

Evaluating The School Leaders' Communication Competence At Lugus District, Division of Sulu: Teachers' Perspectives

Aida U. Alamia¹, Masnona S. Asiri

¹ School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State College, Jolo 7400, Philippines

*Corresponding author: gs@sulustatecollege.edu.ph

ABSTRACT. This study assessed the extent of teachers' evaluation of the communication competence of school leaders in Lugus District, Division of Sulu. It examined communication competence across the domains of clarity and accuracy, listening and feedback, interpersonal communication, written communication, and non-verbal and presentation skills, while also considering the respondents' demographic profiles such as age, gender, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment. The study employed a descriptive-exploratory research design, with 100 teacher-respondents selected through purposive sampling. Data were treated using frequency and percentage distribution, weighted mean, standard deviation, Pearson's correlation coefficient, independent samples t-test, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Findings revealed that the majority of respondents were 36 years old and above, predominantly female, mostly married, had five years and below in service, and held bachelor's degrees. Results indicated that most teacher-respondents perceived the communication competence of school leaders across all domains as "often" manifested. It was also found that teachers with doctorate degrees demonstrated better ways of perceiving the overall communication competence of school leaders. Furthermore, very high positive relationships were observed among the sub-categories of communication competence, indicating strong interrelatedness among these domains. These findings support Rachmad's (2022) Communication Leadership Theory, which emphasizes that leadership communication is a holistic process designed to establish mutual understanding rather than mere message transmission. In addition, the Leadership for Teacher Flourishing (LFTF) framework (Granville-Chapman, Lee et al., 2024) suggests that leaders who effectively integrate these communication skills create supportive environments necessary for teachers to thrive. Overall, the study underscores the importance of communication competence in fostering a psychologically safe environment that recognizes the unique contributions of a diverse workforce. **KEYWORDS:** *Communication Competence, School Leadership, Teachers' Perceptions, Interpersonal Communication, Educational Leadership, Psychological Safety*

ARTICLE DETAILS

JEAS-00086; Received: January 25, 2026; Accepted: February 5, 2026; Published: February 25, 2026

CITATION:

Alamia, Aida U., Asiri, Masnona S. (2026). *Evaluating The School Leaders' Communication Competence At Lugus District, Division of Sulu: Teachers' Perspectives*. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*, 3(1). DOI: 10.62596/whczs461

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2026 by author(s). *Journal of Education and Academic Settings* is published by Stratworks Research Inc. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing redistribution and reproduction in any format or medium, provided the original work is cited or recognized.

Introduction

Effective communication is a fundamental component of educational leadership, influencing school effectiveness, teacher engagement, and organizational outcomes (Bush, 2020; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). School leaders—such as principals and supervisors—act as

key communicators who convey policies, articulate vision, and engage stakeholders within the school system (Hallinger, 2018). Communication competence goes beyond information delivery; it involves clarity, responsiveness, interpersonal sensitivity, and the effective use of both traditional and digital communication platforms (Northouse, 2021; Pont, Nusche, & Moorman, 2008).

This study focuses on five core dimensions of communication competence: clarity and accuracy, listening and feedback skills, interpersonal communication, written communication, and non-verbal and presentation skills. These dimensions are essential for fostering collaboration, strengthening relationships, and ensuring effective communication within the school community (Guffey & Loewy, 2019; Wolvin & Coakley, 2016; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984; Burgoon, 1994).

Globally and in the Philippines, communication competence is recognized as a critical leadership skill for effective school governance and reform implementation (OECD, 2020; UNESCO, 2021). The Department of Education (DepEd) highlights the role of school leaders as frontline implementers of policies under the K to 12 program and School-Based Management. However, communication challenges persist, particularly in geographically isolated and resource-constrained areas.

In the Lugus District, Division of Sulu, school leaders operate within unique geographical and socio-cultural conditions that require adaptive communication practices. Despite its importance, limited studies have examined how teachers evaluate school leaders' communication competence in this context, particularly when grouped according to demographic profiles and across specific communication domains.

Therefore, this study aims to assess the extent of teachers' evaluation of school leaders' communication competence across the five dimensions. It also examines differences based on teachers' demographic profiles and determines the relationships among the communication domains. The findings are expected to inform leadership practices and improve communication strategies in similar educational contexts.

