**Leadership Style Among Employers And Employee Performance: A Regressional Analysis**

**ABSTRACT**

|  |
| --- |
| This research explored how different leadership styles impact employee performance in the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Cateel, Davao Oriental. The study focused on four leadership styles—transformational, transactional, authoritative, and laissez-faire—and their effects on three areas of employee performance: task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational design with a quantitative approach, data were gathered from 177 employees selected through stratified sampling. Standardized questionnaires adapted from Anyango (2015) and Koopmans (2015) were used, and statistical methods such as mean, Pearson correlation, and multiple linear regression were applied for analysis. Among the leadership styles, transformational leadership had the highest average rating (M = 4.27), indicating it as the most favored by employees, followed by transactional (M = 4.15), laissez-faire (M = 3.97), and authoritative leadership (M = 3.80). Regarding performance, contextual performance received a "Very High" score (M = 4.24), task performance was rated "High" (M = 4.17), while counterproductive behavior was assessed as "Neutral" (M = 2.84). Correlation results showed a significant positive link between all leadership styles and employee performance. Notably, laissez-faire leadership had the strongest correlation (r = 0.486), followed by transactional and authoritative styles (r = 0.454), and transformational leadership (r = 0.377). These results indicate that although transformational leadership is the most preferred, leadership approaches that offer autonomy and clear structure tend to have a greater impact on performance. To improve organizational performance and employee productivity, the study recommends a strategic focus on leadership development. Training supervisors and department heads in transformational leadership can also enhance motivation, creativity, and employee confidence. |
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**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The leadership style has been a critical determinant of employees' performance in organizations worldwide. Currently, in the business world, most organizations recognize that leadership is not only about managing tasks but also about inspiring and enabling employees to achieve higher levels of performance (Caillier, 2016).

 This ability to understand can be drawn to a logical conclusion in transformational leadership, which has been proven to seriously affect the engagement and job satisfaction of employees who are directly linked with enhanced performance outcomes, so that as a business becomes more complex, so does the need to understand the right leadership style to achieve better employees' performance (Eva et al.,2019). Booming economies in most parts of the world require higher effectiveness in leadership, particularly in regions such as Asia and Africa, where culturally significant activities significantly influence workplace behavior. This is why transactional leadership is used more frequently, as it is structured and reward-based (Darley-Baah, 2015). Yet, the demand for innovation and creativity requires far more gender identity and expression in leadership orientations. These matters involve transformational and servant leadership styles to ensure the institution of employee empowerment and job satisfaction, which in turn fosters sound performance.

 These organizations that switch to hybrid and traditional leadership approaches, such as autocratic or transactional styles, now prove to be less effective in keeping employees motivated (Dirani et al.,2020). It was observed that transformational leadership, coupled with empathy, communication, and motivation, became crucial for maintaining performance and morale during periods of uncertainty and isolation.

 The global trend towards employee well-being involves scrutinizing leadership styles, which not only determine how leaders improve productivity but also impact the holistic performance of employees. The styles of servant leadership and authentic leadership yield better long-term performance gains compared to those styles focused on (Eva et al., 2019).

 Much attention is not paid to the various leadership styles that affect employee performance within organizations, especially in the context of their job roles. Most available papers examine the effects of one type of leadership style and the remaining leadership styles are compared to the existing ones without considering the distinctive character of the job and the organization as a whole (Banks et al., 2016).

1. **OBJECTIVES**

The main objective of this study was to scrutinize the relationship between the leadership style of the employee's performance in the Local Government Unit of Cateel, Davao Oriental, specifically:

1. To determine the level of the leadership style of the employees in Cateel, Davao Oriental, when analyzed according to the:
	1. Transformational leadership;
	2. Transactional leadership;
	3. Authoritative leadership, and
	4. Laissez faire leadership.
2. To determine the level of employees’ job performance in the Local Government Unit of Cateel, Davao Oriental, when analyzed according to:
3. Task performance;
4. Contextual performance and
5. Counterproductive work behavior.
6. To determine if there is a significant relationship between Leadership style and employee performance.
7. To determine the most preferred leadership style among employees in terms of:
8. Transformational leadership;
9. Transactional leadership;
10. Authoritative leadership, and
11. Laissez faire leadership.

