic organization composed of program heads and faculty members who play significant roles in instructional delivery and academic management. For confidentiality purposes, the name of the institution is withheld. The institution offers various undergraduate programs and maintains an organizational structure that allows the assessment of leadership practices and faculty performance within an academic setting.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study consisted of five (5) program heads and ninety-seven (97) faculty members, for a total of one hundred two (102) respondents. Program heads participated in assessing their own leadership styles and evaluating faculty performance, while faculty members assessed the leadership styles of their respective program heads and conducted self-evaluations of their performance. These respondents were considered the most appropriate participants because they directly experience the leadership practices and performance evaluation processes within the institution.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The study utilized total population sampling, a non-probability sampling technique wherein all qualified members of the target population were included as respondents. Since the accessible population was relatively small and met the inclusion criteria, all five program heads and ninety-seven faculty members were invited to participate in the study. This sampling technique ensured comprehensive representation of the academic personnel and minimized sampling bias while increasing the reliability of the findings.

2.5 Research Instrument

Data were gathered using two adapted research instruments. The first was the Leadership Style Survey developed by Clark (2004), which measured the organizational leadership styles of program heads in terms of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles. The second instrument was the institution's Faculty Performance Evaluation Tool, which assessed faculty performance in terms of learning environment for students, use of technology in teaching, instructional facilitation and delivery, assessment, and professionalism. The instruments underwent expert validation and pilot testing to establish content validity and reliability prior to their administration. Responses were measured using a four-point Likert scale appropriate to each instrument.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, the researcher secured approval from the appropriate institutional authorities to conduct the study. The adapted research instruments were subjected to expert validation and pilot testing to ensure their validity and reliability. Upon approval, informed consent was obtained from all respondents, emphasizing voluntary participation, confidentiality, and anonymity. The questionnaires were administered through an online survey platform, allowing respondents sufficient time to complete the instruments. After retrieval of the accomplished questionnaires, the responses were encoded, verified, organized, and prepared for statistical analysis.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

The collected data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical tools. Frequency and percentage distribution were used to describe the demographic profile of the respondents. Weighted mean and standard deviation were utilized to determine the organizational leadership styles of program heads and the level of faculty performance. Independent samples t-test and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were employed to determine significant differences among the variables when respondents were grouped according to their profile. Finally, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's r) was used to determine the significant relationship between the organizational leadership styles of program heads and the performance of the faculty. All statistical analyses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

The researcher strictly observed ethical principles throughout the conduct of the study. Prior approval was obtained from the appropriate educational authorities before data collection commenced. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was secured from all respondents after explaining the objectives, procedures, benefits, and confidentiality of the study. The identities of the respondents and the academic records of the pupils were kept anonymous through coding, and all information gathered was treated with strict confidentiality and used solely for academic and research purposes in compliance with the provisions of the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173) and accepted ethical standards in educational research.

Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of the Respondents in terms of the Selected Variables

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents, consisting of five (5) program heads and ninety-seven (97) faculty members. Most of the respondents were aged 19–40 years, accounting for 60% of the program heads and 87.63% of the faculty. Male respondents slightly outnumbered females, comprising 60% of the program heads and 52.58% of the faculty. In terms of educational attainment, most faculty members held a bachelor's degree (63.92%), while the program heads were equally represented by bachelor's degree holders (40%) and those with doctoral units (40%). All program heads occupied administrative positions, whereas the faculty respondents were predominantly tertiary instructors (63.92%). Regarding employment status, most faculty members were employed on a part-time full-load basis (31.96%), while the program heads were equally distributed between part-time full-load and regular employment (40% each). In terms of teaching experience, the majority of both program heads (40%) and faculty members (77.32%) had one to five years of experience, indicating that most respondents were relatively early in their professional careers.

Table 1.1
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents According to their Profile.

Profile of the Respondents	Program Heads (n=5)		Faculty (n=97)	
	F	%	F	%
1.1 Age				
19–40 years old	3	60.00	85	87.63
41–65 years old	2	40.00	12	12.37
66 years old and above	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	5	100.00	97	100.00
1.2 Sex				
Male	3	60.00	51	52.58
Female	2	40.00	46	47.42
Total	5	100.00	97	100.00
1.3 Educational Attainment				
Bachelor's Degree	2	40.00	62	63.92
Master's Degree (with units)	0	0.00	21	21.65
Master's Degree (graduate)	1	20.00	14	14.43
Doctoral Degree (with units)	2	40.00	0	0.00
Doctoral Degree (graduate)	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	5	100.00	97	100.00
1.4 Designation				
Senior High School Faculty	0	0.00	35	36.08
Tertiary Faculty	0	0.00	62	63.92
Program Head	5	100.00	0	0.00
Total	5	100.00	97	100.00
1.5 Employment Status				
Part-time	0	0.00	29	29.90
Part-time Full Load	2	40.00	31	31.96
Probationary	1	20.00	20	20.62
Regular	2	40.00	17	17.53
Total	5	100.00	97	100.00
1.6 Years of Experience				
Less than 1 year	0	0.00	7	7.22
1–5 years	2	40.00	75	77.32
6–10 years	1	20.00	8	8.25
11–15 years	1	20.00	3	3.09
More than 16 years	1	20.00	4	4.12
Total	5	100.00	97	100.00