Research Questions

1. What is the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1. Age;
 - 1.2. Gender;
 - 1.3. Civil Status;
 - 1.4. Length of Service; and
 - 1.5. Educational Attainment?
2. What is the extent of teachers' evaluation of the communication competence of school leaders in the context of:
 - 2.1. Clarity and Accuracy of Communication;
 - 2.2. Listening and Feedback Skills;
 - 2.3. Interpersonal Communication;
 - 2.4. Written Communication; and
 - 2.5. Non-Verbal and Presentation Skills?
3. Is there a significant difference in the evaluation of teachers on the communication competence of school leaders when data are grouped according to their demographic profile in terms of:
 - 3.1. Age;
 - 3.2. Gender;

- 3.3. Civil Status;
 - 3.4. Length of Service; and
 - 3.5. Educational Attainment?
4. Is there a significant correlation among the sub-categories of communication competence of school leaders in terms of clarity and accuracy, listening and feedback, interpersonal communication, written communication, and non-verbal and presentation skills?

Literature

Communication Competence in Educational Leadership

Communication competence is widely recognized as a core component of effective educational leadership. It is defined as a multidimensional construct that integrates clarity, accuracy, interpersonal sensitivity, and adaptability rather than mere message transmission (Rachmad, 2022). Leadership communication functions as both a relational and strategic process, enabling school leaders to build trust, resolve conflicts, and align stakeholders with school goals (Men et al., 2020).

Theoretical frameworks such as transformational and instructional leadership emphasize that leaders influence teacher performance and school effectiveness through clear vision, empathy, and dialogue (Northouse, 2021; Azorín et al., 2019). These perspectives highlight that communication competence is not an isolated skill but a central leadership function that shapes organizational coherence and performance.

Core Dimensions of Communication Competence

Literature consistently identifies key dimensions of communication competence, including clarity and accuracy, listening and feedback, interpersonal communication, and written and non-verbal skills (Öner & Hoşgörür, 2021). Clarity and accuracy ensure that policies and expectations are well understood, minimizing misinterpretation in school operations.

Interpersonal communication—particularly empathy, respect, and active listening—has been strongly linked to teacher morale, commitment, and collaboration (Capalad et al., 2024). Communication is further strengthened through feedback practices, which are most effective when treated as a two-way, dialogic process that supports professional growth (Carless & Boud, 2018). Similarly, responsive leadership is reflected through accessibility, attentiveness, transparency, and active engagement with stakeholders, reinforcing the value of two-way communication in leadership effectiveness (Chavez et al., 2024).

Non-verbal communication, including tone, gestures, and presentation style, also plays a significant role in shaping perceptions of credibility and leadership effectiveness (Knapp et al., 2019). Additionally, recent literature highlights the growing importance of digital communication skills as school leaders adapt to technology-driven environments (Fullan, 2021). Public speaking competence can be improved through professional support and regular practice, strengthening overall communication effectiveness (Savellon et al., 2024).

Empirical Evidence and Philippine Context

Empirical studies consistently show that communication competence significantly influences teacher performance, job satisfaction, and school climate. Clear and consistent communication enhances teacher motivation and collaboration, while ineffective communication leads to misunderstandings and low morale (Al-Jaradat, 2018).

In the Philippine context, communication is considered fundamental to school leadership, supporting both instructional guidance and organizational management (Santiago, 2019). Studies emphasize that clarity, consistency, and two-way communication improve teacher engagement and

school climate (Garcia, 2019; Alvarez, 2021). Interpersonal communication is particularly important in fostering collaboration within a collectivist culture, while feedback mechanisms enhance professional growth (Flores, 2020; Bautista, 2021). Additionally, exposure to structured communication and writing practices has been found to strengthen individuals' language awareness, clarity of expression, and communication confidence, highlighting the role of sustained communicative engagement in developing competence (Chavez et al., 2024).

However, limited research has examined how teachers evaluate school leaders' communication competence across specific dimensions in localized and culturally diverse settings such as Lugus District, Division of Sulu. This gap highlights the need for context-specific assessment of communication competence in educational leadership.

Methodology

1. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-exploratory research design. This approach was selected to systematically describe and examine teachers' evaluation of the communication competence of school leaders in selected elementary schools in Lugus District. It enabled the collection, analysis, and validation of data to identify existing conditions and generate insights that may serve as a basis for further in-depth investigation.