**3. METHODOLOGY**

**3.1 Research Design**

This study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to explore the impact of leadership styles on employee job performance, drawing data from a selected group of respondents. Emphasizing a quantitative approach, the research aimed to describe and interpret information gathered about employees' current working conditions. By focusing on the relationship between leadership style and employee performance, the study applied appropriate quantitative methods, using a questionnaire survey to collect comprehensive data from a large sample.

**3.2 Research Locale**

The study was carried out at the Human Resources Management Office (HRMO) of the Local Government Unit in Cateel, Davao Oriental, as the majority of respondents were employees directly under the supervision of the municipality’s Human Resources Manager. This made the HRMO a key site for collecting relevant data.

**3.3 Research Participants**

 The participants in this study were employees of the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Cateel, categorized according to their employment status as regular, casual, or job order workers. Table 1 presents the breakdown of respondents based on employment status from a total workforce of 318. Applying Slovin's formula with a 0.05 margin of error, a sample size of 177 was calculated. This sample consisted of 54 regular, 14 casual, and 109 job order employees, ensuring each group was proportionally represented for accurate analysis. A stratified sampling method was used to group respondents by their employment status.

**Table 1.** Respondents of the study

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Employment Status** | **Current Number of LGU-HRMO Employees**  | **Percentage rate** | **Sample size** |
| Regular Employee  | 97 | 30.50% | 54 |
| Casual Employee  | 25  | 7.80% | 14 |
| Job Order Employee  | 196  | 61.70% | 109 |
| **Total Population**  | **318** | **100%** | **177** |

**3.4 Research Instrument**

The independent variable was measured using a modified questionnaire from Anyango (2015), covering four leadership styles: transformational, transactional, authoritative, and laissez-faire. The dependent variable followed Koopmans’ (2015) model, which included task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. The questionnaire had two sections—Leadership Style (27 items) and Employee Performance (17 items)—rated on a five-point Likert scale."

**3.5 Data Gathering Procedure**

The researchers employed a primary data collection method, following several essential steps to ensure ethical and procedural compliance. First, ethical clearance was secured from the Davao Oriental State University-Cateel Extension Campus Research Ethics Board (DORSU-UREB). After obtaining approval, the researchers sought formal permission from the appropriate authorities to conduct the study, ensuring adherence to institutional and local research guidelines. Upon receiving the necessary permissions, the questionnaire forms were distributed to the selected respondents. Once the participants completed the surveys, the researchers collected the responses. The gathered data were then encoded into statistical software for analysis, allowing for a detailed assessment of leadership styles and employee performance.

**3.6 Data Analysis**

 Each questionnaire response was carefully analyzed and recorded. To process the data, several statistical tools were used.

**Table 2.** Interpretation on the level of Leadership style

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Range of Mean** | **Description**  | **Interpretation**  |
| 4.20-5.00 | Very High  | An indicator shows leadership style is manifested all the time.  |
| 3.40-4.19 | High  | This indicates that leadership style is always manifested.  |
| 2.60-3.49 | Neutral | This indicates that leadership styleis manifested sometimes.  |
| 1.80-2.59 | Low  | This suggests that leadership style is manifested over extended periods. |
| 1.00-1.79 | Very Low  | This indicates that leadership style is never manifested. |

**Table 3.** Interpretation on the level of Employee performance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Range of Mean** | **Description**  | **Interpretation**  |
| 4.20-5.00 | Very High  | Consistently exceeds expectations; exceptional performance in all aspects. |
| 3.40-4.19 | High  | Often exceeds expectations; shows high competence and reliability. |
| 2.60-3.49 | Neutral  | Meets expectations; performs adequately but has room for improvement. |
| 1.80-2.59  | Low  | Rarely meets expectations; demonstrates inconsistent performance. |
| 1.00-1.79 | Very Low  | Fails to meet expectations; significant improvement required. |

 The mean was calculated to identify the dominant leadership style and compare the effectiveness of different styles. To assess the relationship between leadership style and employee performance, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient was applied. Additionally, multiple linear regression was used to examine how different factors collectively influenced employee performance, allowing the researchers to predict outcomes and understand the impact of each variable on overall performance.

**4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

 This chapter outlines the findings of the study on the impact of leadership styles on employee performance within the LGU of Cateel, Davao Oriental. Participant responses were organized by key themes, and regression analysis was conducted to examine how various leadership styles affect employee performance.

