Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Leadership Practices Of Schools Heads and Performance Of Teachers In Public Elementary: Basis For A Proposed Innovative Learning And Development Program

Karelle Allysa D. Andres [1], Nerissa P. Batoon, PhD [1]
1 – Isabella State University - Echague

Publication Date: May 18, 2026 DOI: **10.5281/zenodo.20268695**

Abstract

This study determined the extent of leadership practices of school heads based on the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) and examined their relationship with teacher performance and School-Based Management (SBM) level of practice.

A descriptive–correlational research design was employed involving 139 school heads and 288 teachers. Data were collected using an adopted questionnaire based on PPSSH indicators, along with Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings and SBM levels. Statistical tools included mean, t-test, and Pearson correlation.

Leadership practices were generally rated as Intensively Practiced (IP) to Most Intensively Practiced (MIP). No significant differences were found between school heads and teachers in most domains except Developing Self and Others. Teacher performance was uniformly rated Outstanding. No significant relationships were found between leadership practices and teacher performance and SBM level.

School heads demonstrated strong leadership practices; however, gaps exist in professional development implementation. Strengthening leadership support systems and aligning leadership practices with teacher experiences are recommended.

Keywords: *school leadership, PPSSH, teacher performance, SBM, educational leadership*

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

1. Introduction

Background and Rationale

Leadership plays a vital role in the success of schools. In the Philippine educational system, school heads are expected to demonstrate effective leadership practices aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). Their leadership influences teacher performance, school management, and learner outcomes.

Despite the implementation of the PPSSH, limited studies have examined how school heads practice these standards and how such practices relate to teacher performance and School-Based Management (SBM).

Thus, this study determined the extent of leadership practices of elementary school heads in Legislative District 2 of Isabela and examined their relationship with teacher performance and school performance through SBM. It also aimed to propose an Innovative Learning and Development Program for school heads based on the findings.

Review of Related Literature

School leadership plays a critical role in achieving organizational goals, shaping school culture, and improving student outcomes through strategic direction, resource management, and instructional support (Leithwood & Reihl, 2003). In the Philippine context, leadership practices are guided by the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), institutionalized through Department of Education Order No. 24, s. 2020. The PPSSH outlines five key domains: leading strategically, managing school resources and operations, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections (DepEd, 2020). These domains provide a comprehensive framework for evaluating and strengthening leadership competencies aligned with national educational goals.

School-Based Management (SBM), mandated under Republic Act No. 9155, emphasizes decentralization and empowers schools to make decisions responsive to their context. Effective leadership is essential in implementing SBM, as school heads translate policies into actionable school improvement plans and foster participatory governance. Empirical studies indicate that leadership competence significantly influences SBM outcomes. For instance, Estrada and Gumban (2024) and Olasiman and Torreon (2024) found strong relationships between leadership practices and SBM implementation, particularly in planning, resource allocation, and stakeholder engagement. Similarly, Avergonzado (2025) highlighted that proficient school heads positively impact teacher morale, curriculum coherence, and school innovation.

International literature supports these findings, emphasizing that professional leadership standards enhance school effectiveness by promoting strategic vision, instructional focus, and stakeholder collaboration (Grissom et al., 2021; Bush & Glover, 2014). Global frameworks, such as those implemented in Australia and Scotland, demonstrate that leadership standards contribute to improved accountability, instructional quality, and school performance (Armstrong, 2020).

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

These global perspectives align with the PPSSH, reinforcing its relevance as a framework for leadership development in the Philippine education system.

Leadership also has a direct and indirect influence on teacher performance. Instructional and transformational leadership practices enhance teachers' pedagogical skills, motivation, and professional growth (Hallinger, 2011; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). Local studies further support this relationship. Fresnido and Uy (2026) found that instructional leadership improves teachers' use of evidence-based strategies, while Capillanes (2025) reported that collaborative leadership and professional development opportunities enhance instructional performance. Moreover, leadership aligned with SBM fosters teacher empowerment, encouraging innovation and shared accountability (Estrada & Gumban, 2024).

Overall, the literature establishes a strong interconnection between school leadership, SBM implementation, and teacher performance. Leadership practices grounded in the PPSSH create enabling environments that support teacher development, strengthen school governance, and improve learner outcomes. These findings underscore the need for targeted Learning and Development (L&D) programs to enhance leadership competencies, ensuring sustained school improvement and quality education in the Philippine context (DepEd, 2017; DepEd, 2020).

Statement of the Problem

This study examined the extent of leadership practices of school heads based on the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads and determined their relationship with teacher performance and School-Based Management level of practice.

Research Objectives

General Objective

To determine the extent of leadership practices of school heads and their relationship with teacher performance and SBM level of practice.

Specific Objectives

1. To describe the profile of school heads and teachers.
2. To determine the extent of leadership practices across PPSSH domains.
3. To determine differences in perceptions between school heads and teachers.
4. To determine the relationship between leadership practices, teacher performance, and SBM level.

Hypotheses

1. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of school heads and teachers?
2. Is there a significant relationship between leadership practices and teacher performance?
3. Is there a significant relationship between leadership practices and SBM level?

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

2. Methods

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationships among school heads' leadership practices, teacher performance, and school-based management. The respondents consisted of two groups: 139 elementary school heads and 288 teachers from public elementary schools in Legislative District 2 of Isabela. Data were collected using an adopted questionnaire anchored on the indicators of the five domains of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), namely: Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections. In addition, secondary data were obtained from teachers' Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings to measure teacher performance, as well as the School-Based Management (SBM) Level of Practice to assess school performance. The data gathered were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools, including frequency and percentage, mean, t-test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and correlation analysis.