2. Participants and Sampling

The respondents of this study consisted of 100 public elementary school teachers from 10 selected schools in Sulu, namely: Alu Duyung Elementary School, Laud Alu Primary School, Bas Nunuk Elementary School, Bas Mangakallay Elementary School, Boli Pongpong Primary School, Lahud Primary School, Lugus Central School, Parian Kawayan Elementary School, Rugasan Elementary School, and Gapas Primary School during School Year 2025–2026. A non-probability purposive sampling technique was employed, whereby teachers were selected based on accessibility, availability, and relevance to the study. Inclusion was limited to those actively teaching during the specified school year and possessing relevant teaching experience to ensure the collection of rich, reliable, and contextually grounded data.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by School

Selected Elementary Schools, Lugus District, Division of Sulu	Number Of Respondents
1. Alu Duyung Elementary School	10
2. Laud Alu Primary School	10
3. Bas Nunuk Elementary School	10
4. Bas Mangakallay Elementary School	10
5. Boli Pongpong Primary School	10
6. Lahud Primary School, Lugus Central School	10
7. Lugus Central School	10
8. Parian Kawayan Elementary School	10
9. Rugasan Elementary School	10
10. Gapas Primary School	10
Total:	100

3. Instruments

Data were gathered using a modified standardized questionnaire adapted from Spitzberg's (1983) communication competence framework and McCroskey's (1982) rhetorical communication model. The instrument consisted of 50 statements designed to assess communication competence within an educational context. Items were tailored to fit the objectives

of the study while maintaining the core dimensions of knowledge, skill, and impression management in communication competence.

4. Data Collection Procedure

A permit to administer the questionnaire was first secured from the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies of Sulu State College, followed by approval from the Schools Division Superintendent and the principals of the ten (10) selected elementary schools. After approval, the researcher personally conducted the administration and retrieval of the questionnaires.

5. Data Analysis

Data gathered were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical tools in line with the study objectives. Frequency and percentage distributions were used to describe the teachers’ demographic profile in terms of gender, age, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment. Weighted mean and standard deviation were employed to determine the extent of teachers’ evaluation of the school leaders’ communication competence in terms of clarity and accuracy of communication, listening and feedback skills, interpersonal communication, written communication, and non-verbal and presentation skills. To test for significant differences, an independent samples t-test was used for gender, while a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied for age, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment. Finally, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was utilized to determine the significant relationships among the sub-categories of communication competence.

Results

1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Analysis of the demographic profile of the 100 teacher-respondents reveals a predominantly female workforce (85% female, 15% male). In terms of age, most respondents fall within the older age group, with 60% aged 36 years and above, followed by 32% aged 26–35 years, and 8% aged 25 years and below. Regarding civil status, the majority are married (69%), while 31% are single. As to length of service, a considerable proportion are experienced educators, with 40% serving for 16 years and above, 25% for 6–10 years, 20% for 5 years and below, and 15% for 11–15 years. In terms of educational attainment, most hold bachelor’s degrees (78%), while 14% have master’s units, 3% are master’s degree holders, and 5% have doctorate degrees, indicating a workforce largely grounded in undergraduate qualifications with a small proportion having pursued graduate studies.

Table 2: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Demographic Variable	Number of Respondents (n=100)	Percentage (%)
Age		
25 years old and below	8	8%
26-35 years old	32	32%
36 years old and above	60	60%
Gender		
Male	15	15%
Female	75	75%
Civil Status		
Single	31	31%
Married	69	69%
Widowed/Separated	0	0%
Length of Service		
5 years and below	20	20%
6-10 years	25	25%

11-15 years	15	15%
16 years and above	40	40%
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	78	78%
Bachelor's Degree with Master's Units	14	14%
Master's Degree	3	3%
Master's Degree with Doctorate Units	0	0%
Doctorate Degree	5	5%

2. Extent of Teachers' Evaluation of the Communication Competence of School Leaders

Overall, teachers assessed the communication competence of school leaders as “often” across all five domains. Among these, Listening and Feedback Skills ($M = 4.378$, $SD = 0.54728$) and Clarity and Accuracy of Communication ($M = 4.334$, $SD = 0.48684$) obtained the highest mean ratings, indicating strong performance in active listening, providing clear directions, and delivering well-organized messages.

