

# School Heads' Leadership Practices and Their Influence on Teachers' Occupational Stress and Work Attitude

Redeem A. Patarlas

Student  
Medina College  
Philippines

## Abstract:

In education, leadership practices play an important role in shaping teachers' professional expectations, motivation, and work environment. This study determined the influence of school heads' leadership practices on teachers' occupational stress and work attitude in selected public elementary schools in the Department of Education Division of Lanao del Norte. A descriptive–correlational design was utilized to examine the relationships among variables without manipulating the natural school setting. The respondents included twenty-four (24) school heads through complete enumeration and one hundred fifty-two (152) teachers selected using stratified random sampling. Data were gathered using a researcher-developed questionnaire with a reliability coefficient of 0.89. Frequency count, mean, and standard deviation were employed for descriptive analysis, while the Kruskal–Wallis test and Pearson correlation coefficient were used to test differences and relationships. Findings showed that school heads manifested a high level of leadership practices, teachers experienced a high level of occupational stress, and teachers demonstrated a very high level of work attitude. Leadership practices were significantly related to occupational stress ( $r = -0.356$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and work attitude ( $r = 0.521$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). No significant differences were found when respondents were grouped according to age, educational attainment, and length of service. The study concludes that effective leadership practices contribute to reduced stress and more positive work attitudes among teachers.

**Keywords:** Leadership Practices, Occupational Stress, Work Attitude, School Heads, Public Elementary Teachers.

## INTRODUCTION

In education, leadership practices are key in shaping expectations, support, and direction of professional work by teachers. The school heads use their leadership to affect the motivation, decision-making, and professional value of teachers in the school. Simultaneously, teachers also experience work pressures caused by instructional factors, emotional issues, and time and workload management pressure. These stress experiences influence attitudes of teachers toward their work that are manifested in their satisfaction with their jobs, their involvement in teaching activities, and their dedication to the profession. Examining leadership practices in relation to teachers' occupational stress and work attitude provides deeper insight into how school leadership contributes to teachers' professional functioning and the effectiveness of the school organization.

The existing body of literature emphasizes the primary role of school leadership practices in shaping the professional experience of teachers and the overall effectiveness of schools. A meta-analytical synthesis by Sun and Leithwood (2015) has demonstrated that direction-setting leadership activities, such as setting clear goals and a common vision, are important contributors to the motivation, commitment, and professional engagement of teachers. In line with these results, Sirisookslip et al. (2015) have observed that school administrators have a significant influence on teacher effectiveness whose leadership styles are supportive and transformational, meaning that those styles of leadership that support and transform teachers have a significant effect on their professional functionality. Occupational stress of teachers has been one of the most reported serious issues along with leadership factors; De Simone et al. (2016) report workload pressures,

emotional pressures, and time as key stressors that harm the job satisfaction of teachers and their overall well-being. Moreover, work attitudes of teachers have been revealed to be directly correlated with the outcomes of their profession since Willemse and Deacon (2015) discovered that meaningful work experiences have a positive impact on job satisfaction, work engagement, and commitment to work among teachers.

Despite the increasing volume of research on school leadership, teachers' occupational stress, and work attitude, gaps remain in both the literature and educational practice. Previous research has tended to focus on leadership practices against teacher performance or organizational performance, occupational stress, and work attitude have also been a common topic of research, but leadership variables have been rarely integrated. As a result, there is insufficient empirical evidence that simultaneously examines how school heads' leadership practices relate to both teachers' occupational stress and work attitude. Even in school environments where leadership practices exist, empirically, teachers still face high workload demands, emotional demands, and time demands in the school. These circumstances show that the connection between leadership practices and the well-being and professional attitudes of teachers should be further studied.

This study set out to identify how leadership practices of school heads affected the occupational stress and work attitude of teachers. In particular, it aimed at defining the demographic characteristics of the respondents in the context of age, education level, and years of service, and estimating the degree of school heads' leadership practices based on inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and idealized influence. The purpose of the study was also to find out the degree of occupational stress in teachers concerning the workload-related stress, emotional stress, and time-management stress, and to find out the degree of work attitude in terms of job satisfaction, work engagement, and professional commitment among the teachers. Besides, it was also looking at the significant associations between leadership practices of school heads and occupational stress among teachers, and between leadership practices and the work attitude among teachers. Lastly, the research was aimed at identifying the existence of meaningful differences in the practices of leadership, work stress, and work attitude when respondents are clustered on the basis of demographic profile.

## **THEORETICAL/CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The present study will have a theoretical background based on two significant theories, which include Transformational Leadership Theory, as developed by Bass (1985) and further theorized by Bass and Avolio (1994), and the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model, as suggested by Bakker and Demerouti (2007). All these frameworks indicate the reason why the leadership practices of school heads can influence the occupational stress and work attitude of teachers, which are distinct but highly related to the professional experience of teachers within the school organizations.

### **Transformational Leadership Theory (Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1994)**

Transformational Leadership Theory, proposed by Bass (1985) and its later developments by Bass and Avolio (1994), is the approach through which leaders persuade the followers to go beyond personal interests towards the overall organizational objectives. The theory suggests that transformational leaders are able to enhance their motivation, commitment, and performance since they shape the values, beliefs, and professional behaviours of the followers. Transformational leadership can be characterized by four primary dimensions, and these aspects are inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and idealized influence, which, in summary, characterize leadership practices that ensure the development of the profession and the involvement in the organization.

Inspirational motivation is also evident in the school head, who has the ability to articulate a powerful vision that is compelling and gives the teachers a sense of direction. Intellectual stimulation gives the teachers an incentive to critically examine the teaching practice and constantly improve their professional competence. Personal attention can be applied to make school heads realize personal needs and struggles faced by teachers, and as such, establish trust and professional confidence. Moral leadership and credibility of an ideally influential individual become higher, and uncertainty is reduced, leading to morale within the school

organization. The leadership practices will provide a positive working environment among the professionals that will influence the teacher motivation, activities, and response to work expectations.

Transformational Leadership Theory applies to the field of education, with empirical evidence supporting this. In their study, Cetin and Kinik (2015) discovered that transformational leadership actions of academic leaders are positively linked with professional commitment and instructional effectiveness of teachers. Equally, Yang (2014) pointed out that transformational leadership by principals has a significant impact on improving schools in terms of achieving a common vision and professional practice. Although Berkovich (2016) critically examined the contextual limits of transformational leadership theory, the study reaffirmed its relevance in explaining how leadership behaviors influence teachers' professional experiences. Further evidence by Jovanovic and Ciric (2016) highlighted that transformational leadership promotes teacher motivation, trust, and commitment, particularly during periods of organizational change. Research conducted by Afshari et al. (2012) and Navickaite and Janiunaite (2012) also revealed that transformational leadership by principals is very instrumental in managing change in education, even though situational obstacles might influence its execution.

### **Job Demands-Resources JD-R Model (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007)**

Although Berkovich (2016) critically examined the contextual limits of transformational leadership theory, the study reaffirmed its relevance in explaining how leadership behaviors influence teachers' professional experiences. Further evidence by Jovanovic and Ciric (2016) highlighted that transformational leadership promotes teacher motivation, trust, and commitment, particularly during periods of organizational change. Job demands are those aspects of work that involve physical or psychological effort that is sustained, such as workload, emotional demands, and time pressure, and will result in stress when too much. Job resources, conversely, are organizational, social, and managerial conditions that assist individuals in dealing with job demands, minimize stress, and enhance motivation and work engagement.

Work, emotional, and time-management stresses are also considered to be the major job demands in the teaching profession, which influence the occupational well-being of teachers. With prolonged exposure to such demands, one may experience stress, fatigue, and become unsatisfied with the job. Conversely, job resources that may alleviate the negative effects of job demand and produce positive work attitudes, including job satisfaction, work engagement, and professional commitment, are the role of leadership practices, social support, and organizational resources.

It is possible to state that there is a great amount of empirical evidence to justify the application of the JD-R Model to education. Simbula et al. (2012) determined that the relationship between job requirements and job resources is a significant predictor of well-being and productivity of teachers. Similarly, Brouwers et al. (2011) confirmed that low job control and social support and high job demand are among the factors that induce teacher burnout, but the resources are able to ameliorate stress consequences. Simbula (2010) also established that stress and well-being among the teachers occurred directly as a result of changes in job requirements on a day-to-day basis. Longitudinal evidence of the concept of sustained job demands as a source of stress and exhaustion was conducted by Boyd et al. (2010), and longitudinal evidence of the concept of job resources as a source of engagement and commitment was also conducted. More studies emphasized by Konermann (2011) and Guglielmi et al. (2012) put emphasis on the role of personal and organizational resources in the motivation to work and mitigating the adverse impacts of the stressful work environment. A more recent investigation by White (2024) validated the relevance of the JD -R Model to the situation of describing the contribution of work engagement and psychological detachment to the psychological well-being and stress management.

