

Attributions of Leadership and Teaching Performance of Faculty of Public Higher Education Institutions in Sulu

*Ronnie H. Sammah¹

¹Mindanao State University-Sulu, Jolo, Sulu 7400, Philippines

Abstract

This study assesses leadership attributes and teaching performance of faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu during School Year 2021-2022. Employing the descriptive-correlational research design with 200 respondents taken through purposive sampling procedure, and treating data through weighted mean, standard deviation, t-test for independent samples, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson's test of correlation, this study reveals the following findings: 1) Majority of the teacher-respondents are female, within 41-50 years old, married, have 10 years & below of length of service, almost equally distributed into the four groups of ranks/positions, and mostly have bachelor's degree. 2) On the average, teachers expressed agreement that principals of senior high schools oftentimes perform their leadership styles in terms of directive style attributes, supportive style attributes, participative style attributes, and achievement-oriented style. 3) On the average, teachers of public senior high schools in Sulu perceived to have high level of teaching in terms of planning, organizing, monitoring and evaluation, classroom atmosphere and discipline, and leadership. 4) On the average, there is no significant difference in the extent of leadership style attributes of principals of senior high school in Sulu when data are grouped according to gender, civil status, rank/position, and educational attainment. But significant difference exists in terms of age and length of service wherein teachers within 31-40 years old and have 10 years & below have better ways of perceiving the extent leadership style. 5) On the average, except for age, there is no significant difference in the assessment of teacher-respondents of the teaching performance of teachers when data are categorized according to gender, civil status, length of service, rank/position, and educational attainment. 6) There is a high correlation between teachers' assessment of leadership style and teaching performance. This study tends to support (Atsebeha 2016) Model of Principals' Leadership Attributes which asserts that Principal's Leadership Attributes are manifested by principal's leadership behaviors as directive style attributes, supportive style attributes, participative style attributes, and achievement-oriented style attributes..

Keywords: Leadership attributes, Teaching performance, Public higher education institutions

1. Introduction

It is a widely accepted principle that the success of school leadership and administration rest on principal's stewardship. Coupled with such success is faculty' effective teaching performance. Principal's leadership attributes play an important role in school management, such that their leadership and management styles are extremely influential with regard to the performance of faculty in their schools and that the success of the school largely rests upon them (Adeyemi and Akpotu 2004).

Depending on the situation, (House 1997) describes principal's leadership styles as to directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented styles. According to (Enueme and Egwunyenga, 2008), an

*Corresponding author



appropriate leadership style provides leadership that enables faculty to make a maximum contribution to the quality of education. It is also important in terms of the program for staff improvement that principals are expected to implement. Consequently, the activities of a principal depend on his/her leadership style through which s/he is recognized as a leader of the organization. It is also believed by many researchers that good leadership is the most important factor in implementing educational plans, school programs, and support of staff and facilities with the aim of fostering the progress and success of the school in Atsebeha, 2016).

Educators adhere to the notion that an effective implementation of school program mostly depends on staff quality (Kaleem 2021). That is to say, one of the most fundamental approaches in improving the quality of education is the improvement of teacher performance (Rowland 2008). The condition is clear, if leaders are to fulfill their roles, they have to use diversified methods that enable them to work with stakeholders and they must adopt proper leadership styles to perform their roles efficiently. As a result, to maintain their roles as leaders and to get people to participate in school activities, it is vital that school leaders should lead the school effectively in terms of improving the performance of faculty by adopting appropriate leadership styles.

Apparently, the attributes of leadership are the most important factor for the success of schools and to influence the performance of faculty to achieve the objectives of their schools. School principals are keen to make themselves and others responsible for learner support in order for them to learn and to improve the faculty' capacity to achieve set goals, which ultimately is learning on the part of the learners (Enueme & Egwunyenga, 2008 in Atsbeha, 2016). However, what the students learn can be affected by the performance of faculty which is a result of many attributes such as commitment, professional growth and school environments (Mekelle University, 2010 in Atsebeha, 2016). Similarly, (Ortega-Paz, Capodanno et al. 2021) indicated that the contributing factors in teaching performance such as person-related Factor, school-related Factor, learner-related Factor, and community-related factor are correlated to the level of faculty' performance. All of these factors are connected either directly or indirectly to principals' actions or inaction.

Although it is believed that adequate numbers of research efforts have done in some western countries in relation to school principals' leadership style attributes and faculty' performance, In the Philippines specifically in island regions and provinces, studies similar to these concepts are rarely conducted. Thus, gap of knowledge still exists. Hence, this study paid attention to the extent of leadership attributes and their relation to teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu province.

2. Materials and Methods

Bless and Higson-Smith (1995) introduced the concept of a research design as "a program that guides a researcher in collecting, analyzing and interpreting observed facts." (p.63). Similarly, Babbie and Mouton (2001: p.75) regard research design as the road map or blueprint by which one intends to conduct research and achieve his/her research goals and objectives." (Aming-Hayudini, Jaddani et al. 2022) used a descriptive design in their study of which a descriptive-correlational research design was employed in this study, that is, with the intent to describe, quantify, and infer as well as to discover relationships among variables and to allow the prediction of future events from present knowledge or phenomenon of faculty, namely: 1) The demographic profile of faculty of public HEIs in Sulu in terms of Gender, Age, Civil status, Length of service, Academic Rank, and Educational attainment; 2) The extent of leadership attributes of faculty of public HEIs in Sulu in the following dimensions Directive style attributes, Supportive style attributes, Participative style attributes, and Achievement oriented style attributes; 3) The extent of teaching performance of faculty of public HEIs in Sulu in the following dimensions Planning, Organizing, Monitoring and evaluation, Classroom atmosphere and discipline, and Leadership; 4) The study of (Kasim and Aming-Hayudini, 2022) that significant difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty of public HEIs in Sulu when data are grouped according to Gender, Age, Civil status, Length of service, Academic rank, and Educational attainment; 5) The

significant difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty of public HEIs in Sulu when data are grouped according to Gender, Age, Civil status, Length of service, Academic rank, and Educational attainment; and 6) The significant correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under leadership attributes and teaching performance of faculty of public HEIs in Sulu. Faculty of public HEIs in Sulu were the main source of data which were quantified to answer the research questions in this study. Library and internet researches and publications were the sources of information that was used to enrich the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of this research. The data from the respondents were collected through the use of survey-questionnaires.

This study was conducted in Sulu among the public HEIs during the Academic Year 2021-2022. These public HEIs under the direct supervision and administration of the Commission on Higher Education. The respondents of this study were the faculty of public HEIs in Sulu who are currently employed and teaching at the different universities and colleges during the Academic Year 2021-2022.

Table A Distribution of the target samples among faculty of public HEIs in Sulu

Public HEIs In Sulu	Faculty
MSU-Sulu	84
Sulu State College	84
Lapak Agricultural College	12
HBSAT	20
Total	200

A none-probability sampling design through (Hayudini, Hussin et al. 2022) purposive sampling method was employed in this study due to resources and time constrains. The use of purposive sampling technique ensured the adequate representation of gender, age, civil status, length of service, academic rank, and educational attainment variables. The following steps were employed in the course of data gathering: 1) A permit to administer the questionnaire was sought from the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, and then from the administrators of public HEIs in Sulu; and 2) The launching and administering as well as the retrieval of the questionnaire were conducted personally by the researcher. A survey-questionnaire was the main instrument to be employed to gather data on the extent leadership attributes and performance of faculty of public HEIs in Sulu. The research instrument was adapted and patterned from standardized questionnaire of Atsebeha (2016) which was used in his study on “Leadership Styles and Their Effects on Faculty’ Performance in The Tigray Region of Ethiopia”.