**4.1 The Level of Leadership Style of Employees in Cateel, Davao Oriental**

**Table 4.** Level of the leadership style of the employee in terms of transformational leadership

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statements** | **Mean**  | **Std. Deviation**  | **Interpretation**  |
| 1. My supervisor makes others feel good to be around him/her.
 | 4.39 | 0.62 | Very High |
| 1. I have complete faith in my supervisor
 | 4.37 | 0.56 | Very High |
| 1. I am proud to be associated with my supervisor
 | 4.38 | 0.57 | Very High |
| 1. My supervisor expresses in a few simple words what we could and should do.
 | 4.29 | 0.58 | Very High |
| 1. My supervisor provides appealing images about what we can do.
 | 4.20 | 0.60 | Very High |
| 1. My supervisor helps me find meaning in my work.
 | 4.26 | 0.59 | Very High |
| 1. My supervisor enables others to think about old problems in new ways.
 | 4.19 | 0.67 | High |
| 1. My supervisor provides others with new ways of looking at puzzling things.
 | 4.18 | 0.71 | High |
| 1. My supervisor gets others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before.
 | 4.13 | 0.66 | High |
| 1. My supervisor helps others develop themselves.
 | 4.33 | 0.63 | Very High |
| 1. My supervisor lets others know how he/she thinks we are doing.
 | 26 | 0.61 | Very High |
| 1. My supervisor gives personal attention to others who seem rejected.
 | 4.20 | 0.64 | Very High |
| **Average** | 4.27 | 0.40 | Very High |

The mean scores in Table 4 reveal that employees generally hold a highly favorable view of their supervisor’s leadership style, with ratings ranging from 4.13 to 4.39. The highest-rated item, “My supervisor makes others feel good to be around him/her” (4.39), highlights perceptions of the supervisor as approachable, supportive, and encouraging. This aligns with Lee et al. (2017), who found that transformational leaders foster trust and create a positive work atmosphere. Similarly, high ratings for statements like “I have complete faith in my supervisor” (4.37) and “My supervisor helps others develop themselves” (4.33) reflect strong trust and a focus on employee development.

Afsar et al. (2019) support this, noting that leaders who invest in employee growth tend to cultivate a more engaged workforce. However, the statement “My supervisor gets others to rethink ideas they had never questioned before” received a slightly lower, though still positive, score of 4.13. This indicates a relative gap in encouraging innovative and critical thinking—a key aspect of transformational leadership, as noted by Hoch et al. (2018), who emphasized the importance of intellectual stimulation in fostering creativity and problem-solving.

Despite this minor shortfall, the overall mean of 4.27 supports the conclusion that an integrative, trusted, and motivational leadership style positively influences the team environment. However, as Eisenberg et al. (2019) suggested, structured settings like government institutions may limit certain leadership practices, such as stimulating innovation, which helps explain the study’s noted areas for improvement.

**Table 5.** Level of the leadership style of the employee in terms of transactional leadership

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statements**  | **Mean**  | **Std. Deviation**  | **Interpretation**  |
| 1. My supervisor instructs others on how to perform their tasks effectively in order to be rewarded for their work.
 | 4.17 | 0.59 | High |
| 1. My supervisor provides recognition and rewards when others reach their goals.
 | 4.19 | 0.66 | High |
| 1. My supervisor calls attention to what others can get for what they accomplish.
 | 4.22 | 0.69 | Very High |
| 1. My supervisor is always satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards.
 | 4.18 | 0.73 | High |
| 1. As long as things are working, my supervisor does not attempt to make any changes.
 | 4.09 | 0.85 | High |
| 1. My supervisor informs us of the standards we need to be aware of in order to carry out our work.
 | 4.01 | 0.91 | High |
| **Average**  | **4.15** | **0.52** | High |

Table 5 shows that employees generally view their supervisor’s transactional leadership style positively, with mean scores ranging from 4.01 to 4.22. The highest-rated item, “My supervisor calls attention to what others can get for what they accomplish,” suggests effective use of rewards to motivate performance, supporting Pradhan et al. (2017). Recognition and goal achievement were also rated highly, reflecting employee appreciation. However, the lower score of 4.01 for setting clear standards points to a possible gap in communicating expectations, consistent with concerns from Oshagbemi and Gill (2017). Breevaart et al. (2016) noted that transactional leadership works best for achieving specific goals, though it may limit innovation. Overall, the average score of 4.15 indicates a favorable view, with room for improvement in proactive guidance and fostering growth.