Taken together, Transformational Leadership Theory and Job Demands Resources Model can offer an effective and sufficient theoretical basis for the current study. Transformational Leadership Theory stands out in the role that was played by school head leadership practices as being fundamental job resources that predetermined both the motivation, engagement, and commitment of teachers to the job, and the JD-R Model explains how the resources tied to leadership interacted with job demands to influence the occupational stress

and work attitude of teachers. The theoretical combination is a consistent view of the influence of the leadership practice of school heads on the occupational stress and the school work attitude among teachers, and to clarify the contribution of the leadership to the well-being of the teachers and school performance.

### Statement of the Problem

The present study aimed to determine the influence of school heads leadership practices on teachers occupational stress and work attitude. Particularly, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
  - 1.1 Age;
  - 1.2 Educational Attainment; and
  - 1.3 Length of Service?
2. What is the extent of school heads' leadership practices in terms of:
  - 2.1 Inspirational Motivation;
  - 2.2 Intellectual Stimulation;
  - 2.3 Individualized Consideration; and
  - 2.4 Idealized Influence?
3. What is the level of teachers' occupational stress in terms of:
  - 3.1 Workload-related Stress;
  - 3.2 Emotional Stress; and
  - 3.3 Time-management Stress?
4. What is the level of teachers' work attitude in terms of:
  - 4.1 Job Satisfaction;
  - 4.2 Work Engagement; and
  - 4.3 Professional Commitment?
5. Is there a significant relationship between school heads' leadership practices and teachers' occupational stress?
6. Is there a significant relationship between school heads' leadership practices and teachers' work attitude?
7. Is there a significant difference in school heads' leadership practices when grouped according to respondents' demographic profile?
8. Is there a significant difference in teachers' occupational stress when grouped according to respondents' demographic profile?
9. Is there a significant difference in teachers' work attitude when grouped according to respondents' demographic profile?

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between school heads' leadership practices and teachers' occupational stress.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between school heads' leadership practices and teachers' work attitude.

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant difference in school heads' leadership practices when respondents are grouped according to their demographic profile.

**H<sub>04</sub>:** There is no significant difference in teachers' occupational stress when respondents are grouped according to their demographic profile.

**H<sub>05</sub>:** There is no significant difference in teachers' work attitude when respondents are grouped according to their demographic profile.

## METHODS

### Research Design

The research design that was used in this study was the descriptive-correlational research design in order to understand the relationship between the leadership practices of school heads and the occupational stress and work attitude of teachers. This design was suitable since it aims at the description of the existing conditions and the establishment of the relation between variables without manipulating and controlling them. In this research, the independent variable was the leadership practices of the school heads, and the dependent

variables were the occupational stress of the teachers and the attitude towards work. According to Creswell (2014), correlational designs may be used to identify the direction and the strength of the correlation among variables, and on the basis of the obtained data, the researcher may have an impression concerning the way in which variables interact within the real settings. In this way, the study could examine the correlations between the leadership practices and the occupational stress among teachers, and the leadership practices and the work attitude of teachers in the natural school setting.

### Research Setting

This research was conducted in the Department of Education (DepEd Division of Lanao del Norte) in selected schools of elementary schools in the public schools. The division was selected as the study area since it comprises elementary schools with diverse leadership activities, organizational designs, and teaching situations that created a suitable environment to investigate the leadership practices launched by school heads as well as professional experiences of teachers. The availability of school heads and elementary school teachers in various schools enabled the evaluation of leadership practices and how they are linked to occupational stress and work attitude of teachers. In addition, the teaching and administrative environment of state elementary schools within the division offered a topical framework regarding the learning of the leadership dynamics and well-being of teachers in the framework of basic education. These features were what made the DepEd Division of Lanao del Norte a proper environment to explore the relationships between leadership practices, occupational stress, and work attitude.

### Research Respondents

This research focused on the school heads and elementary school teachers in the selected elementary public schools in the Department of Education (DepEd) Division of Lanao del Norte. The small size of the school heads resulted in complete enumeration, and all the 24 school heads became the respondents. Stratified random sampling was applied in the study of the teacher-respondents to ensure the sampled schools were proportionally represented, which is recommended as a more efficient approach in increasing representativeness and reducing sampling bias (Creswell, 2014). A total of 152 teachers were sampled by multiplying 251 elementary school teachers in Raosoft Sample Size Calculator, and the sample size was computed under a 95 percent interval, 5 percent margin of error, and 50 percent distribution of the respondents (Raosoft, Inc., 2004). This type of combination of sampling procedures ensured that the respondents were statistically representative of the population and helped to make the findings reliable.

**Table 1 - Distribution of Respondents**

District	Number of School Heads			Number of Teachers			
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
Kapatagan	2	3	5	12	38	50	
Lala	1	4	5	10	42	52	
Tubod	2	3	5	14	41	55	
Kolambugan	1	4	5	11	39	50	
Maigo	1	3	4	9	35	44	
Total	7	17	24	56	195	251	n = 152

### Research Instrument

The researcher employed a self-made questionnaire as the main tool for collecting data, which was created to collect data on leadership practices of school heads, occupational stress of teachers, and the work attitude of teachers. The questionnaire consisted of four parts and employed a four-point Likert scale, where 1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Agree, and 4 – Strongly Agree, to measure the respondents' perceptions. Part A was focused on the demographic profile of the respondents, including age, educational level, and the length of service. Part B measured the extent of school heads' leadership practices in terms of Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, and Idealized Influence. Part C assessed

the level of teachers' occupational stress, specifically workload-related stress, emotional stress, and time-management stress. Part D evaluated teachers' work attitude in terms of job satisfaction, work engagement, and professional commitment. The instrument was constructed to ensure alignment with the objectives of the study and the variables under investigation.

### **Validity of Instrument**

To establish the validity of the research instrument, the researcher initially conducted pilot testing prior to the actual data collection. The questionnaire was administered to selected school heads and elementary school teachers from public elementary schools outside the DepEd Division of Lanao del Norte to determine its suitability in measuring school heads' leadership practices, teachers' occupational stress, and teachers' work attitude. The pilot test resulted in a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.89, which is a high degree of internal consistency and acceptability of the instrument. After pilot testing, the questionnaire was also subjected to expert validation by specialists in the areas of educational leadership and research methodology to determine its content validity further. Through the comments of the pilot respondents and the expert validators, slight changes were made to enhance the readability, phrasing, and correspondence of the items to the research variables to ensure that the instrument suited the purpose of the actual research.

### **Data Gathering Procedure**

The researcher sought formal permission to conduct the study within the chosen public elementary schools in Lanao del Norte through the Department of Education (DepEd) Division of Lanao del Norte before administering the research instrument to the subjects. The office of the division was asked to sign the research by sending a formal request letter, which stated the purpose, scope, and significance of the study. After obtaining the permission, the school heads were coordinated to help in the dissemination of the questionnaires to the selected respondents. The respondents were allowed to read the informed consent letter on the goals of the research and were provided with assurances that all data collected would remain confidential and would only be used in academic ways before the actual administration. The study was done voluntarily, and the respondents were made aware of their right to pull out at any point in time with no repercussions. The researcher conducted a questionnaire through face-to-face interviews with the respondents and provided clear guidelines to ensure that the respondents provided corrected and honest answers. The respondents had an adequate time to fill the instrument, after which the completed questionnaires were retrieved, validated to be complete, and sorted systematically to be analyzed.

### **Ethical Considerations**

During the process of conducting this study, ethical considerations were highly considered in line with the best practices in conducting ethical social science research (Bell and Bryman, 2007). The respondents did not experience any physical, emotional, or psychological injury, and their rights and dignity were not violated during any part of the study. This was done voluntarily, with informed consent, and the respondents were made aware of the fact that they could withdraw at any time without any repercussions. Privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity of the respondents were guaranteed by not giving them identifying information and only utilizing the data in an academic way. Fraud or falsification of the purpose and methodology of the study was avoided intentionally. The researcher was sincere and open to the fact that he was sincere in the data collection, analysis, and findings reporting, any affiliations or potential conflict of interest, and committed to the entire obligation of upholding the ethical standards in research that were observed during the research process.

### **Data Analysis**

The data collected following the questionnaire collection were analyzed with the help of descriptive and inferential statistics:

**Frequency Count:** The frequency count was used on the demographic properties of the respondents in terms of age, education level, and length of service, as well as summing the frequency distribution of the responses to the survey.

**Mean and Standard Deviation:** Mean and Standard deviation were employed to establish the degree of school heads' leadership practices and the degree of occupational stress and work attitude of teachers. These

measures were used to describe the mean of the respondents and the difference in the perceptions of the respondents as regards the individual variables.

**Kruskal–Wallis Test:** It has been used to establish the significant differences in the leadership practice of the school heads, occupational stress of the teachers, and the attitude of the teachers towards their work, when the respondents were categorized based on their age, educational attainment, and length of service. The use of this non-parametric test was suitable for comparing responses of three or more independent groups.

**Pearson's r:** Pearson's r correlation coefficient (Pearson's r) was used to measure the strength and direction between leadership practices and school heads and work attitude of teachers, or between leadership practices and school heads and work attitude of teachers.