The research instrument used in this study consisted of three parts. Part I of the research instrument focused on obtaining the demographic profile of the respondents which include gender, age, civil status, length of service, academic rank, and educational attainment. Part II was geared toward obtaining data on the extent of leadership attributes which includes Directive style attributes, Supportive style attributes, Participative style attributes, and Achievement oriented style attributes. Part III dealt with the extent of teaching performance of faculty of public HEIs in Sulu in terms of Planning, Organizing, Monitoring and evaluation, Classroom atmosphere and discipline, and Leadership. The research instrument used in this research was patterned and adapted from standardized questionnaires which was used in previous studies. However, to suit its applicability to the local settings, these questionnaires were subjected for perusal of at least two experts from among the faculty members of the Graduate Studies of Sulu State College. Both descriptive and inferential statistical tools were appropriately employed in the treatment of data to be gathered for this study, namely: for research question number 1, frequency counts and percentages were employed to determine the profile of faculty-respondents; for research question number 2, mean and standard deviation were employed to determine the extent of leadership attributes; for research question

number 3, mean and standard deviation were employed to determine the extent of teaching performance; for research question number 4, t-test for independent samples was employed to determine the significant differences in the extent of leadership attributes when data are grouped according to gender; and One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) when data are grouped according to age, civil status, length of service, academic rank, and educational attainment, for research question number 5, t-test for independent samples was employed to determine the significant differences in the extent of teaching performance when data are grouped according to gender; and One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) when data are grouped according to age, civil status, length of service, academic rank, and educational attainment, and for research question number 6, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's r) was employed to determine the significant correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under leadership attributes and teaching performance.

3. Results

The presentations, analyses and interpretations of results were based on the empirical data collected of this study. Specifically, it describes the leadership attributes and teaching performance of faculty in public Higher Education Institutions in Sulu during School Year 2021-2022. More specifically, it deals with demographic profiles of faculty-respondents in terms of gender, age, civil status, length of service, academic rank, and educational attainment; extent of leadership attributes in the following dimensions: Directive style attributes, Supportive style attributes, Participative style attributes, and Achievement oriented style attributes; extent of teaching performance in the following dimensions: Planning, Organizing, Monitoring and evaluation, Classroom atmosphere and discipline, and Leadership; and the significant correlation and differences in these sub-categories when data are classified according to faculty-respondents' demographic profiles.

3.1 Gender

It shows that the demographic profile of faculty in public Higher Education Institutions in Sulu in terms of gender. It can be gleaned that out of 200 faculty-respondents, 120 (60.0%) are female and 80 (40.0%) are male. These data show that more than one-half or majority of the faculty-respondents are female. This result implies that female faculty members of faculty in public Higher Education Institutions in Sulu are quite bigger in number as against their male counterparts.

3.2 Age

It shows that the demographic profile of faculty in public Higher Education Institutions in Sulu in terms of age. It can be gleaned that out of 200 faculty-respondents, 58 (29.0%) are 30 years old & below, 51 (25.5%) are 31-40 years old, 63 (31.5%) are 41-50 years old, and 28 (14.0%) are 51 years old & above. These data show that more than one-third of the faculty-respondents are within 41-50 years old. This result implies that there is high concentration of faculty in public Higher Education Institutions in Sulu within the middle age bracket as categorized in this study.

3.3 Civil Status

It presents that the demographic profile of faculty in public Higher Education Institutions in Sulu in terms of civil status can be gleaned that out of 200 faculty-respondents, 35 (17.5%) are Single, 125 (62.5%) are Married, 23 (11.5%) are Separated, and 17 (8.5%) are Widowed. These data show that nearly three-fourth of the faculty-respondents are married. This result implies that the teaching force of public higher education institutions in Sulu consisted by married faculty.

3.4 Length of Service

It presents that the demographic profile of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of length of service can be seen that out of 200 faculty-respondents, 62 (31.0%) have 10 years & below, 61 (30.5%) have 11-20 years, 43 (21.5%) have 21-30 years, and have 34 (17.0%) 31 years & above. Though with little discrepancy, this means that one-third of the faculty-respondents have 10 years & below, and the other one-third have 11-20 years of length of service. This result implies that, the faculty force of public higher education institutions in Sulu have 10 to 20 years of teaching experiences.

3.5 Academic Rank

The demographic profile of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of Academic Rank can be seen that out of 200 faculty-respondents, 51 (25.5%) are Instructor I, 53 (26.5%) are Instructor II, 53 (26.5%) are Instructor III, 43 (21.5%) are Assistant Professor I, II or III. Though with minimal discrepancy, this means that faculty-respondents involved in this study are almost equally distributed into the four groups of academic rank.

3.6 Educational Attainment

The educational attainment of the respondents can be seen that out of 200 faculty-respondents, 35 (17.5%) have Bachelor's degree, 65 (32.5%) have Bachelor's degree with MA units, 50 (25.0%) have Master's degree, 39 (19.5%) have Master's degree with doctoral units, and 11 (5.5%) have Doctorate degree. In this study, this means that more than one-third or majority of the faculty-respondents have bachelor's degree. This result implies that, the faculty force of public higher education institutions in Sulu is constituted mostly by faculty who have bachelor's degree.

3.7 Directive Style Attributes

It shows the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of directive style which is under faculty-respondents obtained a total weighted mean score of 4.1570 with standard deviation of .39742 which is rated as "Often". This result indicates that faculty-respondents perceive that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu are oftentimes practicing directive leadership style. That is, oftentimes telling subordinates what are expected from them and showing how to perform jobs assigned to them. This includes giving subordinates schedules of specific work to be done at a specific time, guidance, clarifying policies and procedures. Relatively, under this category, faculty-respondents rated with "Often" the following items: "I let my staff know what is expected of them", "I inform my faculty about what needs to be done and how it needs be done", "I ask my faculty to follow standard rules and regulations", "I explain the level of performance that is expected of my faculty", and "I give vague explanations of what is expected of my faculty on the job".

3.8 Supportive Style Attributes

It shows the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of supportive style. Under this category, faculty-respondents obtained a total weighted mean score of 4.1760 with standard deviation of .33283 which is rated as "Often". This result indicates that faculty-respondents perceive that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu are oftentimes practicing supportive leadership style. That is, oftentimes leading towards the satisfaction of subordinates' needs and preferences, such as displaying concern for subordinates' welfare and creating a friendly and psychologically supportive work environment. Relatively, under this category, faculty-respondents rated with "Often" the following items: "I maintain a friendly working relationship with my faculty", "I do little things to make it pleasant to be

a member of the group”, “I say things that hurt my faculty’ personal feelings”, “I encourage continual improvement in my faculty’ performance”, and “I behave in a manner that is thoughtful of my faculty’ personal needs”.