**Table 6.** Level of the leadership style of the employee in terms of authoritative leadership

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statements** | **Mean**  | **Std. Deviation**  | **Interpretation** |
| 1. My supervisor believes that employees need to be closely supervised; they are unlikely to perform their work without supervision. | 4.15 | 0.77 | High |
| 2. As a general rule, my supervisor believes that employees should be given rewards and punishments to motivate them to achieve organizational objectives. | 4.10 | 0.83 | High |
| 3. I feel insecure about my work and need direction.  | 3.17 | 1.13 | High |
|  4. My supervisor is the chief judge of employee achievements | 4.11 | 0.78 | High |
| 5. My supervisor gives orders and clarifies procedures. | 4.18 | 1.69 | High |
| 6. My supervisor believes that most employees in the general population are lazy.  | 3.11 | 1.39 | High |
| **Average** | **3.80** | **0.59** | High |

Table 6 shows that employees view their supervisor’s authoritative leadership as structured and directive, with scores ranging from 3.11 to 4.18. The highest rating, 4.18, for “My supervisor gives orders and clarifies procedures,” reflects appreciation for clear guidance, aligning with Giltinane (2019), who described authoritative leadership as order-driven. High scores also indicate strong task supervision, as supported by Shen and Chen (2017).

However, lower ratings—3.17 for feeling unsafe and 3.11 for perceived distrust—suggest concerns about excessive control. This echoes De Hoogh et al. (2015), who noted that too much control can lower morale and stifle innovation. The overall mean of 3.80 suggests that while structure is valued, greater trust and autonomy are needed. Afsar et al. (2019) emphasized that overly strict leadership can hinder collaboration and engagement.

**Table 7.** Level of the leadership style of the employee in terms of Laissez Faire leadership

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statements** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation**  | **Interpretation**  |
| 1. In complex situations, my supervisor allows me to work out my problems independently.
 | 3.86 | 0.83 | High  |
| 1. As a rule, my supervisor allows me to appraise my work.
 | 4.06 | 0.70 | High  |
| 1. My supervisor gives me complete freedom to solve problems independently.
 | 4.07 | 0.70 | High  |
| 1. Generally, my supervisor believes it is best to leave subordinates to their own devices.
 | 3.91 | 0.82 | High |
| 1. My supervisor would rather entrust his confidence in me, knowing that I can perform the job efficiently without needing constant supervision.
 | 3.94 | 0.69 | High |
| **AVERAGE** | **3.97** | **0.55** | High |

 Table 7 shows that employees generally perceive a good level of autonomy, with scores from 3.86 to 4.07. Top ratings for solving problems independently (4.07) and self-evaluating work (4.06) reflect a leadership style that supports autonomy, aligning with Skogstad et al. (2018).

 However, the lower score of 3.86 for handling complex tasks suggests some employees still seek support. The 3.91 score for working alone may be seen as either empowering or isolating, depending on the situation. Yang (2015) noted that autonomy can boost confidence, but both he and Skogstad warned that too much independence without guidance may lead to confusion. These results point to the importance of balancing autonomy with proper support.

**Table 8.** Level of leadership style of employee

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Factors** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation**  | **Interpretation**  |
| 1. Transformational Leadership
 | 4.27 | 0.40 | Very High |
| 1. Transactional Leadership
 | 4.15 | 0.52 | High |
| 1. Authoritative Leadership
 | 3.80 | 0.59 | High |
| 1. Laissez Faire Leadership
 | 3.97 | 0.55 | High |
| **Overall Leadership** | **4.05** | **0.40** | **High** |

Table 8 shows that Transformational Leadership received the highest rating (4.27), reflecting appreciation for supportive and motivating supervisors, in line with Lee et al. (2017) and Afsar et al. (2019). Transactional Leadership followed with 4.15, highlighting the value of clear expectations and rewards, as noted by Pradhan et al. (2017).

Laissez-Faire Leadership scored 3.97, while Authoritative Leadership was lowest at 3.80, suggesting that strict control is less preferred. The overall average of 4.05 indicates employees favor a leadership style that balances inspiration, structure, and autonomy. This supports Skogstad et al. (2018) on the benefits of autonomy and De Hoogh & Coulter (2015) on the drawbacks of excessive control.

**4.2 The Level of Employee Performance in Cateel, Davao Oriental**

Table 9 shows that employees rate their task performance positively, with top scores of 4.35 for being organized, punctual, and planning efficiently—indicating strong time management. A 4.31 score for outcome prediction and 4.11 for identifying key issues show goal clarity and focus. This aligns with Koopmans et al. (2016), who define effective task performance as timely, productive, and high in quality.

