

School Heads' Administrative Strategies and School Performance

Jeffrey E. Pasatiempo¹
0009-0004-2371-7650

William A. Buquia¹
0009-0000-8356-313X

1 – STI West Negros University

Publication Date: August 28, 2026

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.22144998](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22144998)

Abstract

This study determined the levels of school heads' administrative strategies in relation to school performance in a large-sized schools division in Central Philippines during School Year 2024–2025. Specifically, it examined administrative strategies in terms of leadership and governance, strategic planning, and communication and collaboration, including differences when respondents were grouped according to age, length of service, and plantilla position, and their relationship with school performance. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design involving 230 teachers proportionately selected from 20 schools. Data were gathered using a researcher-developed questionnaire and analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, Mann-Whitney U test, and Spearman's rho. Findings revealed high levels of administrative strategies in leadership and governance and strategic planning, while communication and collaboration was moderate. No significant differences were found in the three areas of administrative strategies when respondents were grouped according to age, length of service, and plantilla position. Moreover, school heads' administrative strategies had a significant and very strong positive relationship with school performance. The findings indicate that stronger administrative strategies are associated with higher school performance and highlight the need to strengthen communication and collaboration, particularly stakeholder engagement, alongside sustained leadership, governance, and strategic planning practices.

Keywords: *administrative strategies, school heads, school performance, strategic planning, educational leadership*

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

Educational leadership and administration play a significant role in ensuring that schools achieve their goals and provide quality learning opportunities for students. School heads are expected not only to manage daily school operations but also to provide direction, formulate and implement plans, mobilize resources, communicate organizational priorities, and establish productive relationships with teachers and other stakeholders. The UNESCO 2024/5 Global Education Monitoring Report emphasizes that effective educational leadership involves setting expectations, focusing on learning, fostering collaboration, and developing people, while also requiring competencies in planning, implementation, monitoring, problem-solving, and communication (Global Education Monitoring Report Team, 2024). In the Philippine context, these responsibilities are reflected in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), which identifies leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections as major domains of school leadership (DepEd, 2020). These responsibilities underscore the importance of leadership and governance, strategic planning, and communication and collaboration as administrative strategies that may contribute to effective school management and improved school performance.

The importance of these administrative strategies becomes more evident considering the continuing challenges confronting Philippine basic education. Results of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2022 showed that Filipino learners continued to perform below the OECD average in mathematics, reading, and science, with only 16% attaining at least Level 2 proficiency in mathematics, 24% in reading, and 23% in science (OECD, 2023). Such outcomes highlight the need to examine not only classroom-level factors but also the leadership and administrative conditions that support teaching, learning, and overall school improvement. This concern is consistent with the Basic Education Development Plan (BEDP) 2030, which emphasizes strengthened school-level governance, accountability, School-Based Management, planning, monitoring, and stakeholder participation in improving educational outcomes (DepEd, 2022). Leadership and governance can provide direction and accountability; strategic planning can enable schools to identify priorities, establish appropriate interventions, allocate resources, and monitor progress; while communication and collaboration can facilitate the participation of teachers, parents, communities, and other stakeholders in accomplishing shared educational goals.

The study is likewise aligned with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (UNSDG) 4: Quality Education, which seeks to “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all” (United Nations, n.d.), which aims to ensure that children complete quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes. Achieving this goal requires not only competent teachers and adequate learning resources but also school leaders who can effectively govern their institutions, strategically plan programs and interventions, and build meaningful collaboration among stakeholders. The need to examine these practices is particularly important because the existence of national leadership standards does not necessarily indicate how consistently administrative

strategies are practiced across schools or whether these strategies are associated with differences in school performance. Moreover, UNESCO (2024) recognizes that educational leadership operates within varying organizational and contextual conditions; hence, evidence obtained from other settings may not fully explain the experiences and performance of schools within a particular schools division.

Current State of Knowledge

Recent research increasingly demonstrates that the administrative and leadership practices of school heads are important factors associated with school performance. De los Reyes (2023) examined the strategic management practices of school heads in high-performing public secondary schools in the Division of Laguna, involving 290 public secondary school teachers. The study covered planning, leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, resource management, budget allocation, and continuous improvement. Findings revealed significant relationships between these strategic management practices and school performance. In particular, planning and leadership and governance—two areas closely related to the administrative strategies investigated in the present study—were significantly associated with school outcomes. The findings suggest that school performance is not independent of administrative practices; rather, the ability of school heads to strategically direct school operations and establish effective governance mechanisms may contribute to the achievement of institutional goals (De los Reyes, 2023).