**Table 2 - Scaling of the Extent of School Heads' Leadership Practices**

Range	Response	Interpretation
1.0 – 1.75	Strongly Disagree	Very Low
1.76 – 2.50	Disagree	Low
2.51 – 3.25	Agree	High
3.26 – 4.0	Strongly Agree	Very High

**Note:**

3.26–4.00 — Indicates a very high extent of leadership practices by school heads; hence, school heads are always portrayed to be good leaders through inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized considerations, and idealized influence.

2.51–3.25 — Indicates a great extent of leadership practices, implying that school heads tend to portray effective leadership practices.

1.76–2.50 — Indicates a low extent of leadership practices, which means that there is a low level of display of leadership behaviors.

1.00–1.75 — Indicates a very low extent of leadership practices, that is, leadership behaviors are hardly exercised.

**Table 3 - Scaling of the Level of Teachers' Occupational Stress**

Range	Response	Interpretation
1.0 – 1.75	Strongly Disagree	Very Low
1.76 – 2.50	Disagree	Low
2.51 – 3.25	Agree	High
3.26 – 4.0	Strongly Agree	Very High

**Note:**

3.26–4.00 — Indicates a very high level of occupational stress, and this means that teachers are usually prone to workload-related stress, emotional stress, and time-management stress in their work.

2.51–3.25 — Indicates a high level of occupational stress, implying that teachers are under pressure work related situations most of the time.

1.76–2.50 — Indicates a low level of occupational stress, which implies that teachers are under pressure at manageable levels.

1.00–1.75 — Indicates a very low level of occupational stress, which means that there is not much work stress.

**Table 4 - Scaling of the Level of Teachers' Work Attitude**

Range	Response	Interpretation
1.0 – 1.75	Strongly Disagree	Very Low
1.76 – 2.50	Disagree	Low
2.51 – 3.25	Agree	High
3.26 – 4.0	Strongly Agree	Very High

**Note:**

3.26–4.00 — Indicates a very high level of work attitude, which means that teachers are always filled with positive job satisfaction, strong work engagement, and high levels of professional commitment.

2.51–3.25 — Indicates a high level of work attitude, which implies that teachers are usually positive in their attitudes towards work.

1.76–2.50 — Indicates a low level of work attitude, which means that they are not satisfied, engaged, or committed.

1.00–1.75 — Indicates a very low level of work attitude, which indicates that teachers seldom portray positive attitudes towards their work.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION****Table 5 - Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

Profile	School Heads		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
<b>Age</b>				
22-30 years	2	8.33	28	18.42
31-40 years	4	16.67	40	26.32
41-50 years	8	33.33	47	30.92
51-60 years	7	29.17	30	19.74
61 years and above	3	12.50	7	4.60
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Educational Attainment</b>				
Bachelor's Degree	0	0.00	22	14.47
Master's Degree (units earned)	0	0.00	54	35.53
Master's Degree (completed)	14	58.33	72	47.37
Doctoral Degree (units earned)	7	29.17	4	2.63
Doctoral Degree (completed)	3	12.50	0	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Length of Service</b>				
1-5 years	0	0.00	22	14.47
6-10 years	2	8.33	36	23.68
11-15 years	5	20.83	42	27.63
16-20 years	9	37.50	38	25.00
21 years and above	8	33.33	14	9.21
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 5 presents the profile of the respondents in terms of age, educational attainment, and length of service, classified into school heads and teachers.

In terms of age, the majority of the school heads were within the 41–50 years age group (33.33%), followed by those aged 51–60 years (29.17%). This is a pointer that the majority of school heads are within their middle and late career stage, which is in line with professional maturity and experience needed in leadership of public elementary schools. Meanwhile, the teachers were largely concentrated in the 41–50 years age group (30.92%) and 31–40 years group (26.32%), suggesting that the teaching workforce is primarily composed of mid-career educators.

The given finding is confirmed by Isaacs (2012), who highlighted that the age and career stage of school leaders have a considerable impact on their leadership effectiveness and resilience. Moreover, Branch et al.

(2012) indicated that more experienced principals, who are directly associated with the age, have a more powerful influence on the productivity of a school. Similarly, Yucel and Bektas (2012) concluded that teachers who are in their middle career years exhibit greater job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which helps the schools to be stable in the process of their professional existence.

Regarding educational attainment, none of the school heads were bachelor's degree holders or had only master's units. The majority had completed a master's degree (58.33%), while others had earned doctoral units (29.17%) or completed a doctoral degree (12.50%). This implies that school heads generally possess advanced academic qualifications, which align with the competency and qualification requirements expected of school leaders. In contrast, the teachers were mostly master's degree holders (47.37%) or had earned master's units (35.53%), while only a small proportion had doctoral units and none had completed a doctoral degree.

Mushtaq and Akhtar (2014) confirm these findings by revealing that an increased level of educational achievement by academic leaders plays a significant role in the choice of leadership styles and administrative performance. Furthermore, as suggested by Tahir et al. (2015), a high academic achievement of the principals is one of the factors that lead to an increase in teacher trust and the overall leadership achievement. Similarly, Love (2015) highlighted the importance of preparing teachers at the graduate level in terms of instructional competence and professional preparedness.

With respect to length of service, none of the school heads had less than five years of service. The largest proportion had served for 16–20 years (37.50%), followed by those with 21 years and above (33.33%). This implies that school principals usually gain much teaching and management experience at a lower level before they get the leadership job. Among the teachers, the highest proportion had 11–15 years of service (27.63%), followed by those with 16–20 years (25.00%) and 6–10 years (23.68%), indicating a workforce distributed across early, mid, and advanced career stages.

This trend is in line with Isaacs (2012), who observed that a long time in the profession enhances leadership capabilities as well as decision-making in the organization. Similarly, Hughes (2012) also found that there is a strong relationship between length of service and instructional competence, professional commitment, and retention of teachers. In addition, Yucel and Bektas (2012) discovered that the length of tenure among teachers is a factor that leads to increased organizational commitment and long-term participation in the school procedures.

**Table 6.1 - Level of School Heads' Leadership Practices in terms of Inspirational Motivation**

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I clearly communicate the school's vision and goals to teachers.	0.74	3.24
2. I inspire teachers to perform at their best.	0.71	3.22
3. I motivate teachers to work toward shared school goals.	0.76	3.20
4. I encourage optimism when facing school challenges.	0.80	3.17
5. I promote a sense of purpose among teachers.	0.73	3.21
<b>Grand Mean</b>		<b>3.21 (High)</b>

**Scale:** 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

Table 6.1 indicates the level of school heads' leadership practices with respect to inspirational motivation. The results indicate a high degree of inspirational motivation, as shown by the grand mean of 3.21.

Out of the indicators, the statement, "I clearly communicate the school's vision and goals to teachers", scored the highest at 3.24, suggesting that school heads effectively offer clear direction and align teachers with school objectives. In contrast, the statement "I encourage optimism when facing school challenges" obtained the

smallest mean of 3.17, although it still falls within the high level. This implies that while inspirational leadership is generally evident, fostering optimism during challenging situations may be an area that requires further emphasis. Nonetheless, the close range of mean scores indicates relatively consistent leadership practices across all indicators.

The inspirational motivation that was high in the study is justified by the available literature that has underscored the significance of inspirational leadership in schools. Hauserman and Stick (2013) also highlighted that teachers appreciate principals with a transformational form of leadership, more especially those who popularize a vision and motivate teachers to help in achieving common objectives. In the same vein, Aydin et al. (2013) established that leadership practices by principals have a significant impact on teacher job satisfaction and organizational commitment, particularly where school leaders motivate and inspire teachers by being purpose-driven leaders. Also, Whitaker et al. (2013) emphasized that inspirational school leaders promote motivation, positivity, and devotion among teachers by ensuring that they refer to and uphold the school mission and urge teachers to rise to challenges as a team.

In table 6.2, it shows the level of school heads' leadership practices with respect to intellectual stimulation. The results indicate a high degree of intellectual stimulation, as reflected in the grand mean of 3.16.

**Table 6.2 - Level of School Heads' Leadership Practices in terms of Intellectual Stimulation**

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I encourage teachers to think creatively and innovatively.	0.83	3.19
2. I support new ideas and teaching strategies.	0.79	3.21
3. I challenge teachers to find solutions to school-related problems.	0.85	3.12
4. I value teachers' ideas when making decisions.	0.81	3.18
5. I promote critical thinking in addressing school concerns.	0.87	3.10
<b>Grand Mean</b>		3.16 (High)

**Scale:** 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

Among the indicators, the statement “I support new ideas and teaching strategies” received the highest mean of 3.21, which indicated that school heads are usually willing to accept innovation and instructional changes in the classroom that are initiated by the teachers. Conversely, the statement “I promote critical thinking in addressing school concerns” registered the lowest mean of 3.10, although it still falls within the high category. This implies that while school heads encourage creativity and value teachers' contributions, there may be fewer opportunities for structured critical and analytical engagement in resolving school-related issues. The differences between the mean scores are relatively small, which demonstrates that the intellectual stimulation as perceived was quite similar in all indicators.