**Table 9.** Level of employee performance in terms of task performance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statements**  | **Mean**  | **Std. Deviation** | **Interpretation** |
| 1. My work was well-planned, hence, it was completely done on time.
 | 4.35  | 0.55 | Very High  |
| 1. My work plan was properly optimized.
 | 4.35  | 0.58 | Very High  |
| 1. I always anticipated the result that I had to achieve in my work.
 | 4.31  | 0.57 | Very High  |
| 1. I always anticipated the result that I had to achieve in my work.
 | 4.11  | 0.66 | High  |
| 1. I was able to perform my work with minimal time and less effort.
 | 3.74 | 1.02 | High  |
| **Average** | **4.17** | **0.44** | **High** |

 A lower score of 3.74 suggests some tasks may take more effort than expected. The overall average of 4.17 reflects strong performance, supported by transformational and transactional leadership, which enhance task efficiency through motivation and clear goals.

**Table 10**. Level of employee performance in terms of contextual performance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statements** | **Mean**  | **Std. Deviation**  | **Interpretation**  |
| 1. I took and assumed extra responsibilities.
 | 4.11  | 0.67 | High |
| 1. I started a new task myself when the old ones were finished
 | 4.16  | 0.61 | High |
| 1. I also took on challenging work tasks whenever they became available to complete.
 | 4.16  | 0.60 | High |
| 1. I made an effort to keep my job knowledge up-to-date.
 | 4.36  | 0.59 | Very High |
| 1. I worked on keeping my job skills up to date.
 | 4.35  | 0.68 | Very High |
| 1. I developed creative solutions to new problems.
 | 4.37  | 0.67 | Very High |
| 1. I continually sought new challenges in my job.
 | 4.22 | 0.70 | Very High |
| 1. I actively participated in work meetings.
 | 4.19 | 0.64 | High |
| **TOTAL** | **4.24** | **0.44** | **Very High** |

Table 10 shows strong contextual performance, with the highest score of 4.37 for offering innovative solutions, reflecting creativity and initiative. High ratings for maintaining job knowledge (4.36) and skills (4.35) indicate a focus on continuous learning, consistent with Podsakoff et al. (2018), who emphasized the value of extra-role behaviors like helping and problem-solving.

While still positive, the lowest score of 4.11 for taking on extra tasks suggests some caution toward added responsibilities. The overall average of 4.24 highlights a proactive, growth-oriented workforce, supporting Afsar et al. (2019), who linked supportive leadership to initiative, creativity, and professional development.

**Table 11.** Level of employee performance in terms of counterproductive work behavior (CWB)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statements**  | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation**  | **Interpretation**  |
| 1. I complained about irrelevant matters during working hours.
 | 3.69 | 0.89 | High |
| 1. I made problems greater than they were at work.
 | 3.04 | 1.05 | Neutral |
| 1. I focused on the negative aspects of a work situation instead of on the positive aspects.
 | 2.45 | 1.00 | Low |
| 1. I spoke with people from outside the organization about the negative aspects of my work.
 | 2.19 | 1.08 | Low |
| **AVERAGE** | **2.84** | **0.76** | **Neutral**  |

 Table 11 shows a moderate level of counterproductive behavior, with the highest score of 3.69 for complaining and venting, suggesting occasional distractions. This supports Schulte-Braucks et al. (2019), who noted such behaviors often result from stress but can be reduced in supportive settings.

 Lower scores, like 2.45 for negative attitudes and 2.19 for sharing issues with outsiders, indicate overall professionalism and loyalty. The average of 2.84 suggests these behaviors are infrequent. Loi et al. (2020) emphasized that open communication and fair leadership can minimize workplace negativity and foster a healthier environment.

**Table 12.** Level of employee performance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Performance**  | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation**  | **Interpretation**  |
| 1. Task Performance
 | 4.17 | 0.44 | High |
| 1. Contextual Performance
 | 4.24 | 0. 44 | Very High  |
| 1. Counterproductive Work Behavior
 | 2.84 | 0.76 | Neutral  |
| **Overall Performance** | **3.75** | **0.41** | **High**  |

 Table 12 shows that employees view their performance positively, with an overall mean of 4.24. Contextual Performance ranked highest, highlighting teamwork and engagement, as noted by Podsakoff (2018). Task Performance also scored well at 4.17, reflecting consistent productivity, in line with Koopmans et al. (2016).