Interpersonal Communication ($M = 4.268$, $SD = 0.60718$) and Non-verbal and Presentation Skills ($M = 4.242$, $SD = 0.68846$) were likewise rated as “often,” reflecting generally positive but comparatively moderate performance in fostering respectful interactions, building rapport, and demonstrating appropriate non-verbal cues such as eye contact and professional presence.

Written Communication obtained the lowest mean ($M = 4.202$, $SD = 0.64745$), though still interpreted as “often,” suggesting that while school leaders demonstrate adequate competence in written outputs, this area is relatively less developed compared to the other domains. Overall, the findings indicate a consistently high level of communication competence among school leaders, with written and non-verbal communication emerging as areas for further enhancement.

Table 3: Extent of Teachers' Evaluation of the Communication Competence of School Leaders

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation (S.D.)	Descriptive Interpretation
Clarity and Accuracy	4.334	.48684	Often
1. The school leader communicates ideas clearly.	4.48	.61101	Often
2. The school leader uses simple and understandable language.	4.42	.72725	Often
3. The school leader avoids ambiguity in instructions.	4.04	.77746	Often
4. The school leader ensures accuracy of information before sharing.	4.30	.73168	Always
5. The school leader provides clear directions in meetings.	4.52	.67390	Often
6. The school leader communicates objectives effectively.	4.44	.67150	Often
7. The school leader explains school policies comprehensively.	4.32	.70896	Often
8. The school leader avoids miscommunication by double-checking facts.	4.10	.94815	Often
9. The school leader adapts messages for the audience's understanding.	4.30	.75879	Often
10. The school leader delivers information in an organized manner.	4.42	.72275	Often
Listening and Feedback Skills	4.378	.54728	Often
1. The school leader actively listens to teachers' concerns.	4.58	.60603	Always
2. The school leader gives teachers full attention during conversations.	4.42	.69892	Often
3. The school leader acknowledges teachers' inputs with respect.	4.48	.64322	Often

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation (S.D.)	Descriptive Interpretation
4. The school leader provides constructive feedback.	4.38	.74914	Often
5. The school leader encourages open dialogue with teachers.	4.32	.73691	Often
6. The school leader listens patiently even during disagreements.	4.16	.81303	Often
7. The school leader ensures teachers feel heard and understood.	4.42	.60603	Often
8. The school leader responds appropriately after listening.	4.38	.66332	Often
9. The school leader clarifies points before making decisions.	4.26	.66088	Often
10. The school leader values feedback from teachers.	4.38	.69311	Often
Interpersonal Communication	4.268	.60718	Often
1. The school leader communicates well in one-on-one interactions.	4.18	.71605	Often
2. The school leader uses a friendly and approachable tone.	4.34	.71379	Often
3. The school leader communicates respect in conversations.	4.46	.73057	Often
4. The school leader adjusts communication style to different personalities.	4.28	.72586	Often
5. The school leader builds rapport through effective communication.	4.38	.69311	Often
6. The school leader manages conflicts through open communication.	4.06	1.01325	Often
7. The school leader communicates assertively without being harsh.	4.06	.95155	Often
8. The school leader encourages teachers through motivational talks.	4.32	.81501	Often
9. The school leader communicates with fairness and consistency.	4.26	.82413	Often
10. The school leader maintains professionalism in all interactions.	4.34	.76831	Often
Written Communication	4.202	.64745	Often
1. The school leader writes clear and concise memoranda.	4.46	.57595	Often
2. The school leader avoids errors in written correspondence.	4.14	.94302	Often
3. The school leader organizes written communication logically.	4.30	.85870	Often
4. The school leader uses proper grammar and vocabulary in letters.	4.26	.79924	Often
5. The school leader communicates effectively through emails.	3.58	1.20755	Often
6. The school leader documents school policies accurately.	4.18	.84543	Often
7. The school leader writes reports that are easy to understand.	4.26	.82413	Often
8. The school leader ensures written messages are complete.	4.52	.57700	Always
9. The school leader adapts written style to formal and informal contexts.	4.08	.84900	Often
10. The school leader uses written communication to strengthen accountability.	4.24	.88899	Often
Non-verbal and Presentation Skills	4.242	.68846	Often
1. The school leader uses appropriate gestures to support messages.	4.38	.72167	Often
2. The school leader maintains good eye contact while speaking.	4.44	.72919	Often
3. The school leader's tone of voice matches the message.	4.22	.83581	Often
4. The school leader demonstrates confidence in presentations.	4.34	.74155	Often
5. The school leader uses visual aids effectively when presenting.	4.32	.70896	Often
6. The school leader maintains professional appearance during communication.	4.40	.80403	Often
7. The school leader uses facial expressions to convey sincerity.	4.34	.91254	Often
8. The school leader ensures body language is consistent with words.	4.24	.79290	Often