3.9 Participative Style Attributes

It shows the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of participative style. Under this category, faculty-respondents obtained a total weighted mean score of 3.8740 with standard deviation of .30560 which is rated as “Often”. This result indicates that faculty-respondents perceive that principals of public higher education institutions in Sulu are oftentimes practicing participative leadership style. That is, oftentimes leading towards encouragement of subordinates and taking their opinions and suggestions into account when making decisions. Relatively, under this category, faculty-respondents rated with “Often” the following items: “I consult with my faculty when facing a problem”, “I listen receptively to my faculty’ ideas and suggestions”, “I ask for suggestions from my faculty concerning how to carry out assignments”, and “I ask my faculty for suggestions on what assignments should be made”.

3.10 Achievement-Oriented Style Attributes

It shows the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of achievement-oriented style. Under this category, faculty-respondents obtained a total weighted mean score of 3.9160 with standard deviation of .35379 which is rated as “Often”. This result indicates that faculty-respondents perceive that principals of public higher education institutions in Sulu are oftentimes practicing achievement-oriented leadership style. That is, oftentimes leading towards motivating performance in setting challenging goals, seeking improvement, emphasizing excellence in performance, and showing confidence that subordinates will attain high standards of performance. Relatively, under this category, faculty-respondents rated with “Often” the following items: “I let my faculty know that I expect them to perform at their highest level”, “I set goals for my faculty’ performance that are quite challenging”, “I help my faculty overcome problems that stop them from carrying out their tasks”, “I show that I have doubts about my faculty’ ability to meet most objectives”, and “I consistently set challenging goals for my faculty to attain”.

3.11 Planning

It shows that the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of planning of the faculty-respondents obtained a total weighted mean score of 4.2550 with standard deviation of .29934 which is rated as “Agree”. This result indicates that faculty-respondents perceive that teaching performance of public higher education institutions in Sulu as high extent in terms of planning. In other words, faculty have high ability to formulate lesson plan by considering the overall objectives for the subject; checking whether the subject’s objectives fit into the overall educational aims; understanding what the aims mean in terms of what the teacher expects students to achieve in the subject and the level at which the objectives can be achieved; and identifying which learning, teaching and assessment activities will help students to achieve the subject aims. Relatively, under this category, faculty-respondents rated with “Agree” the following items: “Faculty prepare well for lessons”, “Faculty enrich the curriculum by planning visits to places of interest”, “Faculty teach at the level of their learners’ competence and understanding.”, “The use of teaching media is well planned”, “In their planning to improve results faculty take learner diversity into account”, “Faculty provide the right opportunities for learners to become competent learners”, and “Faculty plan effectively to engage learners in their classes”.

3.12 Organizing

It shows the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of organizing. Under this category, faculty-respondents obtained a total weighted mean score of 4.3517 with

standard deviation of .29598 which is rated as “Agree”. This result indicates that faculty-respondents perceive that teaching performance of public higher education institutions in Sulu as high extent in terms of organizing. In other words, faculty have high ability to organize a safe classroom environment. Importantly, faculty place furniture, learning centers and materials strategically, in order to optimize learners’ learning and to reduce distractions. Furniture arrangements, the location of materials, displays, fixed elements and decorating the classroom with students’ work are all part of teacher’s organizing ability. Relatively, under this category, faculty-respondents rated with “Agree” the following items: “Faculty organize their assessment according to the school assessment policy”, “Seating arrangements are organized according to the purpose of the lesson”, “Assessment of learners’ work is done regularly according to a planned schedule”, “Faculty promote learner participation through group work”, “Faculty have well-structured schemes of work”, and “Faculty use teaching time effectively”.

3.13 Monitoring and Evaluation

It shows the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of monitoring and evaluation. Under this category, faculty-respondents obtained a total weighted mean score of 4.2386 with standard deviation of .32724 which is rated as “Agree”. This result indicates that faculty-respondents perceive that teaching performance of public higher education institutions in Sulu as high extent in terms of monitoring and evaluation. In other words, when after a plan has been developed, faculty’ have high extent of ability to monitor system in place to measure the achievement and to see if it has been implemented and whether outcomes have been achieved. Relatively, under this category, faculty-respondents rated with “Agree” the following items: “The work books of learners are regularly marked”, “The work books of learners are regularly signed by both faculty and parents”, “Faculty check that learners master the work while presenting lessons”, “Faculty use assessment data to improve their teaching”, “Tests are given immediately after completing a unit of work”, “Faculty keep record of marks obtained by learners and monitor their progress carefully”, and “Faculty check school attendance of learners and assist that no learner falls behind”.

3.14 Classroom Atmosphere and Discipline

It shows the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of classroom atmosphere and discipline. Under this category, faculty-respondents obtained a total weighted mean score of 4.4021 with standard deviation of .28286 which is rated as “Agree”. This result indicates that faculty-respondents perceive that teaching performance of public higher education institutions in Sulu as high extent in terms of establishing classroom atmosphere and discipline. In other words, faculty have high extent of ability to establish a conducive classroom atmosphere and orderly environment for learning to take place. Relatively, under this category, faculty-respondents rated with “Agree” the following items: Teacher conduct towards learners is characterized by professionalism”, “Faculty manage their classes in a disciplined way”, “Classrooms are clean and appropriately decorated”, “Faculty love working with learners”, “Faculty communicate in an appropriate way”, “Faculty create a non-threatening classroom atmosphere conducive to optimal learning”, and “Faculty have an effective classroom discipline management policy”.

3.15 Leadership

It shows the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of leadership. Under this category, faculty-respondents obtained a total weighted mean score of 4.3900 with standard deviation of .24794 which is rated as “Agree”. This result indicates that faculty-respondents perceive that teaching performance of public higher education institutions in Sulu as high extent in terms of leadership. In other words, faculty have high extent of ability to act Resource Provider - Teacher leaders share

instructional resources with their colleagues; Instructional Specialist - Teacher leaders support their workmates to implement effective teaching strategies; Curriculum Specialist - Teacher leaders have to understand subject content and identify how various components of curriculum link together; and Classroom Supporter-Teacher leaders support their colleagues in classroom work to implement new approaches. Relatively, under this category, faculty-respondents rated with “Agree” the following items: “Faculty have a positive influence on learners”, “Faculty know and support the vision and mission of the school”, “Faculty have high but realistic expectations of learners”, “Faculty motivate learners to learn”, “Faculty utilize learner leaders in their classroom management”, “Faculty model values that promote a healthy classroom culture”, and “Faculty show learners how to learn their subject”

3.16 Gender

It shows the difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to gender. It can be gleaned from the Mean Differences, t-values, and probability-values of all sub-categories subsumed under the extent of leadership attributes are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, generally, male and female faculty-respondents in this study do not differ in their perceptions toward the extent of leadership attributes. This result implies that being a male teacher-respondent may not probably make him better perceiver toward the extent of leadership attributes than his female counterparts, or vice versa. Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, though they vary in gender, yet they do not differ in ways of perceiving the extent of leadership attributes. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived analogously the ways how principals of public higher education institutions perform their leadership styles in terms of Directive style attributes, Supportive style attributes, Participative style attributes, and Achievement oriented. Hence, it is safe to say that variable gender has no significant influence in the ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of principals’ leadership attributes. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that “There is no significant difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to gender” is accepted.