3.2 Organizational Leadership Style of Program Heads Based on Personal Assessment and as Perceived by the Faculty

Table 2 presents the organizational leadership styles of the program heads based on their personal assessment and as perceived by the faculty members. The findings reveal that democratic leadership obtained the highest mean score among both groups. Based on the personal assessment of the program heads, democratic leadership recorded a mean of 3.38 with a standard deviation of 0.38, followed by laissez-faire leadership with a mean of 3.18 and a standard deviation of 0.52, while autocratic leadership obtained the lowest mean of 2.78 with a standard deviation of 0.69. Similarly, the faculty members perceived democratic leadership as the most dominant style, with a mean of 3.42 and a standard deviation of 0.32, followed by laissez-faire leadership with a mean of 3.36 and a standard deviation of 0.35. Autocratic leadership received the lowest mean of 3.12 with a standard deviation of 0.34. Overall, the results indicate that both the program heads and the faculty consistently identified democratic leadership as the predominant organizational leadership style practiced by the program heads.

Table 2

Organizational Leadership Style of Program Heads Based on Personal Assessment and as Perceived by the Faculty

Leadership Style	Program Heads (n=5)		Faculty Perception (n=97)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Autocratic	2.78	0.69	3.12	0.34
Democratic	3.38	0.38	3.42	0.32
Laissez-faire	3.18	0.52	3.36	0.35

3.3 Level of Faculty Performance Based on Self-Evaluation and Evaluation by the Program Heads

Table 3 presents the level of faculty performance based on their self-evaluation and the evaluation of the program heads. The faculty members rated instructional facilitation and delivery as the highest-performing indicator with a mean of 3.60 and a standard deviation of 0.04, followed by assessment with a mean of 3.56 and a standard deviation of 0.04, learning environment for students with a mean of 3.52 and a standard deviation of 0.08, use of technology in teaching with a mean of 3.50 and a standard deviation of 0.01, and professionalism with a mean of 3.31 and a standard deviation of 0.14. The overall grand weighted mean of 3.50 indicates that the faculty perceived their performance as exceeding expectations. Similarly, the program heads evaluated the faculty's performance as exceeding expectations, with learning environment for students obtaining the highest mean of 3.45 and a standard deviation of 0.03, followed by instructional facilitation and delivery with a mean of 3.41 and a standard deviation of 0.12, assessment with a mean of 3.39 and a standard deviation of 0.06, and use of technology in teaching with a mean of 3.33 and a standard deviation of 0.07. Professionalism received the lowest mean of 3.11 and a standard deviation of 0.19, corresponding to meets expectations. Overall, the program heads' evaluation yielded a grand weighted mean of 3.34, indicating that faculty performance generally exceeded expectations, although faculty members rated their own performance slightly higher than did the program heads.

Table 3

Level of Faculty Performance Based on Self-Evaluation and Evaluation by the Program Heads

Performance Indicators	Faculty Self-Evaluation		Program Heads' Evaluation	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Learning environment for students	3.52	0.08	3.45	0.03
Use of technology in teaching	3.50	0.01	3.33	0.07
Instructional facilitation and delivery	3.60	0.04	3.41	0.12
Assessment	3.56	0.04	3.39	0.06
Professionalism/Immersive Reader	3.31	0.14	3.11	0.19
Grand Weighted Mean	3.50	0.06	3.34	0.09

3.4 Significant Difference Between the Assessment of the Respondents on Organizational Leadership Style and group according To Sex

Table 4 presents the results of the t-test analysis conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference in the assessment of the respondents regarding the organizational leadership style of the program heads and according to sex. The findings show that the computed t-value of 0.94 for organizational leadership style is lower than the critical value of 2.78 at the 0.05 level of significance, indicating that there is no significant difference between the assessments of the respondents. Likewise, the computed t-value of 0.11 for organizational leadership style according to sex is also lower than the critical value of 2.78, indicating that no significant difference exists between the assessments of male and female respondents. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected in both analyses, suggesting that the respondents' assessments of the organizational leadership style remain consistent regardless of respondent group and sex.