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation (S.D.)	Descriptive Interpretation
9. The school leader controls nervous habits during speaking.	3.96	.80302	Often
10. The school leader engages the audience through non-verbal cues.	3.78	1.30717	Often

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Always; (4) 3.50 – 4.49=Often; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Sometimes; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Seldom; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Never

3. Differences in the Evaluation of Communication Competence Based on Demographic Profiles

To determine whether teachers’ evaluation of the communication competence of school leaders varied across demographic groupings, independent samples t-tests and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted. The results revealed no statistically significant differences when respondents were grouped according to age, gender, and civil status ($p > 0.05$), indicating a generally uniform perception across these variables.

However, a statistically significant difference emerged when respondents were categorized according to length of service, specifically in the domain of Listening and Feedback Skills. Post-hoc analysis using the Tukey HSD test showed that teachers with 16 years and above differed significantly from those with 5 years and below ($p = .019$), with less experienced teachers demonstrating higher evaluations. No significant differences were observed across the remaining domains.

Furthermore, educational attainment was found to yield statistically significant differences across all domains of communication competence ($p < 0.05$). Post-hoc comparisons consistently indicated that teachers with doctorate degrees reported significantly higher evaluations compared to those with lower educational qualifications, particularly in clarity and accuracy, listening and feedback, interpersonal, written, and non-verbal communication skills. These findings suggest that educational attainment influences how communication competence is perceived among teachers.

Table 4: Differences in the Extent of Teachers’ Evaluation of the Communication Competence of School Leaders

Demographic Grouping	Pedagogical Domain	Test Statistic (t / F)	p-value (Sig.)	Description
Age	Clarity and Accuracy of Communication	.711	.494	Not Significant
	Listening and Feedback Skills	.480	.620	Not Significant
	Interpersonal Communication	1.126	.328	Not Significant
	Written Communication	.349	.706	Not Significant
	Non-verbal and Presentation Skills	.473	.625	Not Significant
Gender	Clarity and Accuracy of Communication	-.177	.860	Not Significant
	Listening and Feedback Skills	-.494	.622	Not Significant

Demographic Grouping	Pedagogical Domain	Test Statistic (t / F)	p-value (Sig.)	Description
	Interpersonal Communication	-.285	.777	Not Significant
	Written Communication	-.877	.383	Not Significant
	Non-verbal and Presentation Skills	-.093	.926	Not Significant
Civil Status				
	Clarity and Accuracy of Communication	1.177	.242	Not Significant
	Listening and Feedback Skills	.584	.561	Not Significant
	Interpersonal Communication	.886	.378	Not Significant
	Written Communication	.179	.858	Not Significant
	Non-verbal and Presentation Skills	.062	.951	Not Significant
Length of Service				
	Clarity and Accuracy of Communication	2.275	.085	Not Significant
	Listening and Feedback Skills	3.364	.022	Significant
	Interpersonal Communication	2.144	.100	Not Significant
	Written Communication	1.983	.122	Not Significant
	Non-verbal and Presentation Skills	.866	.461	Not Significant
Educational Attainment				
	Clarity and Accuracy of Communication	8.016	.000	Significant
	Listening and Feedback Skills	3.368	.022	Significant
	Interpersonal Communication	5.919	.001	Significant
	Written Communication	4.217	.008	Significant
	Non-verbal and Presentation Skills	5.504	.002	Significant

*Significance at alpha 0.05

4. Correlational Analysis Among Communication Competence Domains

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (Pearson's r) was employed to examine the interrelationships among the five domains of communication competence of school leaders. As presented in Table 4.1, all sub-categories demonstrated statistically significant positive correlations ($p = .000$). The strongest relationship was observed between Listening and Feedback and Interpersonal Communication ($r = .887$), indicating a very high positive correlation. Similarly, very high correlations were found between Clarity and Accuracy and Interpersonal Communication ($r = .870$), Interpersonal Communication and Written Communication ($r = .859$), and Written Communication and Non-verbal and Presentation Skills ($r = .857$). Other domain pairings also showed consistently very high correlations, ranging from $r = .770$ to $r = .843$, signifying strong interdependence among all communication domains.