Table 1 Differences in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to gender

VARIABLES	Grouping	Mean	S. D.	Mean			Description
				Difference	t	Sig.	
Directive style attributes	Male	4.1475	.39071	-.01583	-.275	.783	Not Significant
	Female	4.1633	.40333				
Supportive style attributes	Male	4.1625	.35592	-.02250	-.467	.641	Not Significant
	Female	4.1850	.31773				
Participative style attributes	Male	3.8650	.32728	-.01500	-.339	.735	Not Significant
	Female	3.8800	.29150				
Achievement oriented style attributes	Male	3.9100	.38173	-.01000	-.195	.845	Not Significant
	Female	3.9200	.33547				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

3.17 Gender

Table 1 illustrates the difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to age. It can be gleaned from this table that, except for “Directive Style Attribute” the F-values and probability-values of all other sub-categories subsumed under the

extent of leadership attributes are indeed significant at alpha .05. This means that, generally, the fact that faculty-respondents vary in age range, in this study they indeed differ in their perceptions toward the extent of leadership attributes. This result implies that being a faculty-respondent whose age within 51 years & above may probably make him better perceiver toward the extent of leadership attributes than other faculty-respondents whose age within 31-40 years old, and 41-50 years old, or vice versa. Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, the fact they vary in gender, yet they indeed differ in ways of perceiving the extent of leadership attributes. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived differently the ways how principals of public higher education institutions perform their leadership styles in terms of Directive style attributes, Supportive style attributes, Participative style attributes, and Achievement oriented. Hence, it is safe to say that variable age has indeed significant influence in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of principals' leadership attributes. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that "There is no significant difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to age" is rejected.

Table 2 Differences in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to age

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Directive style attributes	Between Groups	.804	3	.268	1.715	.165	Not Significant
	Within Groups	30.626	196	.156			
	Total	31.430	199				
Supportive style attributes	Between Groups	1.433	3	.478	4.542*	.004	Significant
	Within Groups	20.612	196	.105			
	Total	22.045	199				
Participative style attributes	Between Groups	.979	3	.326	3.633*	.014	Significant
	Within Groups	17.606	196	.090			
	Total	18.585	199				
Achievement oriented style attributes	Between Groups	1.656	3	.552	4.652*	.004	Significant
	Within Groups	23.253	196	.119			
	Total	24.909	199				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

A Post Hoc Analysis using Scheffe's Test was conducted to determine which among groups classified according to age to have different levels of mean in areas subsumed under the extent of leadership style attributes of faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu as perceived by faculty when data are categorized according to demographic profile in terms of age.

The result of the analysis which is shown in Table 2 indicates that the difference in the means of the Supportive style attributes, Participative style attributes, and Achievement oriented style attributes are obtained by way of lower group means minus higher group means. **On Supportive Style Attributes:** It shows that 31-40 years old group of respondents obtained the mean difference of .26849* with Standard Error of .07627 and p-value of .007 which is significant at alpha=.05 over 51 years old & above group. So under this sub-category, no other groups of faculty-respondents supposed to have better ways of perceiving the extent of leadership style attributes in terms of supportive style than faculty-respondents whose age within 31-40 years old. **On Participative Style:** It shows that 31-40 years old group of respondents obtained the mean difference of .21050* with Standard Error of .07049 and p-value of .033 which is significant at alpha=.05 over

51 years old & above group. So, under this sub-category, no other groups of faculty-respondents supposed to have better ways of perceiving the extent of leadership style attributes in terms of participative style than faculty-respondents whose age within 31-40 years old. **On Achievement-Oriented Style:** It shows that 31-40 years old group of respondents obtained the mean difference of .27787* with Standard Error of .08101 and p-value of .010 which is significant at alpha=.05 over 51 years old & above group. So under this sub-category, no other groups of faculty-respondents supposed to have better ways of perceiving the extent of leadership style attributes in terms of achievement-oriented style than faculty-respondents whose age within 31-40 years old.

Table 2.1 Post Hoc Analysis: Differences in the levels of mean in areas subsumed under the extent of teaching among faculty of public HEIs in Sulu when data are categorized according to their demographic profile in terms of age

Dependent Variables	(I) Grouping by Age	(J) Grouping by Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Supportive Style	31-40 years old	30 years & below	.03327	.06225	.963
		41-50 years old	.07563	.06108	.675
		51 years old & above	.26849*	.07627	.007
Participative Style	31-40 years old	30 years & below	.04523	.05753	.892
		41-50 year sold	.00336	.05645	1.000
		51 years old & above	.21050*	.07049	.033
Achievement-Oriented Style	31-40 years old	30 years & below	.01974	.06612	.993
		41-50 years old	.10009	.06488	.499
		51 years old & above	.27787*	.08101	.010

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

3.18 According to Civil Status

Table 4.3 illustrates the difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to civil status. It can be gleaned from this table that, except for "Participative Style" the F-values and probability-values of all other sub-categories subsumed under the extent of leadership attributes are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, generally, although faculty-respondents vary in civil status, yet they do not differ in their perceptions toward the extent of leadership attributes. This result implies that being a faculty-respondent who is married may not probably make him/her better perceiver toward the extent of leadership attributes than other faculty-respondents who are single, separated, and widowed, or vice versa.

Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, although they vary in marital status, yet they do not differ in ways of perceiving the extent of leadership attributes. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived similarly the ways how principals of public higher education institutions perform their leadership styles in terms of Directive style attributes, Supportive style attributes, Participative style attributes, and Achievement oriented.

Hence, it is safe to say that variable civil status has no significant influence in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of their leadership attributes. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that "There is no significant difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to civil status" is accepted.

Table 3 Differences in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to civil status

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Directive style attributes	Between Groups	1.104	3	.368	2.379	.071	Not Significant
	Within Groups	30.326	196	.155			
	Total	31.430	199				
Supportive style attributes	Between Groups	.276	3	.092	.828	.480	Not Significant
	Within Groups	21.769	196	.111			
	Total	22.045	199				
Participative style attributes	Between Groups	.949	3	.316	3.517*	.016	Significant
	Within Groups	17.635	196	.090			
	Total	18.585	199				
Achievement oriented style attributes	Between Groups	.452	3	.151	1.207	.308	Not Significant
	Within Groups	24.457	196	.125			
	Total	24.909	199				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

3.19 According to Length of Service

Table 4 illustrates the difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to length of service. It can be gleaned from this table that, except for “Directive Style” and “Participative Style” the F-values and probability-values of all other sub-categories subsumed under the extent of leadership attributes are indeed significant at alpha .05. This means that, the fact that faculty-respondents vary in length of service, yet they indeed differ in their perceptions toward the extent of leadership style attributes. This result implies that being a faculty-respondent who has been in teaching service for 31 years & above may probably make him/her better perceiver toward the extent of leadership attributes than other faculty-respondents who have in teaching profession for 10 years & below, 11-20 years, and 21-30 years, or vice versa.

Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, the fact they vary in length of service, yet they indeed differ in ways of perceiving the extent of leadership attributes. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived differently the ways how public higher education institutions faculty perform their leadership styles in terms of Directive style attributes, Supportive style attributes, Participative style attributes, and Achievement oriented.