Similarly, Nacionales (2024) investigated the nexus among school heads' leadership practices and competencies, stakeholder engagement, and school performance in the Division of Laguna. Using a descriptive-correlational design, the study assessed leadership practices in terms of leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections. School performance was assessed using indicators that included promotion, dropout, graduation and cohort-survival rates, School-Based Management level, and performance ratings. The findings established significant relationships between school heads' leadership practices and stakeholder engagement and demonstrated the relevance of leadership practices to school performance. This study particularly supports the inclusion of communication and collaboration in the present investigation because building connections, communicating, collaborating, and involving stakeholders represent essential mechanisms through which school heads mobilize the school community toward common objectives (Nacionales, 2024).

The importance of strategic planning has likewise been demonstrated in recent Philippine research. Oliva et al. (2024) examined strategic planning in the management and utilization of school Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses among school leaders in the Aroroy East District. Using a mixed-method approach involving elementary and secondary school leaders, the study found that most of the identified strategic planning practices were consistently implemented, although variations were evident across particular strategies. The findings highlight the importance of systematic planning in identifying priorities and ensuring that available school resources are directed toward intended educational purposes. Although the study concentrated specifically on financial resource management, it provides evidence that strategic

planning is embedded in important administrative decisions undertaken by school heads. This supports the present study's treatment of strategic planning as a major dimension of administrative strategy, particularly because effective school administration requires the alignment of resources, programs, priorities, and actions with institutional objectives (Oliva et al., 2024).

Further evidence concerning leadership and performance was provided by Olasiman and Torreon (2024), who examined the leadership styles and practices of school heads in relation to teachers' teaching accomplishments in Bohol, Philippines. The investigation involved 598 respondents composed of 98 school heads and 500 teachers. The study assessed how school heads' leadership styles and practices were associated with teaching accomplishments, reinforcing the proposition that school leadership has implications for the performance of personnel responsible for delivering instruction. In a related Philippine study, Uy (2024) investigated school heads' leadership styles and teachers' performance among 114 public secondary junior high school teachers in Misamis Oriental. The study found significant correlations between the leadership styles examined and performance, with democratic and servant leadership emerging as particularly relevant approaches. Taken together, these studies demonstrate that school heads' leadership behavior can influence organizational conditions and personnel performance and strengthen the empirical basis for examining administrative leadership as an important factor associated with school effectiveness (Olasiman & Torreon, 2024; Uy, 2024).

The current body of knowledge therefore provides substantial evidence that leadership and governance, strategic planning, stakeholder engagement, communication, and collaboration are associated with different dimensions of teacher and school performance. However, the reviewed studies were conducted in particular divisions and provinces such as Laguna, Masbate, Misamis Oriental, and Bohol and tended to investigate selected dimensions separately, such as leadership styles, strategic management, resource utilization, stakeholder engagement, or teacher performance. This leaves room for a more integrated investigation of school heads' administrative strategies encompassing leadership and governance, strategic planning, and communication and collaboration and their relationship with overall school performance. Moreover, there remains a need to determine whether administrative strategies vary according to school heads' age, length of service, and plantilla position. The present study addresses this contextual and empirical gap by examining these administrative dimensions simultaneously within a large-sized schools division in Central Philippines during School Year 2024–2025, thereby generating localized evidence that may inform leadership development, administrative interventions, and school improvement initiatives.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The study is anchored on Henri Fayol's Administrative Management Theory as the theoretical foundation for school heads' administrative strategies. Fayol's theory views effective administration as involving essential management functions, particularly planning, organizing, directing or leading, coordinating, and controlling. It further emphasizes principles such as unity of direction, authority and responsibility, discipline, initiative, and esprit de corps or organizational unity. Contemporary discussions of Fayol's theory continue to recognize these

functions as fundamental to the direction and coordination of organizations (Bright & Cortes, 2019). The theory is particularly relevant to educational administration because school heads function as organizational leaders who establish directions, organize people and resources, coordinate activities, communicate expectations, and monitor the accomplishment of school goals. Recent educational research has likewise applied Fayol's Administrative Theory to school leadership and management, particularly in explaining how planning, organizing, leading, coordinating, and controlling contribute to the effective management of teaching and learning (Mhlongo, 2025).

In the present study, Fayol's Administrative Management Theory provides the theoretical basis for examining school heads' administrative strategies in the areas of leadership and governance, strategic planning, and communication and collaboration. Leadership and governance reflect the school head's responsibility for providing direction, exercising authority and accountability, coordinating school activities, and ensuring that personnel work toward common organizational objectives. Strategic planning corresponds directly to Fayol's planning function because school heads are expected to establish goals, identify priorities, formulate strategies, allocate resources, and determine courses of action necessary for school improvement. Communication and collaboration are similarly supported by Fayol's principles of coordination, unity of direction, and esprit de corps, which emphasize cooperation, communication, teamwork, and the alignment of individual efforts toward organizational goals. Thus, the theory assumes that when school heads effectively perform these administrative functions, they create more organized, coordinated, and goal-oriented school environments that can support better school outcomes.