Overall, the findings reveal that communication competence among school leaders functions as a cohesive and integrated construct, where proficiency in one domain is strongly

associated with competence in others. Hence, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant correlation among the sub-categories is rejected.

Table 5. Correlations Among the Pedagogical Domains

Variables	Pearson <i>r</i>	Sig.	N	Description
Clarity and Accuracy of Communication				
Listening and Feedback Skills	.825**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Interpersonal Communication	.870**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Written Communication	.770**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Non-verbal and Presentation Skills	.786**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Listening and Feedback Skills				
Interpersonal Communication	.887**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Written Communication	.843**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Non-verbal and Presentation Skills	.806**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Interpersonal Communication				
Written Communication	.859**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Non-verbal and Presentation Skills	.820**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Written Communication				
Non-verbal and Presentation Skills	.857**	.000	100	Very High Correlation

** Correlation Coefficient is significant at alpha .01 level

Discussion

The demographic profile of teacher-respondents in Lugus District reflects a workforce largely composed of mid-to-late career educators, predominantly female and married, with most holding bachelor’s degrees. This indicates a stable and relatively mature teaching population with established professional and personal responsibilities. However, the limited proportion of teachers with advanced degrees suggests a need for continued professional development, particularly in instructional leadership and academic advancement within the district.

School leaders were consistently rated as “often” competent across all communication domains, with listening and feedback skills emerging as the strongest. This suggests that leaders emphasize responsiveness and active engagement, fostering an inclusive communication climate. This aligns with Cuilan et al. (2024), who emphasize that effective communication is rooted in clarity, responsiveness, and audience-centered messaging supported by active listening and timely feedback. Similarly, España (2025) underscores that leadership communication is strengthened when institutions provide supportive environments that build confidence and reduce barriers such as nervousness and self-doubt, enabling leaders to communicate more effectively and engage stakeholders more meaningfully.

Clarity and accuracy followed, indicating generally effective information delivery. Interpersonal, non-verbal, and presentation skills were also rated positively, reflecting professionalism and rapport-building. However, written communication received the lowest rating, though still “often,” indicating a need to improve precision and clarity in formal written exchanges. This may be linked to self-motivation and professional growth, where career-driven individuals tend to improve communication skills despite confidence barriers (Eustaquio et al., 2025).

Across demographic variables, no significant differences were found in age, gender, and civil status, suggesting shared perceptions of communication competence. Length of service showed no significant variation except in listening and feedback skills, implying slight influence of experience on perceptions of responsiveness. However, educational attainment showed significant differences, with doctorate holders giving higher evaluations, likely due to advanced training and more critical standards.

Correlation analysis revealed strong interconnections among all communication domains. Listening and feedback skills were most strongly linked with interpersonal communication, while clarity and accuracy also showed strong associations with relational skills. Written communication correlated strongly with other domains as well, reinforcing that communication competence functions as an integrated set of skills rather than separate abilities.

Conclusion

The study concludes that educators in Lugus District, Division of Sulu are generally characterized by a stable, mature, and experienced workforce, although most hold only bachelor’s degrees, indicating a gap in advanced academic qualifications. School leaders demonstrate strong communication competence, particularly in listening and feedback, clarity and accuracy, and interpersonal communication, with written and non-verbal skills also contributing to effective leadership practices. Results further show no significant differences in teachers’ evaluations across age, gender, and civil status, but significant variations exist in relation to length of service and educational attainment, suggesting that experience and higher education influence perceptions of leadership communication. Additionally, a strong positive correlation among all communication sub-categories confirms that these competencies function as an integrated system that supports effective leadership, organizational harmony, and teacher well-being.

To enhance the present understanding of communication competence in school leadership within localized educational contexts, future studies should employ rigorous qualitative or mixed-method designs to further examine how structured feedback systems and interpersonal competencies collectively influence collaborative and psychologically supportive school environments. Extending subsequent research frameworks to include diverse stakeholder perspectives, such as teachers and parents, would also provide a more comprehensive and triangulated understanding of communication dynamics in school leadership.