3. Results

1. Profile of the School Head Respondents

Table 1. Profile of the School Heads

Profile	Frequency (n = 139)	Percent (100%)
Sex		
Male	38	27.3
Female	101	72.7
Age		
21-30 years old	13	9.4
31-40 years old	51	36.7
41-50 years old	46	33.1
51-60 years old	29	20.9
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	69	49.6
Master's Degree	57	41.0
Doctorate Degree	13	9.4
Position		
OIC/TIC	45	32.4
Head Teacher	51	36.7
Principal I-IV	43	30.9

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

The table presents the profile of 139 school heads who participated in the study. It includes information about their sex, age, highest educational attainment, and position in their respective schools.

In terms of sex, the data reveals that the majority of school heads are female, with 101 out of 139 respondents, representing 72.7% of the total. Only 38, or 27.3%, are male. This indicates that more women hold leadership positions in schools than men in this group.

As to age, most school heads fall within the 31 to 50-year-old range. Specifically, the largest age group is those aged 31 to 40 years old, with 51 individuals or 36.7% of the total. This is followed closely by those aged 41 to 50, with 46 school heads or 33.1%. Meanwhile, 29 school heads, or 20.9%, are between 51 and 60 years old. The youngest group, those aged 21 to 30, makes up the smallest portion with only 13 respondents or 9.4%. These figures suggest that most school leaders are in their mid-career stage, with fewer younger or nearing-retirement individuals in the sample.

Regarding educational attainment, nearly half of the respondents—69 school heads or 49.6%—hold a bachelor's degree as their highest academic qualification. A significant portion, 57 school heads or 41.0%, have earned a master's degree. Only 13 respondents, equivalent to 9.4%, have pursued and completed a doctorate degree. This shows that while many school heads have advanced their studies beyond the undergraduate level, a considerable number still hold only a bachelor's degree.

As for their position, the largest group is composed of Head Teachers, with 51 individuals or 36.7% of the total. This is followed by 45 school heads (32.4%) who are serving as Teacher-in-Charge (TIC), which are often temporary or acting leadership roles. Meanwhile, 43 school heads (30.9%) hold formal Principal positions, ranging from Principal I to IV. This distribution indicates that while a number of school heads have already achieved full principalship, a significant portion are still serving in lower-level or interim leadership roles.

2. Profile of the Teacher Respondents

Table 2. Profile of the Teachers

Profile	Frequency (n = 288)	Percent (100%)
Sex		
Male	45	15.6
Female	243	84.4
Age		
21-30 years old	53	18.4
31-40 years old	80	27.8
41-50 years old	87	30.2
51-60 years old	68	23.6
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	148	51.4
Master's Degree	140	48.8
Position/Designation		

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Proficient Teacher	249	86.5
Highly Proficient Teacher	39	13.5

The table provides a summary of the background characteristics of the 288 teachers who participated in the study. It includes information on their sex, age, highest educational attainment, and position or designation within their schools.

In terms of sex, the data shows that vast majority of the respondents are female, with 243 or 84.4%. Only 45, or 15.6%, are male. This suggests that the teaching workforce in this group is predominantly composed of women.

As to age distribution, most teachers are in the middle stages of their careers. The largest age group is between 41 and 50 years old, with 87 teachers or 30.2%. This is followed by those aged 31 to 40, totaling 80 individuals or 27.8%. Teachers aged 51 to 60 also represent a significant portion, with 68 or 23.6%. The youngest group, aged 21 to 30, makes up 18.4% of the total with 53 teachers. These figures indicate that the teaching force is a mix of experienced and early-career educators, with a slight majority being in their 40s.

As to **highest educational attainment**, over half of the respondents—148 teachers or 51.4%—hold a bachelor's degree. Meanwhile, 140 teachers, or 48.6%, have gone on to earn a master's degree. This shows that nearly half of the teachers have pursued graduate studies, demonstrating a commitment to professional development.

When it comes to their **position**, a significant majority—249 teachers or 86.5%—hold the rank of Proficient Teacher. Only 39 teachers, or 13.5%, have reached the level of Highly-Proficient Teacher. This suggests that most of the teaching staff are still in the early or mid-level teaching positions, with a smaller group having advanced to higher teaching ranks.

3. Extent of Leadership Practices as Perceived by Schools Heads and by the Teachers in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads

Table 3. Extent of Leadership Practices as Perceived by Schools Heads and by the Teachers in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads in terms of Leading Strategically

Leading Strategically	School Heads Mean	DE	Teachers Mean	DE	t-value	p-value
1. SH communicates the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to the wider school community to ensure shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs, projects and activities.	4.51	MIP	4.47	IP	-.71 ^{ns}	.47
2. SH develops and implement with the planning team school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	4.49	IP	4.46	IP	-.55 ^{ns}	.57
3. SH undertakes policy implementation and review in the school to ensure that operations are	4.60	MIP	4.49	IP	-1.65	.09

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

consistent with national and local laws, regulations and issuances.					ns	
4. SH utilizes relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance.	3.95	IP	4.09	IP	1.71 ns	.08
5. SH implements programs in the school that support the development of learners.	4.51	MIP	4.50	MIP	.22 ns	.82
6. SH utilizes learner voice, such as feelings, views and/or opinions to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement.	4.46	IP	4.40	IP	-.71 ns	.47
7. SH utilizes available monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	4.44	IP	4.44	IP	.02 ns	.97

There were no statistically significant differences between the perceptions of school heads and teachers regarding the Leading Strategically domain. This means that both groups generally shared similar views on how school heads demonstrate strategic leadership practices in their schools. The consistency of responses suggests that school heads' efforts in communicating the DepEd vision, developing school plans, implementing policies, supporting learner-centered programs, using learner voice, and applying monitoring and evaluation processes are visible and recognized by teachers.

Although not significant, some slight perception gaps were noted. School heads rated themselves a little higher in communicating vision, policy implementation, and learner development programs, while teachers rated them slightly higher in the use of research findings for innovation. This may imply that school heads are more aware of their internal leadership processes, while teachers more readily notice outputs or innovations that directly affect classroom practice.