On the other hand, School Effectiveness Theory, associated with the work of school-effectiveness scholars such as Scheerens and Creemers, serves as the theoretical foundation for school performance. The theory explains that school effectiveness is multidimensional and results from the interaction of factors operating at the school, classroom, and contextual levels. Scheerens and Creemers (1989) conceptualized school effectiveness through a framework that considers school-level organizational conditions together with classroom and contextual factors in explaining educational outcomes. Subsequent theoretical development by Scheerens (2015) further conceptualized educational effectiveness as an integration of system-level, school-level, and classroom-level factors. School effectiveness literature has also consistently identified factors such as strong educational leadership, clear academic goals and expectations, a safe and orderly learning environment, and systematic monitoring of student performance as characteristics associated with effective schools.

In relation to the present study, School Effectiveness Theory supports the proposition that school performance is influenced by organizational and leadership conditions existing within the school. School performance may therefore be viewed not merely as an outcome of teachers' classroom practices or learners' individual characteristics but as an organizational outcome potentially associated with the manner in which schools are led, planned, coordinated, and managed. When school heads provide effective leadership and governance, formulate and implement appropriate strategic plans, and maintain effective communication and collaboration among teachers and stakeholders, favorable organizational conditions for accomplishing school objectives may be

created. The theory consequently provides a basis for examining whether variations in school heads' administrative strategies are associated with variations in school performance.

Taken together, Fayol's Administrative Management Theory and School Effectiveness Theory establish the theoretical linkage between the two major variables of the study. Fayol's theory explains how school heads administer and manage their schools through leadership, planning, coordination, and communication, while School Effectiveness Theory explains how school-level organizational and leadership conditions may contribute to educational outcomes and overall school performance. Hence, the present study assumes that the extent to which school heads demonstrate effective administrative strategies in leadership and governance, strategic planning, and communication and collaboration may be significantly associated with the performance of their respective schools. This theoretical relationship provides the basis for testing the significant relationship between school heads' administrative strategies and school performance in a large-sized schools division in Central Philippines during School Year 2024–2025.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to determine the levels of school heads' administrative strategies in relation to schools' performance in a large-sized schools division in Central Philippines during the school year 2024–2025. Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions: What is the profile of the respondents in terms of age, length of service, and plantilla position? What is the level of school heads' administrative strategies in terms of the areas leadership and governance, strategic planning, and communication and collaboration? Is there a significant difference in the levels of school heads' administrative strategies when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables? And is there a significant relationship between the levels of school heads' administrative strategies and schools' performance?

Research Methodology:

This section presents the research design, data-gathering procedure, other instrumentation, and statistical tools. It also discusses the parameters, especially the statistical tools, the respondents, and the study's locality.

Research Design

Descriptive research design is an approach used to systematically describe a population, condition, or phenomenon as it naturally exists without manipulating the variables under investigation. It provides information about the characteristics and existing conditions of the phenomenon being studied and may employ quantitative or qualitative data (Deckert & Wilson, 2023). In this study, the descriptive research design was appropriate because it enabled the

researcher to determine the levels of school heads' administrative strategies in terms of leadership and governance, strategic planning, and communication and collaboration, as well as the schools' performance. It also allowed the researcher to examine differences in administrative strategies when respondents were grouped according to selected profile variables and to determine the relationship between school heads' administrative strategies and school performance.

Study Respondents

The respondents of this study were teachers drawn from twenty schools within a district in a large-sized division in Central Philippines. From a population of five hundred seventy teachers (570), two hundred thirty were selected as the sample and allocated proportionally to the population of each school. This allocation ensured that every school was fairly represented and that the findings reflected the range of teaching experiences and contexts across the division.

Instrument

To gather data on the level of school heads' administrative strategies, the researchers used a self-constructed survey questionnaire with two parts. The first part gathers information about the profile of the respondents, which includes age, length of service, and plantilla position. The second part of the questionnaire consists of two (2) areas, namely school heads' administrative strategies, which has sub-areas, like leadership and governance, strategic planning, and communication and collaboration, composed of 21 items. Then the 2nd area is the school performance identified by each school.

Data Gathering and Procedure

After administering the validity and reliability tests, and upon approval of the schools division superintendent, the questionnaires were administered to the target respondents. The questionnaires were gathered, recorded, and analyzed. The data gathered from the responses of the respondents were tallied and tabulated using the appropriate statistical tools. The encoded data was processed using SPSS.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objectives 1 and 2 employed a descriptive analytical scheme, using frequency counts and percentages as statistical tools to assess the profile of respondents, mean to assess the school heads' administrative strategies across the three areas. Lastly, objectives 3 and 4 utilized a

comparative and relational analytical schemes, applying the Mann-Whitney U test to determine significant differences in the school heads' administrative strategies when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables, and Spearman rho to determine significant relationship between school heads' administrative strategies and school performance.