The intellectual stimulation that has been discussed in this study is high and is supported by literature that has identified the importance of intellectually stimulating leadership as a contributor to innovation and reflective practice in schools. According to Okoth (2017), the intellectual stimulation of principals boosts the performance of a school, as it promotes the innovative thinking and the reflection of teachers in decision-making. On the same note, Tesfaw (2014) discovered that leadership practices, specifically intellectual stimulation, have a positive effect on satisfaction of teachers in terms of professional development and problem-solving skills. Besides that, Gunter (2016) emphasized that a school leadership practice based on intellectual engagement promotes critical inquiry, collaborative learning, and continuous improvement in educational organizations.

**Table 6.3 - Level of School Heads' Leadership Practices in terms of Individualized Consideration**

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I listen to teachers' concerns and suggestions.	0.71	3.44
2. I consider the individual needs of teachers.	0.74	3.39
3. I provide support to teachers who experience difficulties.	0.70	3.46
4. I recognize and appreciate teachers' efforts.	0.76	3.41
5. I treat teachers with respect and fairness.	0.68	3.52
<b>Grand Mean</b>	3.44 (Very High)	

**Scale:** 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

Table 6.3 demonstrates the intensity of leadership practices of school heads with respect to individualized consideration. The results show that there is an extremely high degree of individualized consideration; this is shown by the grand mean of 3.44, which lies in the highest range of the scale.

The top mean of 3.52 achieved by the statement, "I treat teachers with respect and fairness", implies that the school heads will treat the teachers with respect and fairness at all times. On the other hand, the indicator "I consider the individual needs of the teachers" recorded the lowest mean of 3.39, though it qualifies as a very high category. This means that despite the strong demonstrations of respectful and fair treatment, there are still possibilities to develop the leadership practices that are more responsive to the individual needs of the teachers. The low margin between the maximum and minimum mean scores indicates that there is a relatively uniform standard of personal thinking among the school leaders.

The very high degree of individualized consideration that has been observed in this study is supported by the literature that has described the significance of transformational leadership in establishing a positive and supportive school environment. McCarley et al. (2014) state that the leadership techniques focused on personalized support and respect are important in the provision of a good school climate and good teacher engagement. Similarly, Anderson (2017) noted that the transformational education leader is a person who pays personal attention, i.e., recognizes the needs of teachers and provides them with professional and emotional support, which leads to motivation and commitment. Also, as Khan et al. (2016) explain, individualized consideration is the crucial component of the transformational leadership style since it enables trust, equity, and personal development within organizations, including academic ones.

**Table 6.4 - Level of School Heads' Leadership Practices in terms of Idealized Influence**

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I serve as a role model for teachers.	0.72	3.47
2. I demonstrate ethical behavior in my leadership role.	0.66	3.54
3. I gain teachers' trust through my actions.	0.75	3.42
4. I act consistently with the values I promote.	0.70	3.45
5. I lead by example in fulfilling school responsibilities.	0.73	3.44
<b>Grand Mean</b>	3.46 (Very High)	

**Scale:** 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

Table 6.4 indicates the degree of school heads' leadership practices with respect to idealized influence. The outcome indicates that the degree of idealized influence is very high based on the grand mean of 3.46, which is at the highest level.

Among the indicators, the statement, “I demonstrate ethical behavior in my leadership role”, received the greatest mean of 3.54, implying that school heads highly show ethical leadership and are moral people in their schools. Meanwhile, the indicator “I gain teachers’ trust through my actions”, marked with the least mean of 3.42, but also is in the very high category. This means that the aspect of trust-building by taking the same steps is greatly reflected among school heads, which will further prove their credibility and reliability as leaders. The fact that the maximum and minimum values are the same in terms of mean scores is evidence of a very high level of idealized influence in all indicators.

The very high level of the idealized influence, which is evident in this research, is confirmed by the available literature that highlights the importance of school effectiveness and improvement in terms of ethical and value-oriented leadership. Shatzer et al. (2014) stressed that integrity and role model principles have a significant impact on school performance and commitment among teachers. Equally, Brinia and Papantoniou (2016) discovered that school leaders who lead through example and utilize ethical authority have higher chances of getting the trust and respect of teachers. Moreover, Yang (2013) emphasized that another important element in transformational leadership is the idealized influence because the principals who continually exemplify common values are likely to instill confidence, loyalty, and commitment to the shared vision in the teachers.

**Table 6.5 - Summary of the Extent of School Heads Leadership Practices**

Domains	Mean	Interpretation
Inspirational motivation	3.21	High
Intellectual stimulation	3.16	High
Individualized consideration	3.44	Very High
Idealized influence	3.46	Very High
Grand Mean	3.32	Very High

**Scale:** 3.26 – 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

The results in Table 6.5 show that all four domains of school heads’ leadership practices were positively perceived by teachers. Inspirational Motivation achieved a mean of 3.21, and Intellectual Stimulation had a mean of 3.16, both interpreted as High, indicating that school heads moderately inspire and intellectually challenge their teachers. On the other hand, Individualized Consideration (3.44) and Idealized Influence (3.46) were rated Very High, suggesting that school heads provide strong personal support, recognize teachers’ individual needs, and serve as ethical and value-driven role models. The Grand Mean of 3.32, interpreted as Very High, reflects an overall positive perception of transformational leadership practices among school heads. The variation in scores across domains implies that while school heads excel in providing personal support and demonstrating exemplary leadership, there is slightly less emphasis on motivating and stimulating teachers intellectually, though these areas are still rated positively.

The overall pattern of results is supported by existing studies on transformational leadership in school settings. Wahab et al. (2014) reported that school heads commonly demonstrate transformational leadership practices at high levels, particularly in areas related to ethical leadership and individualized support. Similarly, Browning (2014) documented that trust-oriented and value-based leadership behaviors, such as idealized influence, are frequently exhibited by school leaders and are consistently recognized by teachers. In addition, Kamola (2016) found that school heads’ transformational leadership practices are generally evident across multiple leadership dimensions, with variations in the extent to which each domain is manifested.

**Table 7.1 - Level of Teachers’ Occupational Stress in terms of Workload-related Stress**

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I feel overwhelmed by my teaching workload.	0.88	3.02
2. I have too many tasks to complete within a limited time.	0.84	3.08

Indicators	SD	Mean
3. Paperwork adds stress to my teaching responsibilities.	0.90	3.15
4. My workload affects my work performance.	0.86	3.04
5. I feel pressured by multiple school demands.	0.89	3.11
<b>Grand Mean</b>	3.08 (High)	

**Scale:** 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

Table 7.1 presents the degree of teachers' occupational stress in terms of workload-related stress. The results indicate a high degree of workload-related stress, which is reflected by the grand mean of 3.08, which falls within the high scale category.

Among the indicators, the statement "Paperwork adds stress to my teaching responsibilities" obtained the highest mean of 3.15, indicating that administrative and documentation-related tasks are a major contributor to teachers' workload stress. In contrast, the indicator "I feel overwhelmed by my teaching workload" registered the least mean of 3.02, although it still falls within the high category. This indicates that workload-related stress is commonly experienced by teachers across different aspects of their professional duties. The fact that the top mean score was very close to the lowest one indicates that the level of workload-related stress was consistent among teachers.

The high level of workload-related stress in this research is justified by the existing literature that records workload as a major contributor to occupational stress in teachers. According to Usoro and Etuk (2016), job pressure and work overload are major factors that influence the job performance of teachers and lead to stress in schools. On the same note, Wanke (2015) highlighted that a continuous workload related to a physical and mental nature may result in stress and fatigue in professionals, including educators. Moreover, Ferguson et al. (2012) also found that high workload demands are linked with high levels of anxiety and low job satisfaction among teachers, thus again confirming the existence of workload-related stress in the teaching profession.

**Table 7.2 - Level of Teacher's Occupational Stress in terms of Emotional Stress**

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I feel emotionally drained after work.	0.92	2.96
2. Work-related issues cause emotional exhaustion.	0.89	3.01
3. I feel anxious about meeting school expectations.	0.87	2.93
4. Teaching responsibilities affect my emotional well-being.	0.91	3.05
5. I experience stress due to interpersonal challenges at work.	0.90	2.98
<b>Grand Mean</b>	2.99 (High)	

**Scale:** 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

The degree of occupational stress among the teachers in terms of emotional stress is illustrated in Table 7.2. The findings show the presence of a lot of emotional stress, which is represented by the grand mean of 2.99, which falls in the high scale category.

Among the indicators, the statement "Teaching responsibilities affect my emotional well-being" obtained the top mean of 3.05, indicating that teaching-related duties have a notable influence on teachers' emotional condition. In contrast, the indicator "I feel anxious about meeting school expectations" recorded the lowest mean of 2.93, although it still falls within the high category. It shows that emotional stress is experienced across different emotional aspects of teachers' professional lives. The little difference between the maximum mean score and the lowest one is an indication of a constant degree of emotional stress in teachers.

Existing literature that underscores the emotional requirements of the teaching profession supports the high degree of emotional stress experienced in this study. Mérida-Lopesa et al. (2017) have discovered that emotional strain and mental health outcomes in teachers are closely related to role-related stress and low levels of emotion-regulation ability. On the same note, Schonert-Reichl (2017) noted that the emotional load experienced by teachers when they work can have an impact on their emotional health, provided that it is not properly managed. In addition, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2017) reported that emotional stress among teachers is related to work pressures and self-efficacy, influencing how teachers experience and manage with emotional challenges in the school environment.