Hence, it is safe to say that variable length of service has indeed significant influence in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of leadership attributes. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that “There is no significant difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to length of service” is rejected.

Table 4.1 Differences in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to length of service

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Directive style attributes	Between Groups	.772	3	.257	1.644	.181	Not Significant
	Within Groups	30.659	196	.156			
	Total	31.430	199				

Supportive style attributes	Between Groups	1.631	3	.544	5.219*	.002	Significant
	Within Groups	20.414	196	.104			
	Total	22.045	199				
Participative style attributes	Between Groups	.144	3	.048	.509	.677	Not Significant
	Within Groups	18.441	196	.094			
	Total	18.585	199				
Achievement oriented style attributes	Between Groups	1.954	3	.651	5.562*	.001	Significant
	Within Groups	22.954	196	.117			
	Total	24.909	199				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

A Post Hoc Analysis using Scheffe's Test was conducted to determine which among groups classified according to length of service to have different levels of mean in areas subsumed under the extent of leadership style attributes of faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu as perceived by faculty when data are categorized according to demographic profile in terms of length of service. The result of the analysis which is shown in Table 4.1 indicates that the difference in the means of the Supportive style attributes and Achievement oriented style attributes are obtained by way of lower group means minus higher group means. **On Supportive Style Attributes:** It shows that 10 years & below group of respondents obtained the mean difference of .25047* with Standard Error of .06887 and p-value of .005 which is significant at alpha=.05 over 31 years & above group. So, under this sub-category, no other groups of faculty-respondents supposed to have better ways of perceiving the extent of leadership style attributes in terms of supportive style than faculty-respondents whose age within 10 years & below. **On Achievement-Oriented Style:** It shows that 11-20 years group of respondents obtained the mean difference of .28100* with Standard Error of .07324 and p-value of .003 which is significant at alpha=.05 over 31 years & above group. So under this sub-category, no other groups of faculty-respondents supposed to have better ways of perceiving the extent of leadership style attributes in terms of achievement-oriented style than faculty-respondents whose age within 11-20 years teaching profession.

Table 4.2 Post Hoc Analysis: Differences in the levels of mean in areas subsumed under the extent of leadership style attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are categorized according to their demographic profile in terms of length of service

Dependent Variables	(I) Grouping by Length of Service	(J) Grouping by Length of Service	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Supportive Style	10 years & below	11-20 years	.00920	.05820	.999
		21-30 years	.08057	.06405	.664
		31 years & above	.25047*	.06887	.005
Achievement-Oriented Style	11-20 years	10 years & below	.02237	.06172	.988
		21-30 years	.07526	.06814	.748
		31 years & above	.28100*	.07324	.003

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

3.20 According to Academic Rank

Table 5 illustrates the difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to Academic Rank. It can be gleaned from this table that the F-values and probability-values of all sub-categories subsumed under the extent of leadership attributes are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, although faculty-respondents vary in Academic Rank, yet they

indeed differ in their perceptions toward the extent of leadership style attributes. This result implies that a teacher-respondent with Master Teacher Academic Rank may not probably make him/her better perceiver toward the extent of leadership attributes than other faculty-respondents who have Instructor I, Instructor II, Instructor III position, or vice versa. Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, although they vary in Academic Rank, yet they do not differ in ways of perceiving the extent of leadership attributes. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived similarly the ways how public higher education institutions faculty perform their leadership styles in terms of Directive style attributes, Supportive style attributes, Participative style attributes, and Achievement oriented. Hence, it is safe to say that variable Academic Rank has no significant influence in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of their leadership attributes. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that “There is no significant difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to Academic Rank” is accepted.

Table 5.1 Differences in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to Academic Rank

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Directive style attributes	Between Groups	.499	3	.166	1.053	.370	Not Significant
	Within Groups	30.931	196	.158			
	Total	31.430	199				
Supportive style attributes	Between Groups	.345	3	.115	1.039	.376	Not Significant
	Within Groups	21.700	196	.111			
	Total	22.045	199				
Participative style attributes	Between Groups	.312	3	.104	1.117	.343	Not Significant
	Within Groups	18.272	196	.093			
	Total	18.585	199				
Achievement oriented style attributes	Between Groups	.191	3	.064	.504	.680	Not Significant
	Within Groups	24.718	196	.126			
	Total	24.909	199				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

3.21 According to Educational Attainment

Table 6 illustrates the difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to educational attainment. It can be gleaned from this table that the F-values and probability-values of all sub-categories subsumed under the extent of leadership attributes are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, although faculty-respondents vary in educational attainment, yet they do not differ in their perceptions toward the extent of leadership style attributes. This result implies that a teacher-respondent with doctorate degree may not probably make him/her better perceiver toward the extent of leadership attributes than other faculty-respondents who have bachelor's degree, bachelor's degree with MA units, master's degree, and master's degree doctoral unit, or vice versa. Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, although they vary in educational attainment, yet they do not differ in ways of perceiving the extent of leadership attributes. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived similarly the ways how faculty of public higher education institutions perform their leadership styles in terms of Directive style attributes, Supportive style attributes, Participative style attributes, and Achievement oriented. Hence, it is

safe to say that variable educational attainment has no significant influence in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of their leadership attributes. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that “There is no significant difference in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to educational attainment” is accepted.

Table 6 Differences in the extent of leadership attributes of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to educational attainment

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Directive style attributes	Between Groups	1.296	4	.324	2.097	.083	Not Significant
	Within Groups	30.134	195	.155			
	Total	31.430	199				
Supportive style attributes	Between Groups	.680	4	.170	1.551	.189	Not Significant
	Within Groups	21.365	195	.110			
	Total	22.045	199				
Participative style attributes	Between Groups	.711	4	.178	1.940	.105	Not Significant
	Within Groups	17.874	195	.092			
	Total	18.585	199				
Achievement oriented style attributes	Between Groups	.588	4	.147	1.178	.322	Not Significant
	Within Groups	24.321	195	.125			
	Total	24.909	199				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

The extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to: 5.1 Gender, 5.2 Age, 5.3 Civil status, 5.4 length of service, 5.5 Academic Rank, and 5.6 Educational attainment

3.22 According to Gender

Table 7 illustrates the difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to gender. It can be gleaned from this table that the Mean Differences, t-values, and probability-values of all sub-categories subsumed under the extent of teaching performance are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, generally, male and female faculty-respondents in this study do not differ in their perceptions toward the extent of teaching performance. This result implies that being a male teacher-respondent may not probably make him better perceiver toward the extent of teaching performance than his female counterparts, or vice versa. Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, though they vary in gender, yet they do not differ in ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived analogously the ways how faculty of public higher education institutions perform their pedagogical knowledge and skills in terms of Planning, Organizing, Monitoring and evaluation, Classroom atmosphere and discipline, and Leadership. In other words, faculty are perceived not to differ in formulating lesson plan by considering the overall objectives for the subject; checking whether the subject’s objectives fit into the overall educational aims; understanding what the aims mean in terms of what the teacher expects students to achieve in the subject and the level at which the objectives can be achieved; and identifying which learning, teaching and assessment activities will help students to achieve the subject aims. Hence, it is safe to say that variable gender has no significant influence in the ways how faculty of public higher education

institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of teaching performance. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that “There is no significant difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to gender” is accepted.