Ethical Consideration

By guaranteeing the confidentiality of the respondents' answers and upholding their anonymity during the entire research process, the study made a concerted effort to reduce the possibility of harm to its target respondents in accordance with Republic Act 10173, also known as the Data Privacy Act of 2012. The researchers also requested their free and informed consent upfront.

Results and Discussion:

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the data gathered to carry out the predetermined objectives of this study.

Profile of Respondents

Table 1
Profile of the Respondents

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Younger (below 38 years old)	115	50.00
	Older (38 years old and above)	115	50.00
Length of Service	Lower (below 10)	120	52.20
	Higher (10 and above)	110	47.80
Plantilla Position	Lower (teacher 2 and below)	126	54.80
	Higher (teacher 3 and above)	104	45.20

Table 1 presents the profile of the respondents categorized according to age, length of service, and plantilla position. The data show that the number of younger respondents (below 38 years old) and older respondents (38 years old and above) were equal, each comprising 115 or 50

percent. In terms of length of service, a slightly higher portion or 120 respondents (52.20 percent) had served for less than 10 years, while 110 or 47.80 percent had served for 10 years or more. Regarding plantilla position, the majority or 126 respondents (54.80 percent) held lower positions (Teacher II and below), whereas 104 or 45.20 percent held higher ranks (Teacher III and above).

This distribution suggests that the respondent pool was fairly balanced in terms of age and experience, with a slight predominance of less tenured and lower-ranked teachers. Such balance is essential in allowing for equitable analysis of trends in administrative strategies and school performance across varying demographic categories. Additionally, the decision to exclude the highest educational attainment variable, due to one category comprising less than 25 percent, ensures the reliability and validity of grouped comparisons in later analyses.

Level of School Heads' Administrative Strategies

Table 2

School Heads' Administrative Strategies in Leadership and Governance

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Sets a clear vision and mission aligned with educational goals.	3.52	High Level
2. Strengthens shared governance by involving stakeholders in decision-making.	3.54	High Level
3. Shows transparency and accountability in school operations.	3.54	High Level
4. Supports a positive school culture that promotes excellence.	3.57	High Level
5. Safeguards adherence to DepEd rules, policies, and mandates.	3.57	High Level
6. Sustains teacher leadership and delegated responsibilities.	3.43	Moderate Level
7. Secures a safe, inclusive, and learner-friendly environment.	3.50	High Level
Overall Mean	3.52	High Level

Table 2 presents the school heads' administrative strategies in leadership and governance. The overall mean rating is 3.52, which is interpreted as High Level. The item that obtained the lowest mean is "Sustains teacher leadership and delegated responsibilities" with a mean of 3.43, described as Moderate Level.

The highest-rated items in this area are "Supports a positive school culture that promotes excellence" and "Safeguards adherence to DepEd rules, policies, and mandates", both with a mean of 3.57, and interpreted as High Level. These results imply that school heads are strongly committed to upholding a culture of excellence and compliance within their schools. This can be attributed to the continuous push from the Department of Education to instill accountability and

reinforce the mandates of Republic Act No. 9155 (2001). It is also reflective of school leaders' awareness that excellence and compliance are nonnegotiable in effective school governance. Moreover, promoting excellence shapes both teacher behavior and learner achievement, while strict adherence to policies ensures integrity and operational stability. These strategies may also be influenced by leadership training, division-level mandates, and public accountability expectations. When school heads visibly enforce policies and recognize accomplishments, it sets a tone of professionalism that cascades to the entire school community. Over time, this can build a school culture that values discipline, achievement, and responsiveness. Ultimately, prioritizing a strong governance climate positively affects stakeholder trust and systemic coherence.

The findings in Table 3 are consistent with the study of Culduz (2023), who emphasized that effective school leadership is marked by clear policy adherence and a strong performance-oriented culture. Their study showed that public school administrators who demonstrated a high level of compliance with national standards and who cultivated a culture of excellence reported better teacher morale and increased learner performance. These suggest that visible leadership practices in compliance and excellence not only influence school outcomes but also foster professional responsibility among teachers.

Table 3
School Heads' Administrative Strategies in Strategic Planning

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Scans internal and external data for informed school planning.	3.39	Moderate Level
2. Sets SMART objectives that align with the SIP and school priorities.	3.45	Moderate Level
3. Structures strategic plans with measurable targets.	3.65	High Level
4. Streamlines resource allocation based on identified needs.	3.39	Moderate Level
5. Schedules regular monitoring and evaluation of school programs.	3.59	High Level
6. Spearheads innovations to address school improvement gaps.	3.47	Moderate Level
7. Synchronizes school goals with DepEd's strategic directions.	3.56	High Level
Overall Mean	3.50	High Level

Table 3 presents the school heads' administrative strategies in strategic planning. The overall mean rating is 3.50, which is interpreted as High Level. The item that obtained the lowest mean is "Scans internal and external data for informed school planning" and "Streamlines resource allocation based on identified needs", both with a mean of 3.39, and described as Moderate Level.