Table 4

T-test Analysis Showing the Significant Difference Between the Assessment of the Respondents on Organizational Leadership Style and Group According to Sex

Variable	df	t-value	Critical Value	Decision	Interpretation
Organizational Leadership Style	4	0.94	2.78	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Organizational Leadership Style According to Sex	4	0.11	2.78	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant

3.5 Significant Difference Between Faculty Performance when group according to Profile

Table 5 presents the results of the single-factor ANOVA conducted to determine whether faculty performance significantly differs according to the respondents' profile. The findings reveal that no significant differences were found when faculty performance was grouped according to age, sex, designation, years of experience, and employment status, as their computed F-values were lower than the corresponding critical values and their p-values were greater than the 0.05 level of significance. In contrast, educational attainment showed a significant difference in faculty performance, with an F-value of 3.21 exceeding the critical value of 3.10 and a p-value of 0.0448, which is less than 0.05. This indicates that faculty performance varies significantly according to educational attainment, while the other profile variables do not significantly influence the level of faculty performance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected only for educational attainment and retained for all other profile variables.

Table 5
Single-Factor ANOVA Showing the Significant Difference in Faculty Performance According to Profile

Profile Variable	F-value	p-value	F-critical	Decision	Interpretation
Age	3.67	0.0586	3.94	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Sex	0.00	1.0000	3.94	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Educational Attainment	3.21	0.0448	3.10	Reject H_0	Significant
Designation	0.04	0.8504	3.94	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Years of Experience	2.15	0.0810	2.47	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Employment Status	1.11	0.3508	2.70	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant

3.6 Significant Relationship Between the Organizational Leadership Style of Program Heads and the Performance of Faculty

Table 6 presents the Pearson's correlation analysis examining the relationship between the organizational leadership styles of the program heads and faculty performance. The results indicate very weak positive correlations for all three leadership styles. Autocratic leadership obtained a correlation coefficient of 0.13, democratic leadership recorded 0.07, and laissez-faire leadership yielded 0.09. These correlation coefficients indicate negligible relationships between leadership style and faculty performance. Since the computed correlation values do not demonstrate a statistically significant relationship at the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is not rejected. Therefore, the findings suggest that the organizational leadership styles of the program heads are not significantly associated with the performance of the faculty member.

Table 6
Significant Relationship Between the Organizational Leadership Style of Program Heads and the Performance of Faculty

Leadership Style	Pearson's r	Relationship	Decision	Interpretation
Autocratic	0.13	Very Weak Positive	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Democratic	0.07	Very Weak Positive	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant
Laissez-faire	0.09	Very Weak Positive	Fail to Reject H_0	Not Significant

Conclusions & Recommendations

The findings revealed that the program heads predominantly practiced a democratic leadership style as reflected in both their self-assessment and the faculty's perception. Faculty members likewise demonstrated a level of performance that exceeded expectations based on both self-evaluation and the evaluation of the program heads. Statistical analyses further showed no significant differences in organizational leadership assessments based on respondent group and sex, while faculty performance did not significantly differ according to age, sex, designation, years of experience, and employment status. However, educational attainment significantly influenced faculty performance. Moreover, no significant relationship was found between the organizational leadership styles of the program heads and faculty performance, indicating that other organizational and individual factors may contribute to faculty effectiveness.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that the institution continue promoting democratic leadership practices through leadership enhancement programs and continuous professional development. Faculty members should be encouraged to pursue advanced academic qualifications and participate in training opportunities to further improve their instructional competencies and professional growth. The institution should also sustain its performance monitoring and evaluation system while exploring other factors that may influence faculty performance. Finally, future researchers are encouraged to conduct similar studies in other higher education institutions using larger samples and additional variables to provide a more comprehensive understanding of organizational leadership and faculty performance.

Compliance with ethical standards

The author declares no conflict of interest. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. This study was self-funded. The authors thank the participating respondents for their contributions

REFERENCES

- Al Khajeh, E. H. (2018). Impact of leadership styles on organizational performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 2018, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5171/2018.687849>
- Clark, D. R. (2004). Leadership style survey. Big Dog & Little Dog's Performance Juxtaposition. <https://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/leader/survlead.html>
- Cortellazzo, L., Bruni, E., & Zampieri, R. (2019). The role of leadership in a digitalized world: A review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article 1938. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01938>
- Khajeh, E. H. A. (2018). Impact of leadership styles on organizational performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 2018, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5171/2018.687849>
- Nguyen, T. T., Nguyen, H. T., & Tran, T. M. (2023). Leadership styles and faculty performance in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(5), 1021–1038.
- Northouse, P. G. (2022). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en>
- Republic of the Philippines. (2012). Republic Act No. 10173: Data Privacy Act of 2012. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2012/ra_10173_2012.html
- UNESCO. (2024). *Global education monitoring report 2024/25: Leadership in education*. UNESCO Publishing. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/>