Since no major perception gap exists, collaboration and implementation of school improvement initiatives may be smoother. However, the relatively lower mean on the use of research findings suggests a need to strengthen evidence-based decision-making and action research culture in schools so that strategic leadership can become more innovative and data-driven.

Such findings align with leadership studies which state that self-ratings of leaders are often slightly higher than subordinate ratings because leaders have fuller knowledge of planning and decision-making processes (Hallinger, 2011), while teachers tend to assess leadership based on observable behaviors and school outcomes.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 4. Extent of Leadership Practices as Perceived by Schools Heads and by the Teachers in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads in terms of Leading Strategically

Managing School Resources and Operations	School Heads Mean	DE	Teachers Mean	DE	t-value	p-value
1. SH utilizes school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations.	4.35	IP	4.44	IP	1.31 ns	.19
2. SH manages finances adhering to policies, guidelines, and issuances in allocation, procurement, disbursement, and liquidation aligned with the school plan.	4.49	IP	4.30	IP	2.46*	.01
3. SH oversees school facilities and equipment in adherence to policies, guidelines and issuances on acquisition, recording, utilization, repair and maintenance, storage and disposal.	4.38	IP	4.31	IP	1.08 ns	.28
4. SH supervises staffing such as teaching load distribution and grade level and subject area assignment in adherence to laws, policies, guidelines and issuances based on the needs of the school.	4.55	MIP	4.34	IP	2.85*	.01
5. SH ensures school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation and resiliency to ensure continuous delivery of instruction.	4.68	MIP	4.51	MIP	2.73*	.01
6. SH manages emerging opportunities and challenges to encourage equality and equity in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel and other stakeholders.	4.52	MIP	4.46	IP	.87 ns	.38

In the domain of Managing School Resources and Operations, only three indicators showed significant differences between the perceptions of school heads and teachers, meaning the two groups did not view these leadership practices in the same way. In all significant indicators, school heads rated themselves higher than teachers, suggesting a perception gap between leadership intent and staff experience.

Indicator 2 implies that school heads may perceive themselves as compliant and efficient in financial management, while teachers may not fully experience or observe the same level of effectiveness. In the Department of Education, financial processes are highly regulated and often centralized through strict budgeting, procurement, approval, liquidation, and auditing procedures managed under DepEd, DBM, and COA guidelines to ensure transparency and accountability, which may limit teachers' direct understanding of budgeting and fund utilization. Delays in procurement or lack of transparency in school-level financial discussions may also affect teacher perceptions. This supports the findings of Brillantes and Fernandez (2011) that public sector financial management becomes more effective when transparency and stakeholder participation are strengthened.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Indicator 4 also showed a significant difference. This suggests that school heads may believe staffing decisions are fair and responsive to school needs, while teachers may perceive imbalances in workloads, mismatched assignments, or insufficient consultation. In DepEd schools, staffing is often affected by shortages of teachers, specialization gaps, and changing enrolment demands, making assignments challenging. Thus, even well-intended decisions may not always be positively received. This aligns with Bush (2018), who emphasized that personnel management is one of the most sensitive functions of school leadership because fairness and communication strongly influence teacher morale.

Likewise, Indicator 5 showed a significant difference, although both groups rated it highly. This means both school heads and teachers recognized strong practice in this area, but school heads perceived their efforts even more favorably. In the Philippine setting, where schools regularly face typhoons, floods, and other disruptions, school heads are expected to lead disaster preparedness and continuity plans. Teachers may acknowledge these efforts but also directly experience practical challenges such as classroom damage, resource shortages, or workload during emergencies. This finding is consistent with UNESCO (2015), which noted that school leaders play a critical role in disaster risk reduction, but successful implementation depends on whole-school participation.

Table 5. Extent of Leadership Practices as Perceived by Schools Heads and by the Teachers in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Focusing on Teaching and Learning	School Heads Mean	DE	Teachers Mean	DE	t-value	p-value
1. SH assists teachers in the review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards to make the curriculum relevant for learners.	4.51	MIP	4.42	IP	-1.43 ns	.15
2. SH provides technical assistance to teachers on teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas to improve their teaching practice.	4.48	IP	4.38	IP	-1.43 ns	.15
3. SH uses validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance.	4.44	IP	4.32	IP	-1.68 ns	.09
4. SH utilizes learning outcomes in developing data-based interventions to maintain learner achievement and attain other performance indicators.	4.40	IP	4.31	IP	-1.32 ns	.18
5. SH provides technical assistance to teachers in using learner assessment tools, strategies and results consistent with curriculum requirements to ensure accountability in achieving higher learning outcomes.	4.45	IP	4.40	IP	-.66 ns	.51
6. SH manages a learner-friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment.	4.67	MIP	4.57	MIP	-1.70 ns	.08

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

7. SH ensures integration of career awareness and opportunities in the provision of learning experiences aligned with the curriculum.	4.38	IP	4.39	IP	.24 ns	.80
8. SH implements learner discipline policies that are developed collaboratively with stakeholders including parents, school personnel and the community.	4.52	MIP	4.41	IP	-1.57 ns	.11

In the Focusing on Teaching and Learning, no statistically significant differences existed between the perceptions of school heads and teachers in all indicators under this domain. Therefore, both groups generally shared similar views regarding the instructional leadership practices of school heads.

The acceptance of the hypothesis suggests that school heads and teachers were aligned in their perceptions on how school heads support curriculum implementation, provide technical assistance, use feedback and learning data, promote proper assessment practices, create learner-friendly environments, integrate career awareness, and implement learner discipline policies. Such consistency in perception indicates that these leadership practices are visible, recognized, and commonly experienced within the school setting.