The highest-rated item in this area is "Structures strategic plans with measurable targets" which obtained a mean of 3.65, interpreted as High Level. This indicates that school heads give strong emphasis on creating plans that are goal-oriented, realistic, and trackable. This practice may be

rooted in the increasing demand for evidence-based school leadership where plans must produce measurable outcomes aligned with the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The high mean rating also implies that school heads recognize the value of setting clear benchmarks to monitor performance, justify resource allocation, and fulfill accountability standards. One possible cause of this rating is the constant training given to school heads on Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and the Annual Implementation Plan (AIP). Additionally, the influence of quality assurance mechanisms and division-level reviews may push school heads to craft plans that are data-driven and measurable. This also suggests their responsiveness to the call for school autonomy while ensuring alignment with national directives. The impact of this practice is far-reaching: it improves the clarity of school direction, strengthens stakeholder buy-in, and allows for more efficient tracking of progress. As a result, schools are more likely to reach their targets, address gaps in performance, and ensure sustainability of programs.

This finding is supported by the study of Pamor and Bauyot (2025), who found that school heads with strong strategic planning skills demonstrated higher program implementation success and better use of school funds. Their research highlighted that measurable objectives in school planning are associated with greater transparency and improved academic outcomes. The study concluded that measurable and well-structured plans foster more efficient management, which in turn leads to increased stakeholder trust and institutional effectiveness.

Table 4

School Heads' Administrative Strategies in Communication and Collaboration

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Shares relevant school information clearly and promptly.	3.46	Moderate Level
2. Solicits feedback from teachers, learners, and stakeholders.	3.42	Moderate Level
3. Strengthens communication channels within and outside the school.	3.41	Moderate Level
4. Seeks active engagement of parents and community members.	3.31	Moderate Level
5. Schedules regular consultative meetings and dialogues.	3.43	Moderate Level
6. Sustains partnerships with LGUs, NGOs, and other stakeholders.	3.42	Moderate Level
7. Supports open and respectful collaboration among school personnel	3.48	Moderate Level
Overall Mean	3.42	Moderate Level

Table 4 presents the school heads' administrative strategies in communication and collaboration. The overall mean rating is 3.42, which is interpreted as Moderate Level. The item that obtained the lowest mean is "Seeks active engagement of parents and community members" with a mean of 3.31, and interpreted as Moderate Level.

The item with the highest mean is “Supports open and respectful collaboration among school personnel”, which obtained a mean of 3.48, also interpreted as Moderate Level. This suggests that among the listed communication strategies, school heads are most focused on building strong internal relationships among their personnel. A possible reason for this is the understanding that a collegial atmosphere among teachers and staff directly influences teamwork, decision-making, and overall school climate. When school heads support open dialogue and mutual respect, it reduces workplace tension and builds trust, which can positively affect task coordination and professional motivation. This strategy also strengthens collaboration in instructional planning, student support services, and school events. The emphasis on respectful collaboration may stem from leadership training programs under DepEd’s National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP) and School-Based Management frameworks that highlight distributed leadership. However, while this internal focus is commendable, the overall moderate level implies that collaboration could still be more inclusive and structured. The effect of maintaining respectful and open collaboration is that it fosters a professional work environment, reduces conflict, and sustains continuity in leadership practices especially during transitions or emergencies.

This finding is consistent with the study of Cagatan and Quirap (2024), who emphasized that respectful collaboration among school personnel enhances school functionality and promotes a more stable work culture. Their research concluded that collaborative school environments led by participative leadership styles result in better communication, increased teacher satisfaction, and stronger support systems. The study further noted that when internal collaboration is prioritized, school programs are implemented more effectively due to shared ownership and commitment.

Comparative Analyses in the Level of School Heads’ Administrative Strategies

Table 5

Difference in the Level of School Heads’ Administrative Strategies in Leadership and Governance When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	115	114.15	6457.00	.757		Not Significant
	Older	115	116.85				
Length of Service	Lower	120	114.42	6470.00	.796	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	110	116.68				
Plantilla Position	Lower	126	117.39	6314.00	.635		Not Significant
	Higher	104	113.21				

Table 5 displays the results of the comparison in the level of school heads' administrative strategies in leadership and governance when grouped according to age, length of service, and plantilla position. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used as the statistical tool to determine whether significant differences exist between the identified groups. The analysis was conducted using a 0.05 alpha level of significance. According to the decision rule, if the p-value is less than or equal to 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating a significant difference. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no significant difference. The primary goal of this analysis was to examine whether leadership and governance strategies vary among school heads based on their demographic classifications during the school year 2024 to 2025.