**Table 7.3 - Level of Teacher's Occupational Stress in terms of Time-management Stress**

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I struggle to manage my time effectively at work.	0.85	3.06
2. I often feel rushed when completing my tasks.	0.88	3.10
3. Time constraints increase my stress level.	0.83	3.02
4. I have difficulty balancing teaching and other duties.	0.86	3.08
5. Lack of time affects my work efficiency.	0.84	3.04
<b>Grand Mean</b>		<b>3.06 (High)</b>

**Scale:** 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

Table 7.3 demonstrates the intensity of the occupational stress associated with teachers in terms of time-management stress. The findings show that there is a strong time-management stress level, as the grand mean of 3.06 is within the high scale range.

Among the indicators, the statement “I often feel rushed when completing my tasks” obtained the highest mean of 3.10, indicating that time pressure is a prominent source of stress among teachers. In contrast, the indicator “Time constraints increase my stress level” registered the least mean of 3.02, although it still falls within the high category. This shows that challenges related to time allocation and task completion are commonly experienced by teachers. The fact that the highest and lowest mean scores are barely different shows that there is a uniform experience of time-management stress in the indicators.

The time-management stress that was observed to be high in this study is justified by available literature that highlights the role of time constraints in predisposing teachers to occupational stress. Lambert et al. (2012) found that a poor time management habit is a major cause of high stress levels among teachers. In a similar case, Ritz et al. (2013) indicated that stress may be a significant problem among teachers due to time pressure and the need to compete with their responsibilities, and this influences their efficiency and job satisfaction. Furthermore, Chaudhry (2013) also highlighted the importance of insufficient time resources and job demands as the most significant factors that contribute to the occurrence of occupational stress among educators, which further supports the occurrence of time-management stress in teaching settings.

**Table 7.4 - Summary of the Level of Teacher's Occupational Stress**

Domains	Mean	Interpretation
Work-related Stress	3.08	High
Emotional Stress	2.99	High
Time-management Stress	3.06	High
Grand Mean	3.04	High

**Scale:** 3.26 – 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

The table 7.4 illustrates the summary of the occupational stress of the teachers with respect to domains of work-related stress, emotional stress, and time-management stress. The scores show that the overall occupational stress is high, with the grand mean of 3.04, which is in the category of high scale.

The most notable mean score was work-related stress (3.08), then time-management stress (3.06), which were both interpreted as high. Emotional stress recorded a mean of 2.99, which is likewise interpreted as high. These results show that all three domains of occupational stress were experienced at a comparable level, with only minimal variation in mean scores across the domains.

The overall pattern of results is supported by previous studies on teachers' occupational stress. Hasan (2014) reported that primary school teachers commonly experience occupational stress arising from workload, emotional demands, and time pressure. On the same note, Jeyarat (2013) discovered that teachers are stressed at various levels of their activities, such as job-related tasks and emotional tension. In addition, Kayastha and Kayastha (2012) documented that occupational stress is prevalent across different school contexts and is consistently reflected in work-related, emotional, and time-management dimensions, supporting the summary results presented in this study.

**Table 8.1 - Level of Teacher's Work Attitude in terms of Job Satisfaction**

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I am satisfied with my job as a teacher.	0.79	3.34
2. I feel fulfilled in my teaching role.	0.82	3.29
3. I enjoy my daily teaching tasks.	0.77	3.31
4. My work gives me a sense of achievement.	0.81	3.27
5. I am content with my current teaching position.	0.80	3.32
<b>Grand Mean</b>		<b>3.31 (Very High)</b>

**Scale:** 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

Table 8.1 provides the level of work attitude of the teachers based on job satisfaction. The findings show that the level of job satisfaction is very high, with the grand mean standing at 3.31, which comes within the category of very high scale.

Among the indicators, the statement "I am satisfied with my job as a teacher" obtained the highest mean of 3.34, indicating that teachers generally express strong satisfaction with their teaching profession. In contrast, the indicator "My work gives me a sense of achievement" registered the lowest mean of 3.27, although it still falls within the very high scale. This shows that the teachers in this study are always positive in their attitudes toward their work in all indicators. The low distribution of the maximum and minimum mean scores indicates that the job satisfaction among teachers is very high at all times.

Existing literature on highlighting the positive attitude of teachers towards the work supports the very high level of job satisfaction as observed in this study. According to Ignat and Clipa (2012), job satisfaction among teachers is strongly linked with emotional well-being and a positive image of their professional roles. On the same note, Kavitha (2015) found that educators with desirable teaching attitudes were found to have better rates of job satisfaction. Furthermore, Üredi (2017) documented a strong relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and their positive attitudes toward the teaching profession, supporting the findings of a very high level of job satisfaction in this study.

**Table 8.2 - Level of Teacher's Work Attitude in terms of Work Engagement**

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I am enthusiastic about my teaching work.	0.86	3.18
2. I am deeply involved in my job.	0.84	3.21
3. I put extra effort into my teaching responsibilities.	0.88	3.15
4. I feel energized while performing my duties.	0.85	3.19
5. I am committed to improving my teaching performance.	0.87	3.17
<b>Grand Mean</b>		3.18 (High)

**Scale:** 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

Table 10.2 shows the degree of work attitude of teachers with regard to work engagement. The findings show that the work engagement is high, as the grand mean of 3.18 is in the high category of the scale.

Among the indicators, the statement “I am deeply involved in my job” obtained the highest mean of 3.21, indicating that teachers demonstrate strong involvement in their teaching responsibilities. In contrast, the indicator “I put extra effort into my teaching responsibilities” registered the lowest mean of 3.15, although it still falls within the high category. This demonstrates that teachers are always engaged in terms of their involvement, enthusiasm, and commitment to their professional responsibilities. The small gap between the mean scores of the highest and the lowest mean indicates that the level of work engagement among the teachers is relatively stable.

The high degree of work engagement that was evident in this research is justified by the literature available on teacher engagement. Konermann (2012) highlighted that the work engagement of teachers can be observed in their engagement, motivation, and commitment to the teaching duties. Likewise, Klassen et al. (2012) confirmed work engagement in teachers under varying conditions and noted the importance of involvement and energy as key indicators of work engagement. In addition, San and Tok (2017) reported that teachers with higher levels of work engagement demonstrate stronger professional commitment and sustained participation in their work roles, supporting the high level of engagement found in this study.

**Table 8.3 - Level of Teacher's Work Attitude in terms of Professional Commitment**

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I intend to remain in the teaching profession.	0.74	3.42
2. I feel a strong sense of responsibility toward my profession.	0.76	3.38
3. I am dedicated to my role as a teacher.	0.72	3.45
4. I am willing to go beyond my duties for the school.	0.78	3.36
5. I feel proud to be part of the teaching profession.	0.75	3.41
<b>Grand Mean</b>		3.40 (Very High)

**Scale:** 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

Table 8.3 indicates the degree of work attitude with regard to professional commitment. The results indicate an extremely high degree of professional commitment, which is reflected by the grand mean of 3.40, which falls within the very high scale category.

The statement “I am dedicated to my role as a teacher” obtained the top mean of 3.45, indicating that teachers strongly demonstrate dedication to their professional responsibilities. In contrast, the indicator “I am willing to go beyond my duties for the school” registered the lowest mean of 3.36, although it still falls within the

very high category. This indicates that teachers always demonstrate high levels of professional commitment on all indicators. The small gap between the maximum and the minimum values of the mean scores indicates a very high level of professional commitment that is uniform across all teachers.

This result is justified by the literature that has been published, highlighting attachment and identification of teachers with their profession. Bashir (2017) discovered that highly job-satisfied teachers have greater professional commitment and intention of staying in the teaching career. In the same way, Sorensen and McKim (2014) indicated that teachers who are offered conducive working conditions show better professional commitment and dedication to their work. Additionally, Klassen et al. (2012) documented that teachers' occupational commitment is closely associated with their sense of responsibility, professional pride, and long-term engagement in the teaching profession, supporting the very high level of professional commitment reflected in this study.

**Table 8.4 - Summary of the Level of Teacher's Work Attitude**

Domains	Mean	Interpretation
Job Satisfaction	3.31	Very High
Work Engagement	3.18	High
Professional Commitment	3.40	Very High
Grand Mean	3.30	Very High

**Scale:** 3.26 – 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

Table 11 shows the overview of the degree of teachers' work attitude across the domains of job satisfaction, work engagement, and professional commitment. The findings show a very high overall degree of teachers' work attitude, as reflected by the grand mean of 3.30, which falls within the very high scale category.

Among the domains, professional commitment recorded the highest mean score (3.40), followed by job satisfaction (3.31), both interpreted as very high. Work engagement obtained a mean of 3.18, which is considered high. The mean scores across the three domains show only slight variation, indicating that teachers' work attitude across the measured dimensions ranges from high to very high.