Although school heads obtained slightly higher mean ratings in most indicators, these differences were minimal and not statistically meaningful. This implies that while school heads may view their instructional leadership efforts somewhat more positively, teachers also acknowledged these practices at similarly high levels. The close ratings reflect mutual understanding and shared recognition of the school heads' role in improving teaching and learning.

This finding supports Instructional Leadership Theory, which emphasizes that effective school heads influence learner achievement by guiding curriculum, supporting teachers, and maintaining a positive learning climate (Hallinger, 2011). When both administrators and teachers perceive leadership similarly, it often indicates stronger collaboration, trust, and common educational goals. Likewise, Leithwood et al. (2004) noted that leadership is most effective when school personnel work with a shared sense of direction and commitment.

Table 6. Extent of Leadership Practices as Perceived by Schools Heads and by the Teachers in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads in terms of Developing Self and Others

Developing Self and Others	School Heads Mean	DE	Teachers Mean	DE	t-value	p-value
1. SH sets personal and professional development goals based on self-assessment aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads.	4.54	MIP	4.43	IP	1.72 ns	.08
2. SH applies professional reflection and learning to improve one's practice.	4.46	IP	4.33	IP	1.98*	.04
3. SH participates in professional networks to upgrade knowledge and skills and to enhance	4.44	IP	4.46	IP	.23 ns	.81

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

practice.						
4. SH implements the performance management system with a team to support the career advancement of school personnel, and to improve office performance.	4.61	MIP	4.40	IP	3.32*	.01
5. SH implements professional development initiatives to enhance strengths and address performance gaps among school personnel.	4.53	MIP	4.40	IP	2.10*	.03
6. SH provides opportunities to individuals and teams in performing leadership roles and responsibilities.	4.54	MIP	4.38	IP	2.35*	.02
7. SH implements laws, policies, guidelines and issuances on the rights, privileges and benefits of school personnel to ensure their general welfare.	4.48	IP	4.44	IP	.55 ns	.57
8. SH implements a school reward system to recognize and motivate learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary performance and/or continued support.	4.57	MIP	4.23	IP	4.63*	.01

In the Developing Self and Others, statistically significant differences were found in Indicators 2, 4, 5, 6, and 8. In all of these indicators, school heads rated themselves higher than teachers rated them, indicating that school heads perceived their leadership practices more positively than how these were experienced by teachers. These indicators are closely connected to the responsibilities of school heads under the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), particularly in promoting professional growth, managing performance systems, empowering personnel, and sustaining motivation within the school organization.

For Indicator 2, school heads obtained a higher mean than teachers. School heads regularly attend trainings, supervisory conferences, leadership seminars, and capability-building programs intended to enhance competencies and improve school leadership. They are also expected to reflect on school performance results, supervision findings, and implementation challenges. Teachers may not always observe these reflective processes because they often happen during planning sessions, meetings, or professional learning engagements. The implication is for school heads to share learning gained from trainings and demonstrate how reflective practice leads to concrete school improvements.

For Indicator 4, school heads rated themselves higher than teachers. This reflects the school heads' responsibility in overseeing the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS), conducting classroom observations, validating Means of Verification, and guiding teachers in accomplishing performance targets. School heads may perceive these responsibilities as effectively implemented because they ensure compliance with schedules and standards. Teachers, however, may sometimes view the system as focused more on documentation than on professional growth. The implication is to strengthen coaching, feedback conferences, and mentoring so that performance management is experienced as developmental rather than merely procedural.

For Indicator 5, school heads rated themselves higher than teachers. This may indicate confidence in organizing Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, school-based INSET, peer coaching, demonstration teaching, and participation in district or division trainings. Teachers

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

may give lower ratings when such activities are perceived as repetitive or not fully responsive to classroom concerns. The implication is to base professional development plans on teacher needs, classroom observation results, and learner performance data so that training activities become more relevant and practical.

For Indicator 6, school heads rated themselves higher than teachers. This may be associated with assigning teachers as coordinators, committee chairpersons, grade level leaders, club advisers, and focal persons for programs such as SBM, DRRM, ICT, Reading, and LIS. While school heads may consider these assignments as leadership opportunities, some teachers may feel that opportunities are limited or repeatedly given to the same individuals. The implication is to widen participation, rotate assignments fairly, and mentor emerging teacher leaders.

Indicator 8 showed the largest perception gap, with school heads rating themselves higher than teachers. Recognition systems may include certificates during flag ceremonies, Teacher's Day awards, PRAISE initiatives, acknowledgments during school programs, learner recognition rites, and appreciation of stakeholders. School heads may believe these systems are effective, while teachers may perceive them as limited, selective, or inconsistent.

Table 7. Extent of Leadership Practices as Perceived by Schools Heads and by the Teachers in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads in terms of Building Connections

Building Connections	School Heads Mean	DE	Teachers Mean	DE	t-value	p-value
1. SH builds constructive relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents and other stakeholders to foster an enabling and supportive environment for learners.	4.36	IP	4.47	IP	1.61 ns	.10
2. SH manages school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent-teacher associations, by applying relevant policies and guidelines to support the attainment of institutional goals.	4.46	IP	4.40	IP	.87 ns	.38
3. SH exhibits inclusive practices, such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness and culture responsiveness, to foster awareness, acceptance and respect.	4.44	IP	4.49	IP	.65 ns	.51
4. SH communicates effectively in speaking and writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders, through positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support.	4.58	MIP	4.29	IP	4.12*	.01
5. SH initiates partnerships with the community, such as parents, alumni, authorities, industries and other stakeholders, to strengthen support for learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	4.41	IP	4.48	IP	1.04 ns	.29

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

In the Building Connections, a statistically significant difference was found only in Indicator 4. This indicates that school heads and teachers differed in their perceptions regarding this specific leadership practice. In this indicator, school heads rated themselves higher than teachers rated them, suggesting that school heads perceived their communication practices more positively than how these were experienced or observed by teachers.