 Counterproductive Work Behavior was much lower at 2.84, indicating such actions are rare. This supports Schulte-Braucks et al. (2019) and Loi et al. (2020), who found that supportive environments reduce negative behavior. With an average performance score of 3.75, the workforce is generally effective, though improvement is still possible.

**4.3 Significant Relationship between Leadership Style and Employee Performance**

 Table 13 shows that all four leadership styles positively correlate with employee performance, though to varying degrees. Laissez-Faire Leadership had the strongest correlation (0.486), suggesting that autonomy and trust enhance productivity, consistent with Skogstad et al. (2018) and Yang (2015).

**Table 13.** Significant relationship between leadership style and employee performance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Types of Leadership | Overall Performance | Interpretation |
| Transformational Leadership | Pearson Correlation | 0.377 |  Weak Relationship |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |
| N | 179 |
| Transactional Leadership | Pearson Correlation | 0.454 | Moderate Relationship |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |
| N | 179 |
| Authoritative Leadership | Pearson Correlation | 0.454 | Moderate Relationship |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |
| N | 179 |
| Laissez Faire Leadership | Pearson Correlation | 0.486 | Moderate Relationship |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |
| N | 179 |

 Authoritative Leadership followed at 0.454, showing that structure and clear expectations are also valued, aligning with Pradhan et al. (2017) and Giltinane (2019). Transformational Leadership had the weakest correlation (0.3777), but still supported motivation and growth, as noted by Afsar et al. (2019) and Hoch et al. (2018). These findings suggest LGU leaders can improve performance by balancing autonomy, structure, and support.

**4.4 The Leadership Style among Employees**

 Table 14 reveals that Transformational Leadership is the most preferred style across employment types, rated highest by permanent employees (4.38), followed by job order (4.23) and casual workers (4.06). This style fosters trust, motivation, and personal growth, enhancing performance and commitment (Lee et al., 2017; Afsar et al., 2019; Hoch et al., 2018).

**Table 14.** Level of leadership style among employees

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Types of Leadership | Tenure of Employee |
| Job Order | Permanent | Casual |
| Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| A. Transformational Leadership | 4.23 | Very High | 4.38 | Very High | 4.06 | High |
| B. Transactional Leadership | 4.12 | High | 4.22 | Very High | 4.05 | High |
| C. Authoritative Leadership | 3.83 | High | 3.78 | High | 3.67 | High |
| D. Laissez Faire Leadership | 3.98 | High | 3.92 | High | 4.00 | High |

 Transactional Leadership also received favorable ratings, especially from permanent employees (4.22), reflecting the value of clear expectations and rewards (Pradhan et al., 2017). Laissez-Faire Leadership earned consistent, moderate scores, indicating a preference for autonomy (Skogstad et al., 2018).

 Authoritative Leadership was least favored (3.67), particularly by casual employees, suggesting that strict control is less appealing in insecure roles (De Hoogh et al., 2015). Overall, leadership that combines motivation, structure, and autonomy is preferred.

**5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Conclusion**

 The study found that transformational leadership was the most preferred style, as it promoted strong motivation, trust, and support for employees' growth. Surprisingly, laissez-faire leadership showed the strongest positive correlation with performance, suggesting that autonomy and trust significantly enhance outcomes in this context.

 All four leadership styles—transformational, transactional, authoritative, and laissez-faire—were significantly linked to employee performance, emphasizing their impact on work behavior and productivity. Overall, employee performance was rated high, especially in task and contextual performance, with only minimal instances of counterproductive behavior.

 Lastly, differences in leadership style preference by employment status were minimal, though permanent employees showed a stronger inclination toward transformational leadership.

**Recommendations**

1. To improve organizational performance and employee productivity, the study recommends a strategic focus on leadership development. Training supervisors and department heads in transformational leadership can enhance motivation, creativity, and employee confidence.
2. Introducing structured autonomy allows employees to work independently while still receiving necessary support. A hybrid leadership model—blending transactional elements for clear goals and accountability with transformational and laissez-faire styles—can promote both engagement and innovation.
3. To reduce counterproductive behaviors, fostering a positive work environment is essential. This includes open communication, wellness initiatives, and team-building activities tailored to the unique needs of job order, casual, and permanent staff for greater inclusivity.
4. Finally, further research into the contextual factors affecting leadership effectiveness in government settings is encouraged to better understand how various dynamics shape leadership outcomes.
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