The overall pattern of results is supported by existing studies on teachers' work attitude. Agcam and Pinar (2016) reported that teachers generally exhibit positive attitudes toward the teaching profession across different work-related dimensions. Similarly, Willemse and Deacon (2015) reported that work attitudes of teachers are observed in their professional engagement and perceptions of meaningful work. In addition, Colomeischi and Colomeischi (2014) found that teachers' attitudes toward work are manifested through emotional, behavioral, and professional dimensions, consistent with the summarized levels presented in this study.

**Table 9 - Test of Significant Relationship between School Heads' Leadership Practices and Teachers' Occupational Stress**

Test Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p value	Decision
School Heads' Leadership Practices and Teachers' Occupational Stress	-0.356	0.000	Reject the Ho

**Note:** If  $p \leq 0.05$ , there is a significant relationship

Table 9 shows the significant relationship test between the leadership practices of the school heads and the occupational stress of teachers. The findings show that there is a significant correlation between the two variables as indicated by the correlation coefficient as -0.356 and the p-value of 0.000, which is not more than the level of significance of 0.05. According to this outcome, the null hypothesis is dropped. The negative

value of correlation coefficient indicates an inverse relationship between leadership practice of school heads and occupational stress of teachers.

The outcome of this study is confirmed by the available research pointing out the correlation between the school leadership and the teachers stress experiences. According to Marshall (2015), there was a strong correlation between the leadership styles of principals and the level of stress among teachers, meaning that the leadership practices are strongly connected to the level of stress in teachers at work. Similarly, Kılınc et al. (2015) reported that leadership-related factors are significantly associated with teachers perceived stress. In addition, Lambersky (2016) documented that principals' leadership behaviors are related to teachers' stress, morale, and self-efficacy, reinforcing the significant relationship observed in this study.

**Table 10 - Test of Significant Relationship between School Heads' Leadership Practices and Teachers' Work Attitude**

Test Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p value	Decision
School Heads' Leadership Practices and Teachers' Work Attitude	0.521	0.000	Reject the Ho

**Note:** If  $p \leq 0.05$ , there is a significant relationship.

Table 13 shows the test of the significant relationship between the leadership practice by school heads and the work attitude of teachers. It is observed that there is a strong correlation between the two variables as the correlation coefficient of 0.521 and the p-value of 0.000 are lower than the level of significance of 0.05. According to this finding, the null hypothesis is rejected. The positive value in the correlation coefficient implies the existence of a direct relationship between the leadership practice of the school heads and the attitude of the teachers towards their work.

This research has shown the outcome of the study, and it has been supported by previous studies that have insisted on the relationship between leadership practices and the work attitudes of the teachers. Wahab et al. (2014) discovered that job satisfaction and professional commitment of teachers are closely connected to the transformational leadership practices of school heads. On the same note, in a study carried out by Veeriah et al. (2017), transformational leadership by principals was significant in influencing affective commitment of teachers in primary school. Moreover, according to Orphanos and Orr (2013), the positive teacher attitudes and professional engagement have a strong connection with the effective leadership practices of the school heads, which supports the strong correlation presented in this research.

**Table 11 - Test of Significant Difference in School Heads' Leadership Practices when Grouped According to Demographic Profile**

Test Variables	p value	Decision
School Heads' Leadership Practices vs. Age	0.241	Retain the Ho
School Heads' Leadership Practices vs. Educational Attainment	0.318	Retain the Ho
School Heads' Leadership Practices vs. Length of Service	0.276	Retain the Ho

**Note:** If  $p \leq 0.05$ , there is a significant difference.

#### **School Heads' Leadership Practices vs. Age**

The significant difference test between the leadership practices of school heads and their age had a p-value of 0.241 that is above the 0.05 level of significance. This finding implies that the leadership practices are not significantly different when school heads are grouped by age. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means that the leadership practice of school heads does not differ with the age of school heads.

This observation is validated by the available research which shows that age is not always a determinant of leadership behavior. Kotur and Anbazhagan (2014) discovered that the leadership styles did not vary significantly with age because leaders of different age groups can exhibit the same leadership behaviors. In the same regard, Sawati et al. (2013) have reported that the leadership styles among principals do not differ significantly by age and thus leadership practices will not be regarded as having role expectations or demographics as the basis.

### School Heads' Leadership Practices vs. Educational Attainment

The test of significant difference of the leadership practices of school heads and the attained level of education attained a p-value of 0.318, which is above the 0.05 level of significance. This implies that there is no considerable variation in leadership practices when the school heads are clustered based on their educational level. Therefore, the null hypothesis holds, and it means that there is a similarity in the manifestation of leadership practices irrespective of academic qualification.

This finding can be compared to earlier research, which indicated that the level of education is not sufficient to bring about significant differences in the leadership practices. The authors discovered that demographic factors such as educational level do not affect leadership styles significantly (Mushtaq and Akhtar, 2014). On the same note, Sawati et al. (2013) found that the leadership behavior of principals with different educational levels is similar, particularly in standard educational systems.

### School Heads' Leadership Practices vs. Length of Service

The significant difference between the leadership practices and length of service of the school heads presented a p-value of 0.276, which is not below the 0.05 level of significance. This finding shows that the leadership practices do not differ significantly when school heads are classified based on the length of service. The null hypothesis is therefore retained, according to which the head practices of leadership are similar in school heads who hold different years of leadership experience.

This finding is supported by literature emphasizing that leadership practices are not solely dependent on years of service. Piaw et al. (2014) determined that the relationship between leadership competencies of school principals and their experience is not the sole factor because the competencies have several other influencing factors which lead to the adoption of similar leadership practices in various career stages. In addition, Sun et al. (2014) found that organizational and contextual factors influence effective principal leadership, as opposed to length of service, which is associated with such leadership. Furthermore, Fuller et al. (2016) noted that leadership practices tend to be standardized through professional preparation and institutional expectations, contributing to consistency across leaders with different levels of experience.

**Table 12 - Test of Significant Difference in Teachers' Occupational Stress when Grouped According to Demographic Profile**

Test Variables	p value	Decision
Teachers' Occupational Stress vs. Age	0.094	Retain the Ho
Teachers' Occupational Stress vs. Educational Attainment	0.163	Retain the Ho
Teachers' Occupational Stress vs. Length of Service	0.071	Retain the Ho

**Note:** If  $p \leq 0.05$ , there is a significant difference.

### Teachers' Occupational Stress vs. Age

The significant difference test between the occupational stress and the age of teachers returned the p-value of 0.094, which is higher than the level of significance 0.05. It means that no significant difference in the occupational stress of teachers can be observed when they are divided by their age. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted, no significant differences as the findings show that there are no significant differences in terms of occupational stress in teachers of different ages.

The same result can be explained by the existing literature, which states that occupational stress among teachers is not significantly influenced by age. Agai-Demjaha et al. (2015) reported that stress-causing factors among elementary school teachers were generally similar across different age groups. Similarly, Aftab and Khatoon (2012) discovered that there were no occupational stress levels between teachers and an age group; they highlight that in teaching, stressors are likely to be experienced by teachers irrespective of their age.

### Teachers' Occupational Stress vs. Educational Attainment

The significant difference in the occupational stress levels and the educational attainment of teachers was tested and the p-value was 0.163, which is higher than the level of significance of 0.05. This outcome shows that occupational stress does not differ significantly between teachers who can be grouped based on educational attainment. In this way, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means that teachers of various academic qualifications have the same levels of occupational stress.

The result is consistent with other research studies that have indicated that occupational stress among teachers does not have a close relationship with education level. Agai-Demjaha et al. (2015) found that demographic characteristics, including educational background, did not significantly differentiate teachers' stress levels. Similarly, Cooper (2012) explained that occupational stress in teaching arises primarily from work demands, time pressure, and role overload rather than from teachers' academic qualifications.

### Teachers' Occupational Stress vs. Length of Service

The significant difference between the occupational stress of teachers and length of service gave the p-value of 0.071, which exceeds the level of significance (0.05). This finding shows that no big difference lies between the occupational stress of teachers when divided on bases of length of service. Based on this, it is possible to state that the null hypothesis was accepted, which means that teachers of various years of experience do not have dissimilar occupational stress levels.

This finding is supported by studies indicating that occupational stress persists across different career stages in teaching. Qadimi et al. (2015) reported that occupational stress is experienced by teachers regardless of length of teaching experience. In addition, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2015) found that stress levels among teachers remain evident across different stages of the teaching career due to consistent job demands and pressures. Furthermore, Agai-Demjaha et al. (2015) reported the prevalence of work-related stress among teachers at different lengths of service, which supports the non-significance of differences in terms of years of service.

**Table 13 - Test of Significant Difference in Teachers' Work Attitude when Grouped According to Demographic Profile**

Test Variables	p value	Decision
Teachers' Work Attitude vs. Age	0.214	Retain the Ho
Teachers' Work Attitude vs. Educational Attainment	0.289	Retain the Ho
Teachers' Work Attitude vs. Length of Service	0.198	Retain the Ho

**Note:** If  $p \leq 0.05$ , there is a significant difference.

### Teachers' Work Attitude vs. Age

The significant difference test between the work attitude and the age of teachers was 0.214 that is more than the level of significance of 0.05. The outcomes of this result show that there is no big difference in the work attitude of teachers when they are separated by age. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, and it means that the teachers of different ages have the same level of work attitude.