For Indicator 4, the higher rating of school heads may indicate confidence in their efforts to disseminate information, issue memoranda, conduct meetings, use digital platforms, coordinate with stakeholders, and maintain regular communication within the school community. School heads are often responsible for relaying directives, policies, schedules, and updates from higher offices, as well as ensuring that communication channels remain active and functional.

Teachers, however, gave a lower mean rating, which may suggest that while communication efforts are present, some messages may not always be perceived as timely, clear, consultative, or responsive to their needs. Teachers often assess communication based on how understandable instructions are, how promptly concerns are addressed, and whether opportunities for dialogue are present. This difference in perception may occur when school heads focus on the act of sending information, while teachers focus on the quality, clarity, and usefulness of the communication received.

This finding is highly relevant to school leadership because communication is central to the successful implementation of school programs, conflict resolution, stakeholder engagement, and organizational unity. Under the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), effective communication is essential in building trust and strengthening partnerships. Hallinger (2011) emphasized that leadership becomes more effective when school leaders communicate vision, expectations, and support clearly to school personnel. Likewise, Robbins and Judge (2019) noted that communication is successful only when meaning is understood by the receiver, not merely when information is transmitted.

The result implies that school heads may need to strengthen two-way communication systems rather than relying only on one-way dissemination of information. This includes clearer written instructions, more consultative meetings, active listening, prompt feedback, and approachable communication styles. The use of communication platforms such as group chats, official pages, text messaging, and conferences should also focus on clarity, consistency, and responsiveness. When teachers feel heard and adequately informed, stronger trust, cooperation, and organizational commitment are likely to develop.

Table 8. Summary of the Extent and Differences in the Leadership Practices of School Heads as Perceived by School Heads and Teachers Across the Five PPSSH Domains

PPSSH Domain	School Heads Overall Mean	DE	Teachers Overall Mean	DE	Overall t-value	Overall p-value
Leading Strategically	4.42	IP	4.41	IP	-.32 ns	.74
Managing School Resources and Operations	4.50	MIP	4.39	IP	-1.84 ns	.07
Focusing on Teaching and Learning	4.48	IP	4.40	IP	-1.37 ns	.16
Developing Self and Others	4.52	MIP	4.38	IP	-2.41*	.02
Building Connections	4.45	IP	4.43	IP	-.40 ns	.68

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

The table shows the summary of the extent and differences in the leadership practices of school heads wherein the highest-rated domain for school heads was Developing Self and Others, followed by Managing School Resources and Operations, both interpreted as Most Intensively Practiced (MIP). In contrast, teachers rated Building Connections highest, followed by Leading Strategically, although all domains for teachers remained within the Intensively Practiced (IP) level.

Across domains, school heads consistently rated themselves higher than teachers, with noticeable gaps in Managing School Resources and Operations and Developing Self and Others, where school heads reported MIP while teachers rated them as IP. In Leading Strategically, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, and Building Connections, both groups showed closely aligned ratings within the IP level, indicating similar perceptions.

In terms of differences, only Developing Self and Others showed a significant difference, while the rest of the domains revealed no significant differences, suggesting that perceptions are generally comparable except in the area of professional development and support.

Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted in four domains and rejected in Developing Self and Others.

E. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Profile

Table 9. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Sex in terms of Leading Strategically

Leading Strategically	Male		Female		t-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH communicates the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to the wider school community to ensure shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs projects and activities.	4.39	IP	4.56	MIP	-1.42 ns	.15
2. SH develops and implement with the planning team school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	4.44	IP	4.51	MIP	-.60 ns	.54
3. SH undertakes policy implementation and review in the school to ensure that operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations and issuances.	4.71	MIP	4.56	MIP	1.44 ns	.15
4. SH utilizes relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance.	3.94	IP	3.96	IP	-.08 ns	.93
5. SH implements programs in the school that support the development of learners.	4.60	MIP	4.48	IP	1.13 ns	.25
6. SH utilizes learner voice, such as feelings, views and/or opinions to inform policy	4.38	IP	4.49	IP	-.95 ns	.34

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

development and decision-making towards school improvement.						
7. SH utilizes available monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	4.39	IP	4.46	IP	-.53 ns	.59

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings showed that there was no significant difference in the self-perceptions of school heads on Leading Strategically when grouped according to sex. This means that male and female school heads generally assessed their own strategic leadership practices in a similar way.

This implies that both groups viewed themselves as comparably capable in communicating goals, implementing plans, ensuring policy compliance, using data in decision-making, and monitoring school performance. The result suggests that sex did not significantly influence how school heads evaluated their leadership effectiveness.

The finding may be explained by Social Role Theory, which states that individuals in the same professional position tend to develop similar behaviors and self-perceptions based on shared responsibilities. Since school heads perform the same leadership functions, similar self-ratings are expected. It also supports Transformational Leadership Theory, which emphasizes that leadership effectiveness depends on vision, motivation, and management skills rather than gender.

In addition, Ahmad and Hamzah (2022) found that leadership practices were more influenced by competencies than sex. UNESCO (2021) also reported that modern educational leadership increasingly values skills and performance over gender distinctions.