Table 7 Differences in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to gender

VARIABLES	Grouping	Mean	S. D.	Mean		Sig.	Description
				Difference	t		
Planning	Male	4.2857	.32386	.05119	1.186	.237	Not Significant
	Female	4.2345	.28136				
Organizing	Male	4.3542	.31753	.00417	.097	.923	Not Significant
	Female	4.3500	.28205				
Monitoring and evaluation	Male	4.2429	.33974	.00714	.151	.880	Not Significant
	Female	4.2357	.32006				
Classroom atmosphere and discipline	Male	4.3964	.25512	-.00952	-.233	.816	Not Significant
	Female	4.4060	.30091				
Leadership	Male	4.4000	.23001	.01667	.465	.643	Not Significant
	Female	4.3833	.25993				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

3.23 According to Age

Table 8 illustrates the difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to age. It can be gleaned from this table that the F-values and probability-values of all sub-categories subsumed under the extent of teaching performance are indeed significant at alpha .05. This means that, the fact that faculty-respondents vary in age range, in this study they indeed differ in their perceptions toward the extent of teaching performance. This result implies that being a teacher-respondent whose age within 51 years & above may probably make him better perceiver toward the extent of teaching performance than other faculty-respondents whose age within 30years & below, 31-40 years, and 41-50 years, or vice versa. Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, the fact they vary in age range, yet they indeed differ in ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived differently the ways how faculty of public higher education institutions perform their pedagogical knowledge and skills in terms of Planning, Organizing, Monitoring and evaluation, Classroom atmosphere and discipline, and Leadership. In other words, faculty are perceived not to differ in formulating lesson plan by considering the overall objectives for the subject; checking whether the subject’s objectives fit into the overall educational aims; understanding what the aims mean in terms of what the teacher expects students to achieve in the subject and the level at which the objectives can be achieved; and identifying which learning, teaching and assessment activities will help students to achieve the subject aims. Hence, it is safe to say that variable age has indeed significant influence in the ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of teaching performance. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that “There is no significant difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to age” is rejected.

Table 8 Differences in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to age

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Planning	Between Groups	2.225	3	.742	9.314*	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	15.607	196	.080			
	Total	17.832	199				
Organizing	Between Groups	1.283	3	.428	5.191*	.002	Significant
	Within Groups	16.150	196	.082			
	Total	17.433	199				
Monitoring and evaluation	Between Groups	2.200	3	.733	7.520*	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	19.111	196	.098			
	Total	21.311	199				
Classroom atmosphere and discipline	Between Groups	2.054	3	.685	9.675*	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	13.868	196	.071			
	Total	15.922	199				
Leadership	Between Groups	.863	3	.288	4.959*	.002	Significant
	Within Groups	11.370	196	.058			
	Total	12.233	199				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

A Post Hoc Analysis using Scheffe's Test was conducted to determine which among groups classified according to age to have different levels of mean in areas subsumed under the extent of teaching performance among faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu as perceived by faculty when data are categorized according to demographic profile in terms of length of age. The result of the analysis which is shown in Table 8 indicates that the difference in the means of Planning, Organizing, Monitoring and evaluation, Classroom atmosphere and discipline, and Leadership are obtained by way of lower group means minus higher group means. **On Planning:** It shows that 41-50 years old group of respondents obtained the mean difference of .32937* with Standard Error of .06409 and p-value of .000 which is significant at alpha=.05 over 30 years old & below group. So under this sub-category, no other groups of faculty-respondents supposed to have better ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance in terms of planning than faculty-respondents whose age within 41-50 years old. **On Organizing:** It shows that 41-50 years old group of respondents obtained the mean difference of .24206* with Standard Error of .06520 and p-value of .004 which is significant at alpha=.05 over 51 years old & above group. So under this sub-category, no other groups of faculty-respondents supposed to have better ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance in terms of organizing than faculty-respondents whose age within 41-50 years old. **Monitoring and Evaluation:** It shows that 31-40 years old group of respondents obtained the mean difference of .31883* with Standard Error of .07344 and p-value of .000 which is significant at alpha=.05 over 51 years old & above group. So under this sub-category, no other groups of faculty-respondents supposed to have better ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance in terms of monitoring and evaluation than faculty-respondents whose age within 31-40 years old. **On Classroom Atmosphere and Discipline:** It shows that 31-40 years old group of respondents obtained the mean difference of .33073* with Standard Error of .06256 and p-value of .000 which is significant at alpha=.05 over 51 years old & above group. So, under this sub-category, no other groups of faculty-respondents supposed to have better ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance in terms of classroom atmosphere and discipline than faculty-respondents whose age within 31-40 years old. **On Leadership:** It shows that 30 years old & below group of respondents obtained the mean difference of

.19159* with Standard Error of .05543 and p-value of .009 which is significant at alpha=.05 over 51 years old & above group. So under this sub-category, no other groups of faculty-respondents supposed to have better ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance in terms of leadership than faculty-respondents whose age within 30 years old & below.

Table 8.1 Post Hoc Analysis: Differences in the levels of mean in areas subsumed under the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are categorized according to their demographic profile in terms of age

Dependent Variables	(I) Grouping by Age	(J) Grouping by Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Planning	41-50 years old	30 years & below	.10822	.05135	.221
		31-40 years old	.04775	.05315	.848
		51 years old & above	.32937*	.06409	.000
Organizing	41-50 years old	30 years & below	.02614	.05224	.969
		31-40 years old	.01447	.05407	.995
		51 years old & above	.24206*	.06520	.004
Monitoring and evaluation	31-40 years old	30 years & below	.01077	.05994	.998
		41-50 years old	.08697	.05882	.536
		51 years old & above	.31883*	.07344	.000
Classroom atmosphere and discipline	31-40 years old	30 years & below	.11258	.05106	.186
		41-50 years old	.07336	.05010	.544
		51 years old & above	.33073*	.06256	.000
Leadership	30 years & below	31-40 years old	.02342	.04623	.968
		41-50 years old	-.00512	.04383	1.000
		51 years old & above	.19159*	.05543	.009

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

3.24 According to Civil Status

Table 9 illustrates the difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to civil status. It can be gleaned from this table that, except for "Organizing" the F-values and probability-values of all other sub-categories subsumed under the extent of teaching performance are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, the fact that faculty-respondents vary in civil status, in this study they do not differ in their perceptions toward the extent of teaching performance. This result implies that being a teacher-respondent who is married may not probably make him/her better perceiver toward the extent of teaching performance than other faculty-respondents who are single, separated, and widowed, or vice versa. Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, the fact they vary in age range, yet they indeed differ in ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived similarly in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions perform their pedagogical knowledge and skills in terms of Planning, Organizing, Monitoring and evaluation, Classroom atmosphere and discipline, and Leadership. In other words, faculty are perceived not to differ in formulating lesson plan by considering the overall objectives for the subject; checking whether the subject's objectives fit into the overall

educational aims; understanding what the aims mean in terms of what the teacher expects students to achieve in the subject and the level at which the objectives can be achieved; and identifying which learning, teaching and assessment activities will help students to achieve the subject aims. Hence, it is safe to say that variable civil status has no significant influence in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of teaching performance. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that “There is no significant difference in the extent of teaching performance faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to civil status” is accepted.