This finding is supported by studies indicating that teachers' attitudes toward work are not significantly differentiated by age. Yusuf et al. (2016) reported that age does not significantly influence employees'

attitudes toward work, as professional responsibilities and organizational expectations remain similar across age groups. Additionally, Wiyono (2016) reported that the motivation to work and attitudes of teachers do not differ significantly according to age, i.e., there is no difference in work attitudes between teachers regardless of their age.

### **Teachers' Work Attitude vs. Educational Attainment**

The significant difference test between the work attitude of teachers and their educational attainment received a p-value of 0.289, and this value is more than the 0.05 significance level. This finding shows that there is no meaningful difference in the work attitude of teachers in a group of them based on their educational attainment. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, and it proves that the attitude to work does not differ between teachers of various academic qualification levels.

This observation is consistent with findings of other past research studies which revealed that education level was not a big factor in determining the working attitude of teachers. Wiyono (2016) reported that teachers' motivation and attitudes toward work are comparable across different education levels. Similarly, Akçay et al. (2016) discovered that organizational and professional determinants influence the attitude towards work in educational institutions, but not educational background.

### **Teachers' Work Attitude vs. Length of Service**

The significant difference between the attitude of teachers towards their work and the length of service gave a p-value of 0.198, which is more than the 0.05 level of significance. This finding demonstrates that there is no strong variation in the attitude of teachers towards their work when they are divided based on length of service. Based on this, the null hypothesis is accepted, and experts propose that teachers who have different years of experience have a comparable work attitude.

This finding is supported by the available literature which demonstrates that the work attitude of teachers with longer lengths of service does not differ. Al Harthy et al. (2013) found that no significant difference exists in the attitudes and performance of the teachers regarding their teaching experience since professional values and role expectations are still maintained in the career stages. Furthermore, Klassen et al. (2012) also added that the presence of teacher involvement in work is also observed in various professional settings and career levels, which supported the non-existence of considerable variation, conditioned by the duration of service.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Conclusion**

This study affirms that school heads' leadership practices have a meaningful influence on teachers' occupational stress and work attitude in public elementary schools. The way in which school heads lead affects teachers' ability to cope with work-related pressures and shapes their overall outlook toward their professional roles. The study implies that the right leadership is needed to make an environment conducive to the well-being of teachers and the attitude toward their work. This kind of influence is evident in the diverse demographic settings, with the primary focus being on the centrality of leadership in schools. Overall, this research highlights leadership practices as the key indicator in tackling the issue of occupational stress in teachers and improving their attitude towards work.

### **Recommendations**

1. Teachers. Teachers should participate in the process of professional growth activities to improve coping mechanisms for dealing with occupational stress and maintaining positive work attitudes. Enhancing cooperation with the school heads and colleagues can also be useful to create a positive working environment that can support well-being and professional development.
2. School Heads. School heads should constantly enhance leadership habits that support, motivate, exercise equity, and offer professional commendation to teachers. They ought to implement leadership styles that would contribute to mitigating occupational stress and promote positive work attitudes among the school fraternity.

3. Educational Institutions. Schools and other educational institutions should integrate leadership development and teacher support programs. To enhance the teachers performance and the effectiveness of the organization, institutional initiatives must be aimed at encouraging healthy leadership behaviors and work environments.
4. Future Researchers. Future researchers should develop the results of this research by investigating other models of leadership, other variables, or interventions associated with the occupational stress and work attitude of teachers. They will also want to consider undertaking such studies in varying learning settings or levels in order to expand on the knowledge of leadership impact in education.

## REFERENCES:

1. Afshari, M., Bakar, K. A., Luan, W. S., & Siraj, S. (2012). Factors affecting the transformational leadership role of principals in implementing ICT in schools. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 11(4), 164–176. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ989265>
2. Aftab, M., & Khatoun, T. (2012). Demographic differences and occupational stress of secondary school teachers. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 8(5), 159–175.
3. Agai-Demjaha, T., Karadzinska Bislimovska, J., & Mijakoski, D. (2015). Level of work-related stress among teachers in elementary schools. *Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 3(3), 484. <https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2015.076>
4. Agai-Demjaha, T., Minov, J., Stoleski, S., & Zafirova, B. (2015). Stress-causing factors among teachers in elementary schools and their relationship with demographic and job characteristics. *Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 3(3), 493–499. <https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2015.077>
5. Agcam, R., & Pinar, B. M. (2016). An investigation on EFL teachers' attitude toward teaching profession. *Higher Education Studies*, 6(3), 21–31. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1106537>
6. Akçay, R. C., Ulutaş, M., & Sevinç, N. (2016). Attitudes towards work in educational institutions. *Online Submission*, 13(1), 1072–1083. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED592834>
7. Al Harthy, S. S. H., Jamaluddin, S., & Abedalaziz, N. A. (2013). Teachers' attitudes and performance: An analysis of effects due to teaching experience. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 2(9), 889–894. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0002957>
8. Anderson, M. (2017). Transformational leadership in education: A review of existing literature. *International Social Science Review*, 93(1), 1–13. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/90012919>
9. Aydin, A., Sarier, Y., & Uysal, S. (2013). The effect of school principals' leadership styles on teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 13(2), 806–811. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1017309>
10. Bashir, L. (2017). Job satisfaction of teachers in relation to professional commitment. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.25215/0404.007>
11. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
12. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
13. Bell, E., & Bryman, A. (2007). *Business research methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
14. Berkovich, I. (2016). School leaders and transformational leadership theory: Time to part ways? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 54(5), 609–622. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-11-2015-0100>
15. Boyd, C. M., Bakker, A. B., Pignata, S., Winefield, A. H., Gillespie, N., & Stough, C. (2010). A longitudinal test of the job demands–resources model among Australian university academics. *Applied Psychology*, 60(1), 112–140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2010.00429.x>
16. Brouwers, A., Tomic, W., & Boluijt, H. (2011). Job demands, job control, social support and self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of burnout among physical education teachers. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v7i1.103>
17. Browning, P. (2014). Why trust the head? Key practices for transformational school leaders to build a purposeful relationship of trust. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 17(4), 388–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2013.844275>

18. Cetin, M. O., & Kinik, F. S. F. (2015). An analysis of academic leadership behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 519–527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.122>
19. Chaudhry, A. (2013). Analysis of occupational stress of university faculty to improve the quality of their work. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, 9. [https://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/iqtm/PDF-FILES/02-Analysis%20of%20Occupational%20Stress\\_AQ%20Chaudhry\\_v\\_ix\\_issue1\\_june2013.pdf](https://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/iqtm/PDF-FILES/02-Analysis%20of%20Occupational%20Stress_AQ%20Chaudhry_v_ix_issue1_june2013.pdf)
20. Colomeischi, A. A., & Colomeischi, T. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards work in relation with emotional intelligence and self-efficacy. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 159, 615–619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.435>
21. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
22. De Simone, S., Cicotto, G., & Lampis, J. (2016). Occupational stress, job satisfaction and physical health in teachers. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 66(2), 65–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2016.03.002>
23. Ferguson, K., Frost, L., & Hall, D. (2012). Predicting teacher anxiety, depression, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v8i1.2896>
24. Fuller, E. J., Hollingworth, L., & An, B. P. (2016). The impact of personal and program characteristics on the placement of school leadership preparation program graduates in school leader positions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(4), 643–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X16656039>
25. Guglielmi, D., Simbula, S., Schaufeli, W. B., & Depolo, M. (2012). Self-efficacy and workaholism as initiators of the job demands–resources model. *Career Development International*, 17(4), 375–389. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620431211255842>
26. Gunter, H. M. (2016). An intellectual history of school leadership practice and research. *Torrossa*. <https://www.torrossa.com/it/resources/an/5202295>
27. Hasan, A. (2014). A study of occupational stress of primary school teachers. *Educationia Confab*, 3, 11–19. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1914049>
28. Hauserman, C. P., & Stick, S. L. (2013). The leadership teachers want from principals: Transformational. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 36(3), 184–203. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40098167>
29. Hughes, G. D. (2012). Teacher retention: Teacher characteristics, school characteristics, organizational characteristics, and teacher efficacy. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 105(4), 245–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2011.584922>
30. Ignat, A. A., & Clipa, O. (2012). Teachers' satisfaction with life, job satisfaction and their emotional intelligence. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 33, 498–502. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.01.171>
31. Isaacs, A. J. (2012). Resiliency and the individual demographics of school leaders: Making a difference in the quality of educational leadership. *Journal of Research in Education*, 22(1), 128–162. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1098379>
32. Jeyasushma Veeriah, Chua, Y. P., & Siaw, Y. L. (2017). Principal's transformational leadership and teachers' affective commitment in primary cluster schools in Selangor. *International Online Journal of Educational Leadership*, 1(1), 60–89. <https://doi.org/10.22452/iojel.vol1no1.4>
33. Jovanovic, D., & Ciric, M. (2016). Benefits of transformational leadership in the context of education. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2016.09.64>
34. Kamola, P. M. (2016, March 2). Influence of head teacher's transformational leadership style on teachers' job commitment in public primary schools in Matinyani Sub-County, Kitui County, Kenya [Unpublished master's thesis]. South Eastern Kenya University. <https://repository.seku.ac.ke/handle/123456789/1956>
35. Kavitha, S. (2015). Teaching attitude and job satisfaction of secondary school teachers. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 3(4). [https://shanlax.com/wp-content/uploads/SIJ\\_Education\\_V3\\_N4\\_001.pdf](https://shanlax.com/wp-content/uploads/SIJ_Education_V3_N4_001.pdf)