Table 10. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Sex in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources

Managing School Operations and Resources	**Male**		**Female**		**t-value**	**p-value**
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH utilizes school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations.	4.44	IP	4.31	IP	1.08 ns	.28
2. SH manages finances adhering to policies, guidelines, and issuances in allocation, procurement, disbursement, and liquidation aligned with the school plan.	4.52	MIP	4.48	IP	.31 ns	.75
3. SH oversees school facilities and equipment in adherence to policies, guidelines and issuances on acquisition, recording, utilization, repair and maintenance, storage and disposal.	4.26	IP	4.43	IP	-.73 ns	.08
4. SH supervises staffing such as teaching load distribution and grade level and	4.68	MIP	4.50	MIP	1.74 ns	.08

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

subject area assignment in adherence to laws, policies, guidelines and issuances based on the needs of the school.						
5. SH ensures school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation and resiliency to ensure continuous delivery of instruction.	4.84	MIP	4.62	MIP	2.58*	.01
6. SH manages emerging opportunities and challenges to encourage equality and equity in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel and other stakeholders.	4.55	MIP	4.51	MIP	.35 ns	.72

*Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The findings showed that there was no significant difference in the self-perceptions of school heads on Managing School Operations and Resources when grouped according to sex, except for Indicator 5.

In the domain of Managing School Operations and Resources, only one indicator showed a significant difference based on sex: "SH ensures school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation and resiliency to ensure continuous delivery of instruction," where male school heads rated themselves higher than female school heads. This means that male respondents perceived themselves as more effective or more actively involved in leading school safety and disaster preparedness efforts.

A possible explanation is that in many schools, responsibilities related to Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM), emergency response, infrastructure inspection, and safety coordination are often assigned to male personnel, especially in tasks requiring field mobility, physical assessment, and crisis response. Because of this greater exposure, male school heads may develop stronger confidence in this area, which can influence their self-perception. In the Philippine education setting, schools frequently face typhoons, floods, earthquakes, and other hazards, making disaster leadership a highly visible and practical responsibility of school heads.

This finding is supported by Eagly and Karau (2002), who explained in Role Congruity Theory that leadership perceptions are often influenced by traditional gender role expectations, where men are more commonly associated with authority, risk management, and emergency decision-making. Likewise, UNESCO (2015) emphasized that effective disaster preparedness in schools depends on leadership capacity, coordination, and quick response systems.

However, the result may also be refuted by contemporary leadership studies showing that women leaders are equally effective in crisis management when given equal opportunities, resources, and training. Northouse (2022) noted that leadership effectiveness is more strongly related to competence, communication, and experience than sex. Therefore, the significant difference may reflect role exposure and organizational practices rather than actual capability.

Overall, the result suggests the need for the Department of Education to provide equal DRRM leadership opportunities, capacity-building, and safety management training for both male and female school heads so that disaster preparedness responsibilities are shared and leadership confidence is strengthened regardless of sex.

Table 11. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Sex in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Male		Female		t-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH assists teachers in the review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards to make the curriculum relevant for learners.	4.55	MIP	4.50	MIP	.42 ns	.66
2. SH provides technical assistance to teachers on teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas to improve their teaching practice.	4.60	MIP	4.44	IP	1.19 ns	.23
3. SH uses validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance.	4.52	MIP	4.41	IP	.87 ns	.38
4. SH utilizes learning outcomes in developing data-based interventions to maintain learner achievement and attain other performance indicators.	4.47	IP	4.37	IP	.89 ns	.37
5. SH provides technical assistance to teachers in using learner assessment tools, strategies and results consistent with curriculum requirements to ensure accountability in achieving higher learning outcomes.	4.39	IP	4.47	IP	-.59 ns	.55
6. SH manages a learner-friendly. inclusive and healthy learning environment.	4.81	MIP	4.62	MIP	2.20*	.03
7. SH ensures integration of career awareness and opportunities in the provision of learning experiences aligned with the curriculum.	4.42	IP	4.36	IP	.37 ns	.71
8. SH implements learner discipline policies that are developed collaboratively with stakeholders including parents, school personnel and the community.	4.65	MIP	4.47	IP	1.61*	.01

*Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The findings revealed that significant differences were observed only in Indicator 6 and Indicator 8 under Focusing on Teaching and Learning. In managing a learner-friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment, male school heads obtained a higher mean (4.81) than female school heads (4.62) with a p-value of .03. This indicates that male school heads perceived themselves as more effective in maintaining a safe, inclusive, and supportive learning environment. A possible reason is that male school heads may be more directly involved in visible school management tasks such as campus supervision, learner behavior monitoring, and immediate response to school concerns, which may strengthen their confidence in this area. This

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

supports the findings of OECD (2023), which noted that school leaders who are highly engaged in school climate, learner welfare, and safety management often report stronger leadership confidence.

Likewise, in ensuring learner discipline policies developed collaboratively with stakeholders including parents, school personnel, and the community, male school heads also posted a higher mean (4.65) compared with female school heads (4.47) with a p-value of .01. This suggests that male school heads rated themselves higher in implementing discipline systems and coordinating with stakeholders regarding learner behavior concerns. This may be due to greater exposure to disciplinary conferences, conflict resolution, and community coordination, which are common responsibilities of school heads in public schools. Wang and Degol (2022) emphasized that leadership visibility and consistent discipline systems contribute positively to school climate, which may explain stronger self-ratings in this area.

However, some studies may refute the result. UNESCO (2021) reported that female school leaders are often equally effective, and in some cases stronger, in creating inclusive and caring school environments due to collaborative and relationship-oriented leadership approaches. This suggests that the lower female mean scores may reflect more cautious self-assessment rather than lower actual performance.