Table 9 Differences in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to civil status

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Planning	Between Groups	.399	3	.133	1.496	.217	Not Significant
	Within Groups	17.433	196	.089			
	Total	17.832	199				
Organizing	Between Groups	.742	3	.247	2.904*	.036	Significant
	Within Groups	16.691	196	.085			
	Total	17.433	199				
Monitoring and evaluation	Between Groups	.575	3	.192	1.812	.146	Not Significant
	Within Groups	20.736	196	.106			
	Total	21.311	199				
Classroom atmosphere and discipline	Between Groups	.514	3	.171	2.181	.092	Not Significant
	Within Groups	15.407	196	.079			
	Total	15.922	199				
Leadership	Between Groups	.193	3	.064	1.050	.372	Not Significant
	Within Groups	12.040	196	.061			
	Total	12.233	199				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

3.25 According to Length of Service

Table 10 illustrates the difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to length of service. It can be gleaned from this table that, except for “Monitoring and Evaluation” the F-values and probability-values of all other sub-categories subsumed under the extent of teaching performance are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, the fact that faculty-respondents vary in length of service, in this study they do not differ in their perceptions toward the extent of teaching performance. This result implies that a teacher-respondent who has been in teaching profession for 31 years & above may not probably make him/her better perceiver toward the extent of teaching performance than other faculty-respondents who have in service for 10 years & below, 11-20 years, and 21-30 years, or vice versa. Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, although they vary in age length of service, yet they do not differ in ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived similarly in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions perform their pedagogical knowledge and skills in terms of Planning, Organizing, Monitoring and evaluation, Classroom atmosphere and discipline, and Leadership. In other words, faculty are perceived not to differ in formulating lesson plan by considering the overall objectives for the subject; checking whether the subject’s objectives fit into the overall educational aims; understanding what the aims mean in terms of what the teacher expects students to achieve in the

subject and the level at which the objectives can be achieved; and identifying which learning, teaching and assessment activities will help students to achieve the subject aims. Hence, it is safe to say that variable length of service has no significant influence in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of teaching performance. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that “There is no significant difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to length of service” is accepted.

Table 10 Differences in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to length of service

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Planning	Between Groups	.369	3	.123	1.381	.250	Not Significant
	Within Groups	17.463	196	.089			
	Total	17.832	199				
Organizing	Between Groups	.571	3	.190	2.213	.088	Not Significant
	Within Groups	16.862	196	.086			
	Total	17.433	199				
Monitoring and evaluation	Between Groups	1.830	3	.610	6.136*	.001	Significant
	Within Groups	19.481	196	.099			
	Total	21.311	199				
Classroom atmosphere and discipline	Between Groups	.479	3	.160	2.027	.111	Not Significant
	Within Groups	15.442	196	.079			
	Total	15.922	199				
Leadership	Between Groups	.415	3	.138	2.292	.079	Not Significant
	Within Groups	11.818	196	.060			
	Total	12.233	199				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

3.26 According to Academic Rank

Table 11 illustrates the difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to Academic Rank. It can be gleaned from this table that, except for “Classroom Atmosphere and Discipline” the F-values and probability-values of all other sub-categories subsumed under the extent of teaching performance are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, although faculty-respondents vary in Academic Rank, in this study they do not differ in their perceptions toward the extent of teaching performance. This result implies that a teacher-respondent who has Master Teacher Academic Rank may not probably make him/her better perceiver toward the extent of teaching performance than other faculty-respondents who have Instructor I, Instructor II, and Instructor III, or vice versa. Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, although they vary in age length of service, yet they do not differ in ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived similarly in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions perform their pedagogical knowledge and skills in terms of Planning, Organizing, Monitoring and evaluation, Classroom atmosphere and discipline, and Leadership. In other words, faculty are perceived not to differ in formulating lesson plan by considering the overall objectives for the subject; checking whether the subject’s objectives fit into the overall educational aims; understanding what the aims mean in terms of what the teacher expects students to achieve in the subject and the level at which the objectives can be achieved; and identifying which learning, teaching and

assessment activities will help students to achieve the subject aims. Hence, it is safe to say that variable Academic Rank has no significant influence in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of teaching performance. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that “There is no significant difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to Academic Rank” is accepted.

Table 11 Differences in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to Academic Rank

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Planning	Between Groups	.199	3	.066	.736	.532	Not Significant
	Within Groups	17.633	196	.090			
	Total	17.832	199				
Organizing	Between Groups	.545	3	.182	2.107	.101	Not Significant
	Within Groups	16.888	196	.086			
	Total	17.433	199				
Monitoring and evaluation	Between Groups	.526	3	.175	1.652	.179	Not Significant
	Within Groups	20.785	196	.106			
	Total	21.311	199				
Classroom atmosphere and discipline	Between Groups	.785	3	.262	3.387*	.019	Significant
	Within Groups	15.137	196	.077			
	Total	15.922	199				
Leadership	Between Groups	.381	3	.127	2.102	.101	Not Significant
	Within Groups	11.852	196	.060			
	Total	12.233	199				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

3.27 According to Educational Attainment

Table 12 illustrates the difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to educational attainment. It can be gleaned from this table that, except for “Monitoring and Evaluation” the F-values and probability-values of all other sub-categories subsumed under the extent of teaching performance are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, although faculty-respondents vary in educational attainment, in this study they do not differ in their perceptions toward the extent of teaching performance. This result implies that a teacher-respondent who has doctorate degree may not probably make him/her better perceiver toward the extent of teaching performance than other faculty-respondents who have bachelor’s degree, bachelor’s degree with MA units, master’s degree, and master’s degree with doctoral units, or vice versa. Nevertheless, it can be inferred further that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu, although they vary in educational attainment, yet they do not differ in ways of perceiving the extent of teaching performance. That is, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived similarly in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions perform their pedagogical knowledge and skills in terms of Planning, Organizing, Monitoring and evaluation, Classroom atmosphere and discipline, and Leadership. In other words, faculty are perceived not to differ in formulating lesson plan by considering the overall objectives for the subject; checking whether the subject’s objectives fit into the overall educational aims; understanding what the aims mean in terms of what the teacher expects students to achieve in the subject and the level at which the objectives can be achieved; and identifying which learning, teaching and assessment activities will help students to achieve the subject

aims. Hence, it is safe to say that variable educational attainment has no significant influence in ways how faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceive the extent of teaching performance. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that “There is no significant difference in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to educational attainment” is accepted.