The results show that all p-values exceed the 0.05 level of significance. For the age variable, younger school heads obtained a mean rank of 114.15, while the older group had a slightly higher mean rank of 116.85, with a p-value of 0.757. For length of service, school heads with lower service years had a mean rank of 114.42, while those with longer service recorded 116.68, with a p-value of 0.796. Regarding plantilla position, lower-ranked school heads had a mean rank of 117.39, slightly higher than the 113.21 mean rank of their higher-ranked counterparts, with a p-value of 0.635. In all cases, the null hypothesis was accepted, and no significant differences were found. These results imply that the level of administrative leadership and governance among school heads is relatively consistent regardless of age, service tenure, or position classification. This uniformity may be attributed to system-wide alignment in school leadership practices, possibly reinforced by DepEd's national standards, RPMS-PPST frameworks, and ongoing leadership development programs which help ensure consistency across school heads regardless of profile.

The findings align with the results of Resoor et al. (2024), who investigated leadership strategy implementation among school heads in public elementary schools in Region III when grouped by profile variables. Their study concluded that differences in leadership practices by age and rank were statistically insignificant. The researchers emphasized that the standardization of leadership frameworks and performance evaluation tools such as the RPMS ensures alignment of leadership expectations across different administrative profiles. They further highlighted that ongoing professional development programs offered by the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP) contribute to a consistent application of school governance practices. These findings validate the present results and reinforce the view that uniformity in school leadership is a result of structured and policy-driven leadership development.

Table 6

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Administrative Strategies in Strategic Planning When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	115	114.25	6469.00	.775		Not Significant
	Older	115	116.75				
Length of Service	Lower	120	113.85	6402.50	.694	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	110	117.30				
Plantilla Position	Lower	126	117.88	6252.50	.550		Not Significant
	Higher	104	112.62				

Table 6 presents the results of the comparison in the level of school heads' administrative strategies in strategic planning when grouped according to age, length of service, and plantilla position. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to determine if there are significant differences between the groups. The test was conducted at a 0.05 level of significance. According to the hypothesis decision rule, if the computed p-value is less than or equal to 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating a significant difference. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no significant difference. This analysis aimed to evaluate whether age, tenure, or plantilla classification affect how school heads implement strategic planning strategies.

Based on the results, all computed p-values exceeded the 0.05 threshold, confirming that there were no statistically significant differences between any of the profile groupings. Specifically, for the age variable, the younger group obtained a mean rank of 114.25 while the older group recorded 116.75, with a p-value of 0.775. For length of service, those with lower tenure had a mean rank of 113.85, while those with higher tenure obtained 117.30, with a p-value of 0.694. In terms of plantilla position, school heads in lower-ranked positions had a mean rank of 117.88, slightly higher than the 112.62 rank of those in higher positions, with a p-value of 0.550. Since all p-values are greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted across all three groupings. This indicates that the strategic planning practices of school heads are generally consistent regardless of their demographic or positional classification. The results suggest that strategic planning protocols are likely standardized and guided by unified DepEd directives, such as the School Improvement Plan framework and other policy-based planning mechanisms.

These findings are supported by the study of Villafañe (2025), who analyzed strategic planning practices of school heads in public elementary schools across three school divisions in Bulacan. Their study found no significant differences in planning behaviors when school heads were grouped by age and years of service. They attributed the consistency to the implementation of DepEd-mandated tools like the Annual Implementation Plan and the use of unified planning

templates. They further noted that regardless of experience or rank, school heads followed similar training modules and accountability structures tied to the RPMS. These findings affirm the current result, reinforcing the idea that school heads, regardless of profile, apply strategic planning processes in a uniform and standardized manner as required by the education system.

Table 7

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Administrative Strategies in Communication and Collaboration When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	115	117.56	6376.00	.639	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	115	113.44				Not Significant
Length of Service	Lower	120	114.84	6520.50	.874	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	110	116.22				Not Significant
Plantilla Position	Lower	126	115.90	6502.00	.921	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	104	115.02				Not Significant

Table 7 presents the results of the statistical comparison on the level of school heads' administrative strategies in communication and collaboration when grouped according to age, length of service, and plantilla position. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used as the statistical tool to determine whether significant differences exist between the paired groups. The alpha level of significance was set at 0.05. According to the decision rule, the null hypothesis is rejected if the p-value is less than or equal to 0.05, indicating a significant difference. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted, meaning there is no significant difference. This analysis aims to determine whether school heads differ in how they communicate and collaborate based on their age, service tenure, or rank classification.

The results show that the computed p-values for all three variables were greater than 0.05, indicating no significant differences across any of the profile groupings. For age, the younger group obtained a mean rank of 117.56, while the older group recorded 113.44, with a p-value of 0.639. In terms of length of service, the lower service group had a mean rank of 114.84 and the higher service group had 116.22, with a p-value of 0.874. Regarding plantilla position, the lower-ranked group had a mean rank of 115.90, while the higher-ranked group recorded 115.02, with a p-value of 0.921. Since all p-values exceeded the 0.05 level, the null hypothesis was accepted in all cases. These results imply that the school heads, regardless of their demographic or position classifications, practice communication and collaboration strategies at a comparable level. This consistency may be attributed to standardized communication protocols implemented across public schools, such as mandated stakeholder consultations, SGC and PTA structures, and uniform use of DepEd information dissemination systems. It also suggests that school heads are likely to receive similar training in communication skills and community engagement practices.