Table 12. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Sex in terms of Developing Self and Others

Developing Self and Others	**Male**		**Female**		**t-value**	**p-value**
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH sets personal and professional development goals based on self-assessment aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads.	4.63	MIP	4.51	MIP	1.16 ns	.24
2. SH applies professional reflection and learning to improve one's practice.	4.47	IP	4.46	IP	.07 ns	.94
3. SH participates in professional networks to upgrade knowledge and skills and to enhance practice.	4.52	MIP	4.41	IP	1.03 ns	.30
4. SH implements the performance management system with a team to support the career advancement of school personnel, and to improve office performance.	4.65	MIP	4.60	MIP	.49 ns	.62
5. SH implements professional development initiatives to enhance strengths and address performance gaps among school personnel.	4.60	MIP	4.51	MIP	.81 ns	.41
6. SH provides opportunities to	4.63	MIP	4.51	MIP	1.11 ns	.26

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

individuals and teams in performing leadership roles and responsibilities.						
7. SH implements laws, policies, guidelines and issuances on the rights, privileges and benefits of school personnel to ensure their general welfare.	4.52	MIP	4.46	IP	.57 ns	.56
8. SH implements a school reward system to recognize and motivate learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary performance and/or continued support.	4.78	MIP	4.49	IP	3.07*	.01

*Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

In the domain of Developing Self and Others, only one indicator showed a significant difference based on sex: "SH implements a school reward system to recognize and motivate learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary performance and/or continued support," where male school heads rated themselves higher than female school heads. This means that male school heads perceived themselves as more effective in establishing or implementing recognition and incentive systems within the school.

School reward systems are often highly visible leadership practices connected to ceremonies, public recognition, performance acknowledgments, and stakeholder appreciation programs such as awarding during flag ceremonies, year-end rites, recognition days, Brigada Eskwela acknowledgments, and teacher appreciation activities. Male school heads may perceive themselves more strongly in this area because they may be more assertive in formal recognition practices, public commendation, or organizing symbolic motivational activities that are easily noticed in school culture. In some schools, male leaders may also place stronger emphasis on visible reward structures as a management strategy to boost morale and compliance.

Another possible reason is that female school heads, despite performing the same practices, may rate themselves more modestly due to higher self-expectations and more critical self-assessment. In leadership studies, women often evaluate their own performance more cautiously even when outcomes are comparable. This may explain why female respondents gave lower self-ratings despite likely implementing similar recognition systems.

This finding is supported by Eagly (2007), who noted that differences in leadership self-perception may arise from social expectations and confidence in displaying authority-related behaviors. However, the result may be refuted by contemporary educational leadership literature emphasizing that effective recognition systems depend more on organizational climate and leadership values than sex. Northouse (2022) stressed that motivation, support, and appreciation practices can be successfully demonstrated by any leader regardless of gender when systems are institutionalized.

Overall, the significant difference may reflect differences in self-perception, leadership style, and visibility of recognition practices rather than actual capability. For DepEd, this suggests the importance of strengthening structured and inclusive reward systems in all schools while encouraging both male and female school heads to sustain appreciation programs that motivate teachers, learners, and stakeholders.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 13. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Sex in terms of Building Connections

Building Connections	Male		Female		t-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH builds constructive relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents and other stakeholders to foster an enabling and supportive environment for learners.	4.26	IP	4.40	IP	-1.13 ns	.25
2. SH manages school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent-teacher associations, by applying relevant policies and guidelines to support the attainment of institutional goals.	4.52	MIP	4.44	IP	.61 ns	.53
3. SH exhibits inclusive practices, such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness and culture responsiveness, to foster awareness, acceptance and respect.	4.36	IP	4.47	IP	-.79 ns	.42
4. SH communicates effectively in speaking and writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders, through positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support.	4.63	MIP	4.57	MIP	.45 ns	.64
5. SH initiates partnerships with the community, such as parents, alumni. authorities, industries and other stakeholders, to strengthen support for learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	4.42	IP	4.41	IP	.04 ns	.96

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings showed that no significant difference existed in the self-perceptions of school heads on Building Connections when grouped according to sex. This means that male and female school heads generally viewed their ability to build partnerships and maintain stakeholder relationships in a similar manner.

Although not statistically significant, slight mean differences were observed. Female school heads obtained higher means in building constructive relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents, and other stakeholders (4.40 vs. 4.26) and in exhibiting inclusive practices such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness, and culture responsiveness (4.47 vs. 4.36). This may suggest that female school heads perceived themselves as slightly stronger in relationship-building and inclusive leadership practices. Literature often notes that female leaders tend to emphasize collaboration, empathy, and interpersonal communication, which are valuable in stakeholder engagement (UNESCO, 2021).

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

On the other hand, male school heads obtained slightly higher means in managing school organizations (4.52 vs. 4.44), communicating effectively through speaking and writing using communication platforms (4.63 vs. 4.57), and initiating community partnerships (4.42 vs. 4.41). This may indicate stronger self-confidence in organizational management, formal communication, and external coordination. OECD (2023) noted that school leaders who are active in organizational and community linkages often perceive themselves positively in leadership outreach functions.

However, since these differences were not significant, they only reflect minor variations in self-rating and not meaningful distinctions in actual leadership practice. The result implies that both male and female school heads are similarly capable of engaging stakeholders, managing organizations, promoting inclusivity, and strengthening community partnerships.

This finding is supported by Bush (2022), who emphasized that effective school-community leadership depends more on communication skills, trust-building, and shared goals than on gender. In the same way, stakeholder engagement in schools is largely shaped by leadership commitment, experience, and professionalism rather than sex.

Table 14. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Age in terms of Leading Strategically

Leading Strategically	**21-30**		**31-40**		**41-50**		**51-60**		**F-value**	**p-value**
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH communicates the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to the wider school community to ensure shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs projects and activities.	4.84	MIP	4.35	IP	4.45	IP	4.75	MIP	4.17*	.01
2. SH develops and implement with the planning team school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	4.76	MIP	4.50	MIP	4.32	IP	4.62	MIP	2.82*	.04
3. SH undertakes policy implementation and review in the school to ensure that operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations and issuances.	5.00	MIP	4.49	IP	4.42	IP	4.89	MIP	6.00*	.01
4. SH utilizes relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance.	3.69	IP	3.88	IP	3.95	IP	4.20	IP	1.91 ns	.13
5. SH implements programs in the school that support the development of learners.	4.84	MIP	4.37	IP	4.41	IP	4.76	MIP	4.52*	.01

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

6. SH utilizes learner voice, such as feelings, views and/or opinions to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement.	4.53	MIP	4.31	IP	4.41	IP	4.75	MIP	2.77*	.04
7. SH utilizes available monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	4.92	MIP	4.23	IP	4.39	IP	4.68	MIP	5.37*	.01

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings revealed that significant differences existed in the self-perceptions of school heads on Leading Strategically when grouped according to age, as shown in Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7. This means that age influenced how school heads rated their strategic leadership practices.