Table 12 Differences in the extent of teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to educational attainment

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Planning	Between Groups	.429	4	.107	1.201	.312	Not Significant
	Within Groups	17.403	195	.089			
	Total	17.832	199				
Organizing	Between Groups	.070	4	.017	.196	.940	Not Significant
	Within Groups	17.363	195	.089			
	Total	17.433	199				
Monitoring and evaluation	Between Groups	1.135	4	.284	2.743*	.030	Significant
	Within Groups	20.176	195	.103			
	Total	21.311	199				
Classroom atmosphere and discipline	Between Groups	.360	4	.090	1.128	.344	Not Significant
	Within Groups	15.561	195	.080			
	Total	15.922	199				
Leadership	Between Groups	.323	4	.081	1.323	.263	Not Significant
	Within Groups	11.910	195	.061			
	Total	12.233	199				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

3.28 Significant correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under leadership attributes and teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu

Table 13 illustrates the correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under the extent of leadership style attributes and teaching performance of faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu. Specifically, the degrees of correlations leadership style attributes and teaching performance are as follows: High positive correlation between leadership style attributes and teaching performance. This result indicates that the faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu who generally perceived the extent of leadership style attributes as “Often” are most probably the same group of faculty who perceived the extent of teaching performance as “Agree”, respectively. Meanwhile, it is safe to say that, generally the extent of leadership style attributes and teaching performance is highly correlated. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that, “There is no significant correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under leadership attributes and teaching performance of faculty in public higher education institutions in Sulu” is rejected.

Table 13 Correlation between teaching efficacy and job satisfaction

Variables		Pearson	Sig	N	Description
Dependent	Independent	<i>r</i>			
Leadership Style Attributes	Teaching Performance	.531**	.000	200	High

*Correlation Coefficient is significant at alpha .05

Correlation Coefficient Scales Adopted from Hopkins, Will (2002):

0.0-0.1=Nearly Zero; 0.1-0.30=Low; .3-0.5 0=Moderate; .5-0.7-0=High; .7-0.9= Very High; 0.9-1=Nearly Perfect

3. Discussion

The study revealed that Out of 200 faculty-respondents, majority are female, within 41-50 years old, are married, have 10 years & below of length of service, almost equally distributed into the four groups of academic rank, and mostly have bachelor's degree. Meanwhile, on the extent of Leadership Style Attributes that faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu expressed agreement that faculty of public higher education institutions oftentimes perform their leadership styles in terms of directive style attributes, supportive style attributes, participative style attributes, and achievement-oriented style. The performance of the faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu perceived to have high level of teaching in terms of planning, organizing, monitoring and evaluation, classroom atmosphere and discipline, and leadership. In other words, faculty are perceived to have high performance in formulating lesson plan by considering the overall objectives for the subject; checking whether the subject's objectives fit into the overall educational aims; understanding what the aims mean in terms of what the teacher expects students to achieve in the subject and the level at which the objectives can be achieved; and identifying which learning, teaching and assessment activities will help students to achieve the subject aims. More so, on Differences in Leadership Style Attributes that there is no significant difference in the extent of leadership style attributes of faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are grouped according to gender, civil status, Academic Rank, and educational attainment. But significant difference exists in terms of age and length of service wherein faculty within 31-40 years old and have 10 years & below have better ways of perceiving the extent leadership style. Most likely, the differences in Teaching Performance except for age, there is no significant difference in the assessment of faculty-respondents of the teaching performance of faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu when data are categorized according to gender, civil status, length of service, Academic Rank, and educational attainment. Respectively, the correlation between Leadership Style and Teaching Performance that there is a high correlation between faculty' assessment of leadership style and teaching performance among faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu. That is, faculty-respondents who rated leadership style as "Often" are most probably the group of faculty who rated teaching performance as "Agree" or "High Extent".

It is therefore concluded that there is sufficient representation of faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of gender, age, civil status, length of service, Academic Rank, and educational attainment, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu have high extent of leadership style attributes, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu have high level of teaching performance, faculty of public higher education institutions in in Sulu do not differ in ways of assessing leadership style, faculty of public higher education institutions in Sulu do not differ in ways of assessing teaching performance, leadership style attributes is highly correlated with faculty' teaching performance. Thus, this study tends to support Atsebeha (2016) Model of Principals' Leadership Attributes which asserts that Faculty's Leadership Attributes are manifested by faculty's leadership behaviors as directive style attributes, supportive style attributes, participative style attributes, and achievement-oriented style attributes.

Moreover, this study recommends that Administrators of public higher education institutions in Sulu may continue implementing programs and policies that would enhance faculty' teaching performance, administrators of public higher education institutions in Sulu may attend more trainings in order to enhance more their leadership style attributes, Administrators of public higher education institutions in Sulu may continue in providing support to faculty so that their pedagogical knowledge and skills could be enhanced, Student-researchers in the field of educational administration are encouraged to conduct study similar to this one but to include other variables such as faculty' anxiety, faculty's job satisfaction, faculty' morale, and faculty' work engagement.

Funding Information

This research did not receive any specific grant from any funding agency.

Declaration of Conflict

The authors declare that they have not known competing financial or personal relationship that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

1. Adeyemi, K., & Akpotu, N. (2004). Gender analysis of student enrolment in Nigerian universities. *Higher Education*, 48(3), 361–378. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/B:HIGH.0000035547.19318.27>. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:HIGH.0000035547.19318.27>
2. Aming-Hayudini, M. A. E., Jaddani, M. Y. T., & Habibun, S. I. (2022). Practices on waste disposal and its environmental effects. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(8), 1569–1576. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.08.19>
3. Atsebeha, A. T. (2016). Principals' leadership styles and their effects on teachers' performance in the Tigray region of Ethiopia. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/95521614.pdf>. University of South Africa.
4. Enueme, C. P., & Egwunyenga, E. J. (2008). Principals' instructional leadership roles and effect on teachers' job performance: A case study of secondary schools in Asaba Metropolis, Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(1), 13–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2008.11892596>
5. Hayudini, M. A. E. A., Hussin, B. E. A., Aming, R. E., Abdurahman, J. Q., Abdurahman, A. E. A., & Ynawat, M. B. (2022). Incidence of dengue hemorrhagic fever in the Selected Elementary Schools in Jolo and its preventive measures applied by their school principals, school teachers, and school nurses. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(11), 2245–2254. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.11.11>
6. House, J. (1997). Translation quality assessment: A model revisited. https://books.google.com.ph/books?hl=en&lr=&id=D16aYuTCBJ0C&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=house+1997&ots=4YX-W22Qm9&sig=uphJIQM7v-zbcGvtfeuaGhWmiso&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=house%201997&f=false. Gunter Narr Verlag.
7. Kaleem, S. (2021). Impact of principals. *Leadership Style on SchoolsCLIMATE, TEACHERS. Performance and academic achievement of the students in southern districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Ilkogretim Online*, 20(6).
8. Kasim, K. S., & Aming-Hayudini, M. A. E. (2022). Factors influencing treatment default among direct observed treatment short-course enrolled in pulmonary tuberculosis. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(9), 1749–1764. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.09.15>
9. Ortega-Paz, L., Capodanno, D., Montalescot, G., & Angiolillo, D. J. (2021). Coronavirus disease 2019–associated thrombosis and coagulopathy: Review of the pathophysiological characteristics and implications for antithrombotic management. *Journal of the American Heart Association*, 10(3), e019650. <https://www.ilkogretim-online.org/fulltext/218-1623775259.pdf>. <https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.120.019650>
10. Rowland, T. (2008). The purpose, design and use of examples in the teaching of elementary mathematics. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 69, 149–163. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10649-008-9148-y>