The results are supported by the study of Estacio and Estacio (2022), who examined the communication and collaboration practices of public school heads in Region V. Their study

found no statistically significant differences in communication effectiveness when grouped according to age, tenure, or plantilla classification. The authors observed that training from the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP), uniform orientation on school governance policies, and structured channels for stakeholder engagement led to consistent communication behaviors among school heads. They recommended the continued reinforcement of system-wide communication strategies to maintain consistency in school leadership. The findings of their study reinforce the present results and confirm that profile-related differences do not necessarily lead to variations in how communication and collaboration are implemented in schools.

Relational Analysis Between the Level of School Heads' Administrative Strategies and School Performance

Table 8

Relational Analysis Between the Level of School Heads' Administrative Strategies and the Level of School Performance

Variables	N	<i>r</i>	p-value	Level of Significance	Interpretation
Level of School Heads' Administrative Strategies	230	.850	0.000	0.05	Significant
Level of School Performance	230				

Table 8 shows the result of the relational analysis between the level of school heads' administrative strategies and the level of school performance using Spearman's rho. This non-parametric test was used since it is suitable for determining the degree of association between two ranked variables. The test was conducted at a 0.05 level of significance. The null hypothesis will be rejected if the p-value is less than or equal to 0.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between the two variables. Otherwise, the null hypothesis will be accepted, indicating no significant relationship.

The result reveals a computed correlation coefficient of 0.850, which indicates a very strong positive correlation between school heads' administrative strategies and school performance. The computed p-value is 0.000, which is less than the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant relationship between the level of administrative strategies practiced by school heads and the overall school performance. This result implies that schools where administrators actively implement strategic leadership practices such as planning, governance, collaboration, parental involvement, community outreach, and

alumni engagement tend to have higher levels of performance. The positive relationship suggests that strong leadership at the school level plays a crucial role in enhancing academic outcomes, operational effectiveness, and stakeholder satisfaction.

A similar finding was reported by Diva and Bautista (2021) in their study conducted in public elementary schools in the Eastern Visayas region. Their research found that school performance, measured through achievement scores and operational efficiency indicators, was significantly associated with school heads' strategic administrative competencies. The study concluded that proactive and systematic leadership behaviors, particularly in planning and stakeholder coordination, positively influenced school-level outcomes. These findings support the results of the present study, reinforcing the importance of empowering school leaders with strategic leadership capacity to improve school performance.

Conclusion:

The findings indicate that the respondents were equally distributed between the younger and older age groups, while slightly more respondents had fewer than 10 years of service and occupied Teacher II or lower plantilla positions. It can therefore be concluded that the respondents represented both age groups equally, although the sample was characterized by a slight predominance of relatively less experienced and lower-ranked teachers. This distribution provided representation from teachers with varying levels of professional experience and position in assessing the administrative strategies of their school heads.

In terms of leadership and governance, it can be concluded that school heads generally demonstrate a high level of administrative strategies in leadership and governance, particularly in promoting a positive school culture and ensuring adherence to DepEd rules, policies, and mandates. However, sustaining teacher leadership and delegating responsibilities emerged as a comparatively weaker aspect and was practiced only at a moderate level. Thus, while school heads demonstrate strong governance and policy-oriented leadership, greater attention may be given to empowering teachers through shared leadership and delegation of responsibilities.

With regard to strategic planning, the findings lead to the conclusion that school heads demonstrate a high level of administrative strategies in strategic planning, with particular strength in structuring strategic plans with measurable targets. Nevertheless, scanning internal and external data for informed planning and allocating resources according to identified needs were comparatively less evident. This suggests that school heads are generally capable of developing goal-oriented and measurable plans, although opportunities remain to strengthen the use of relevant data and needs-based resource allocation to make strategic planning more responsive and evidence-based.

In contrast, in the area of communication and collaboration, it can be concluded that school heads demonstrate only a moderate level of administrative strategies in communication and collaboration. While open and respectful collaboration among school personnel was the most evident practice, active engagement of parents and community members received the lowest rating. The findings therefore indicate that communication and collaboration constitute an area requiring further enhancement, particularly in extending participation beyond school personnel and establishing stronger mechanisms for parental, community, and external stakeholder engagement.

When the findings were further examined according to the respondents' profile, the absence of significant differences in leadership and governance according to age, length of service, and plantilla position indicates that respondents perceive the leadership and governance strategies of school heads in a generally comparable manner regardless of their profile. Thus, perceptions of school heads' leadership and governance are not significantly differentiated by the respondents' age, professional tenure, or position, suggesting relative consistency in how these administrative practices are experienced across the different groups represented in the study.