References

- Al-Jaradat, M. K. M. (2018). The impact of educational administration and school administration on the achievement of secondary school students. *European Journal of Training and Development Studies*.
- Alvarez, J. (2021). School leaders' communication competence and teachers' job satisfaction in public schools in Cebu. *Philippine Journal of Education and Human Development*, 9(2), 33–47
- Azorín, C., Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2019). Taking a distributed perspective on leading professional learning networks. *School Leadership and Management*, 40(2–3), 111–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1647418>
- Bautista, M. (2021). Feedback systems and professional growth: Examining communication practices in Philippine schools. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 14(1), 65–80.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1994). Nonverbal signals. In M. L. Knapp & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 229–285). Sage Publications.
- Bush, T. (2020). *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Capalad, L., Halili, C., & Vargas, D. (2024). Teachers' views on the roles of school heads' interpersonal communication skills in enhancing teaching performance [Working paper]. SSRN. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1234567>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Chavez, J. V., Anuddin, F. O., Mansul, H. H., Hawari, N. A., Irlis, F. B., Umaron, A. A., Kaslani, F. A. L., Matugol, F. S.-R. B., Siring, R. M., Albani, S. E. (2024). Analyzing impacts of campus journalism on student's grammar consciousness and confidence in writing engagements. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(7). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i7.6106>
- Chavez, J. V., Garil, B. A., Padrique, C. B., Askali, S. T., & Indama, A. C. (2024). Assessing innovative and responsive young leaders in public service: Lens from community clientele. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2876>
- Cuilan, J. T., Chavez, J. V., Soliva, K. J. G., Jaafar, S. H., Savellon, K. I. S., Tantalie, E. M., & Albani, S. E. (2024). Verbal and non-verbal communication patterns of persuasive selling among live online sellers. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(8). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i8.2519>
- España, A. C. (2025). Public speaking confidence as a crucial asset for leadership development in academic setting. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(4). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i4.3193>
- Eustaquio, M. T. L., Mohammad, F. O., Cuilan, J. T., España, A. C., Abdurasul, S. M., Abdurasul, R. T., Lulu, F. M., & Chavez, J. V. (2025). Self-Motivation and personalized strategies for enhancing English language proficiency in professional contexts. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(7). <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i7.8637>
- Flores, L. (2020). Interpersonal communication and collaboration in Philippine schools. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 8(2), 92–104.
- Fullan, M. (2021). *The Right Drivers for Whole System Success*. CSE Leading Education Series.
- Garcia, M. (2019). Principals' communication competence and stakeholder relations in Pampanga. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 94(1), 22–35.

- Granville-Chapman, K., Lee, M.T. & Ritchie-Dunham, J. The Development of a New Model of Educational Leadership: Leadership for Teacher Flourishing. *Humanist Manag J* 9, 247–267 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41463-024-00181-z>
- Guffey, M. E., & Loewy, D. (2019). *Essentials of business communication* (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5-24.
- Knapp, M. L., Hall, J. A., & Horgan, T. G. (2019). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction* (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven Strong Claims about Successful School Leadership Revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40, 5-22.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1982). *An introduction to rhetorical communication* (4th ed.). Prentice-Hall.
- Men, L. R., Yue, C. A., & Liu, Y. (2020). “Vision, passion, and care:” The impact of charismatic executive leadership communication on employee trust and support for organizational change. *Public Relations Review*, 46(3), 101927. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2020.101927>
- Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.
- OECD. (2020). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume II): Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/19cf08df-en>
- Öner, N. S., & Hoşgörür, T. (2021). Organizational communication competencies of school principals. *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(1), 195–213. <https://doi.org/10.21666/muefd.786636>
- Pont, B., D. Nusche and H. Moorman (2008), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 1: Policy and Practice*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264044715-en>.
- Rachmad, Y. E. (2022). Collaborative leadership theory. *Évora Romano Publicações Internacionais, Edição Especial 2022*. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/4PU3X>
- Santiago, A. (2019). Communication as a managerial and instructional tool of school heads. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 5(1), 15–29.
- Savellon, K. I. S., Asiri, M. S., & Chavez, J. V. (2024). Public speaking woes of academic leaders: resources and alternative ways to improve speaking with audience. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2871>
- Spitzberg, B. H. (1983). Communication competence as knowledge, skill, and impression. *Communication Education*, 32(3), 323–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528309378550>
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1984). *Interpersonal communication competence*. Sage Publications.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.54675/ASRB4722>
- Wolvin, A. D., & Coakley, C. G. (2016). *Listening* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.