36. Kayastha, D. P., & Kayastha, R. (2012). A study of occupational stress on job satisfaction among teachers with particular reference to corporate higher secondary schools of Nepal. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences and Education*, 1(2). [http://www.ajmse.leena-luna.co.jp/AJMSEPDFs/Vol.1\(2\)/AJMSE2012\(1.2-06\).pdf](http://www.ajmse.leena-luna.co.jp/AJMSEPDFs/Vol.1(2)/AJMSE2012(1.2-06).pdf)
37. Kılınç, A. Ç., Cemaloğlu, N., & Savaş, G. (2015). The relationship between teacher leadership, teacher professionalism, and perceived stress. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 15(58), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2015.58.5>
38. Khan, Z. A., Nawaz, A., & Khan, I. (2016). Leadership theories and styles: A literature review. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, 16, 1–7. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/293885908>
39. Klassen, R., Wilson, E., Siu, A. F. Y., Hannok, W., Wong, M. W., Wongsri, N., Sonthisap, P., Pibulchol, C., Buranachaitavee, Y., & Jansem, A. (2012). Preservice teachers' work stress, self-efficacy, and occupational commitment in four countries. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(4), 1289–1309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-012-0166-x>
40. Klassen, R. M., Aldhafri, S., Mansfield, C. F., Purwanto, E., Siu, A. F. Y., Wong, M. W., & Woods-McConney, A. (2012). Teachers' engagement at work: An international validation study. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 80(4), 317–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2012.678409>
41. Konermann, J. (2012). Teachers' work engagement: A deeper understanding of the role of job and personal resources in relationship to work engagement, its antecedents, and its outcomes. <https://doi.org/10.3990/1.9789036533027>
42. Kotur, B. R., & Anbazhagan, S. (2014). The influence of age and gender on the leadership styles. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(1), 30–39. <https://hal.science/hal-03878604/>
43. Lambersky, J. (2016). Understanding the human side of school leadership: Principals' impact on teachers' morale, self-efficacy, stress, and commitment. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 15(4), 379–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2016.1181188>
44. Lambert, M., Torres, R., & Tummons, J. (2012). The influence of time management practices on job stress level among beginning secondary agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 53(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2012.01045>
45. Love, T. S. (2015). Examining the demographics and preparation experiences of foundations of technology teachers. *The Journal of Technology Studies*, 41(1), 58–71. <https://doi.org/10.2307/90003807>
46. McCarley, T. A., Peters, M. L., & Decman, J. M. (2014). Transformational leadership related to school climate. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(2), 322–342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214549966>
47. Mérida-López, S., Extremera, N., & Rey, L. (2017). Emotion-regulation ability, role stress and teachers' mental health. *Occupational Medicine*, 67(7), 540–545. <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqx125>
48. Mushtaq, S., & Akhtar, S. (2014). A study to investigate the effect of demographic variables on leadership styles used by department heads in universities. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, 10, 17–33. <https://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/iqtm>
49. Navickaite, J., & Janiunaite, B. (2012). Barriers of school principals' transformational leadership in change process: Case study of Lithuanian schools. *Social Sciences*, 77(3). <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ss.77.3.2771>
50. Orphanos, S., & Orr, M. T. (2013). Learning leadership matters. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(5), 680–700. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213502187>
51. Piaw, C. Y., Hee, T. F., Ismail, N. R., & Ying, L. H. (2014). Factors of leadership skills of secondary school principals. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 5125–5129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1085>
52. Qadimi, A., Shsh, K. R., Praveena, K. B., & Cherabin, M. (2015). The influence of length of teaching experience on occupational stress among teachers. *ResearchGate*, 4(2), 125–131.
53. Ritz, R., Burris, S., & Brashears, T. (2013). The effects of a time management professional development seminar on stress and job satisfaction of beginning agriscience teachers in West Texas. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 54(3), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2013.03001>

54. San, B. Ç., & Tok, T. N. (2017). The relationship between teachers' work engagement and organizational commitment. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, (26), 355–370. <https://doi.org/10.5505/pausbed.2017.37232>
55. Sawati, M. J., Anwar, S., & Majoka, M. I. (2013). Do qualification, experience and age matter for principals' leadership styles? *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(7), 403–413. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v3-i7/63>
56. Schonert-Reichl, K. A. (2017). Social and emotional learning and teachers. *The Future of Children*, 27(1), 137–155. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44219025>
57. Shatzer, R. H., Caldarella, P., Hallam, P. R., & Brown, B. L. (2014). Comparing the effects of instructional and transformational leadership on student achievement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(4), 445–459. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213502192>
58. Simbula, S. (2010). Daily fluctuations in teachers' well-being: A diary study using the job demands-resources model. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 23(5), 563–584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615801003728273>
59. Simbula, S., Panari, C., Guglielmi, D., & Fraccaroli, F. (2012). Teachers' well-being and effectiveness: The role of the interplay between job demands and job resources. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 729–738. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.467>
60. Sirisookslip, S., Ariratana, W., & Ngang, T. K. (2015). The impact of leadership styles of school administrators on affecting teacher effectiveness. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 1031–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.022>
61. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2015). Job satisfaction, stress and coping strategies in the teaching profession: What do teachers say? *International Education Studies*, 8(3), 181–192. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1060892>
62. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Teacher stress and teacher self-efficacy: Relations and consequences. In *Aligning perspectives on health, safety and well-being* (pp. 101–125). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53053-6\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53053-6_5)
63. Sorensen, T. J., & McKim, A. J. (2014). Perceived work-life balance ability, job satisfaction, and professional commitment among agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 55(4), 116–132. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2014.04116>
64. Sun, H., Wang, X., & Sharma, S. (2014). A study on effective principal leadership factors in China. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 28(6), 716–727. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-11-2013-0173>
65. Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2015). Direction-setting school leadership practices: A meta-analytical review of evidence about their influence. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(4), 499–523. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2015.1005106>
66. Tahir, L. M., Musah, M. B., Al-Hudawi, S., Yusof, S., & Yasin, M. H. (2015, February 2). Investigating teacher trust towards principal in high performing schools: Comparisons on teacher demographic profiles. SSRN. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2565692](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2565692)
67. Tesfaw, T. A. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(6), 903–918. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214551948>
68. Üredi, L. (2017). Investigating the relationship between job satisfaction levels of the teachers in educational institutions and their attitudes towards teaching profession. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(12), 175–182. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1140644>
69. Ursulla Okoth. (2017). Impact of principals' intellectual stimulation on students' performance at Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in public secondary schools, Kenya. *Academia.edu*. <https://doi.org/10.21275/ART20178140>
70. Usoro, A. A., & Etuk, G. R. (2016). Workload-related stress and job effectiveness of university lecturers in Cross River and Akwa Ibom States, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Management Studies*, 3(1), 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.500/2016.3.1/500.1.34.41>
71. Wahab, J. A., Fuad, C. F. M., Ismail, H., & Majid, S. (2014). Headmasters' transformational leadership and their relationship with teachers' job satisfaction and teachers' commitments. *International Education Studies*, 7(13). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n13p40>

72. Wanke, E. (2015). Physical and mental workloads in professional dance teachers. *Medical Problems of Performing Artists*, 30(1), 54–60. <https://doi.org/10.21091/mppa.2015.1008>
73. Whitaker, T., Whitaker, B., & Lumpa, D. (2013). *Motivating & inspiring teachers*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315856445>
74. White, E. (2024). Helping to promote psychological well-being at work: The role of work engagement, work stress and psychological detachment using the job demands–resources model. *PEARL*. <https://pearl.plymouth.ac.uk/tpss/vol4/iss2/16/>
75. Willemse, M., & Deacon, E. (2015). Experiencing a sense of calling: The influence of meaningful work on teachers' work attitudes. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 41(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v41i1.1274>
76. Wiyono, B. (2016). Comparison of teachers' work motivation based on gender, age, education level, work duration, rank, and school level. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 3, 67–74.
77. Yang, Y. (2014). Principals' transformational leadership in school improvement. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 28(3), 279–288. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2013-0063>
78. Yucel, I., & Bektas, C. (2012). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and demographic characteristics among teachers in Turkey: Younger is better? *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 1598–1608. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.346>
79. Yusuf, F. N., Omolayo, B. O., & Azikiwe, J. C. (2016). Influence of gender, work environment, length of service and age of academic staff on attitude to work. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(1), 1481–1489. <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2016.s21.14811489>