Similarly, it can be concluded that respondents' assessments of school heads' strategic planning strategies do not significantly differ according to age, length of service, or plantilla position. This indicates that the observed level of strategic planning is relatively consistent across respondent groups and is not dependent on these selected profile characteristics. Hence, school heads' strategic planning practices appear to be experienced similarly by teachers regardless of their demographic and professional classifications.

Consistent with the preceding comparative findings, the findings establish that there are no significant differences in the respondents' assessments of school heads' communication and collaboration strategies when grouped according to age, length of service, and plantilla position. It can therefore be concluded that perceptions of these practices are generally consistent across the identified respondent groups. This further indicates that the moderate level of communication and collaboration observed in the study represents a relatively common assessment among respondents rather than one associated with particular age, tenure, or plantilla categories.

Finally, the study concludes that school heads' administrative strategies have a significant and very strong positive relationship with school performance ($r = .850, p < .001$). This indicates that higher levels of administrative strategies tend to be associated with higher levels of school performance. Accordingly, effective leadership and governance, strategic planning, and communication and collaboration appear to be important administrative conditions associated with better school outcomes. However, because the study employed a descriptive-correlational approach, the significant relationship should be interpreted as an association rather than evidence of causation; the findings do not establish that administrative strategies alone cause improvements in school performance.

References:

Bright, D. S., & Cortes, A. H. (2019). Administrative and bureaucratic management. In *Principles of management*. OpenStax, Rice University.

Cagatan, A., & Quirap, E. (2024). Collaborative Learning and Learners' Academic Performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 07.
<https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i03-57>

Culduz, M. (2023). *The Impact of Educational Leadership in Improving the Learning Experience*.
<https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8332-9.ch008>

Deckert, J., & Wilson, M. (2023). Descriptive research methods. In T. Welsh, M. V. K. Chmelar, & K. L. K. Barr (Eds.), *Research methods in the dance sciences* (pp. 153–165). University Press of Florida. <https://doi.org/10.5744/florida/9780813069548.003.0011>

De los Reyes, E. V., III. (2023). Strategic management, organizational diversity of school heads and school performance. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 125(1), 147–217.
<https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001251520234895>

Department of Education. (2020). *National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads* (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020).
https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf

Department of Education. (2022). *Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030* (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/DO_s2022_024.pdf

Diva, E. C., & Bautista, M. P. (2021). School Heads' Instructional Competence, Leadership Practices and Teachers' Performance. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation Sustainability and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, 2(6).
<https://doi.org/DOI:10.5281/zenodo.15631136>

Estacio, M., & Estacio, D. (2022). Public School Heads' Leadership Style and Best Practices in the Department of Education in Bulacan, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3, 1622–1629.

<https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.09.03>

Global Education Monitoring Report Team. (2024). *Leadership in education: Lead for learning. 2024/5 Global Education Monitoring Report*. UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/reports/gem-report/en/2024>

Nacionales, L. A. C. (2024). The nexus between school heads' leadership practices and competencies on stakeholders' engagement and school performance. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 148(1), 174–193. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001481520246389>

Olasiman, M. R. P., & Torreon, L. C. (2024). Leadership styles and practices of school heads on teachers' teaching accomplishment. *International Journal of Research - GRANTHAALAYAH*, 12(11). <https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v12.i11.2024.5728>

Oliva, R., Oliva, R. D., Bullo, M. M., & Moran, M. K. (2024). Strategic planning in the management and utilization of school MOOE among school leaders of Aroroy East District. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 18(2). <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=27092>

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *PISA 2022 results (Volumes I and II): Country notes—Philippines*. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/philippines_a0882a2d-en.html

Pamor, I. L., & Bauyot, M. M. (2025). Strategic Planning in School Improvement: A Phenomenological Study of Principals' Experiences in Davao Del Norte. *IJMERI*, 3(1).

Resoor, N. ., Serviñas, L. ., Retes, E. ., & Eltanal, G. (2024). School Heads' Leadership and Innovative Skills in Relation to Teachers' Performance. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRIS)*, 1(6), 928–940. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/view/537>

Republic of the Philippines. (2012). *Republic Act No. 10173: Data Privacy Act of 2012*. National Privacy Commission. <https://privacy.gov.ph/data-privacy-act/>

Scheerens, J., & Creemers, B. P. M. (1989). Conceptualizing school effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(7), 691–706. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-0355\(89\)90022-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-0355(89)90022-0)

Scheerens, J. (2015). Theories on educational effectiveness and ineffectiveness. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(1), 10–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2013.858754>

United Nations. (n.d.). *Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4>

Uy, M. R. (2024). School heads' leadership styles and teachers' performance. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 17(1). <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=25456>

Villafañe, R. S. (2025). Participative leadership style of school heads in Bulacan. *EJournals PH*.