In most significant indicators, the 21–30 and 51–60 age groups obtained the highest mean scores, while the 31–40 and 41–50 groups generally posted lower means. For communicating the vision, mission, and core values, the 21–30 group (4.84) rated themselves highest, followed closely by 51–60 (4.75), while 31–40 (4.35) had the lowest mean. This suggests that younger and older school heads perceived themselves as stronger in communicating school direction and values.

For developing school plans aligned with goals and policies, the 21–30 group (4.76) again obtained the highest mean, while the 41–50 group (4.32) had the lowest. In policy implementation and review, the 21–30 group (5.00) posted the highest mean, followed by 51–60 (4.89), while 41–50 (4.42) rated themselves lowest. Likewise, in implementing learner development programs, 21–30 (4.84) and 51–60 (4.76) rated themselves higher than the middle age groups.

In utilizing learner voice, the 51–60 group (4.75) obtained the highest mean, while 31–40 (4.31) had the lowest. For monitoring and evaluation processes, the 21–30 group (4.92) rated themselves highest, followed by 51–60 (4.68), while 31–40 (4.23) posted the lowest mean.

A possible reason for these results is that school heads aged 21–30, many of whom may be newly designated Teachers-in-Charge or younger administrators, may possess strong enthusiasm, energy, and confidence, leading to higher self-ratings. They may also be more open to innovation, technology use, and current management approaches. Meanwhile, 51–60 school heads may rate themselves highly because of extensive experience, long exposure to school leadership, and deeper understanding of systems, policies, and stakeholder management.

On the other hand, the 31–40 and 41–50 groups may be balancing administrative work with family responsibilities, career transition pressures, or heavier workloads, which could lead to more moderate self-assessments. They may also evaluate themselves more critically because of greater awareness of leadership challenges.

These findings are supported by recent literature like the report of OECD (2023) that leadership confidence often increases through both early-career motivation and late-career experience. UNESCO (2021) also noted that younger leaders may bring innovation and adaptability, while experienced leaders contribute institutional knowledge and strategic maturity.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 15. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Age in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources

Managing School Operations and Resources	21-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH utilizes school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations.	4.92	MIP	4.15	IP	4.32	IP	4.48	MIP	6.15*	.01
2. SH manages finances adhering to policies, guidelines, and issuances in allocation, procurement, disbursement, and liquidation aligned with the school plan.	4.92	MIP	4.45	IP	4.41	IP	4.51	MIP	2.03ns	.11
3. SH oversees school facilities and equipment in adherence to policies, guidelines and issuances on acquisition, recording, utilization, repair and maintenance, storage and disposal.	4.61	MIP	4.31	IP	4.21	IP	4.68	MIP	4.43*	.01
4. SH supervises staffing such as teaching load distribution and grade level and subject area assignment in adherence to laws, policies, guidelines and issuances based on the needs of the school.	4.84	MIP	4.45	IP	4.47	IP	4.72	MIP	2.31ns	.07
5. SH ensures school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation and resiliency to ensure continuous delivery of instruction.	4.92	MIP	4.64	MIP	4.58	MIP	4.79	MIP	1.76ns	.15
6. SH manages emerging opportunities and challenges to encourage equality and equity in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel and other stakeholders.	5.00	MIP	4.47	IP	4.43	IP	4.55	MIP	2.94*	.03

*Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The findings revealed that significant differences existed in the self-perceptions of school heads on Managing School Operations and Resources when grouped according to age, particularly in Indicators 1, 3, and 6. This means that age influenced how school heads rated selected operational and resource management practices.

For utilizing school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations, the 21–30 age group obtained the highest mean (4.92), followed by 51–60 (4.48), while 31–40 (4.15) had the lowest mean. This suggests that younger

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

school heads rated themselves highest in technology use and data management, possibly because they are more exposed to digital systems, online platforms, and ICT-based school processes.

In overseeing school facilities and equipment, the 51–60 group posted the highest mean (4.68), followed by 21–30 (4.61), while 41–50 (4.21) had the lowest mean. This may indicate that older school heads perceived themselves as stronger in managing facilities due to longer experience in handling repairs, inventory, maintenance, and school property concerns.

For managing emerging opportunities and challenges to encourage equality and equity, the 21–30 group obtained the highest mean (5.00), followed by 51–60 (4.55), while 41–50 (4.43) had the lowest mean. This implies that younger school heads may view themselves as more adaptable, responsive, and open to addressing new challenges and inclusive practices.

A possible explanation for the higher ratings of the 21–30 group is that many younger school heads may be more energetic, technology-oriented, and willing to adopt new systems and approaches. Meanwhile, the 51–60 group may draw from extensive leadership experience, practical knowledge, and familiarity with school operations. In contrast, the middle age groups may provide more cautious self-ratings because they are more aware of operational complexities and workload pressures.

Recent studies support these findings. OECD (2023) noted that younger leaders often show strength in digital leadership and innovation, while veteran leaders demonstrate stronger confidence in administrative management and institutional operations. UNESCO (2021) also emphasized that leadership strengths may vary across career stages, with younger leaders excelling in adaptability and experienced leaders in organizational stewardship.

Overall, the findings imply that age significantly influenced selected areas of school operations and resource management, with younger school heads rating themselves higher in ICT use and adaptability, while older school heads rated themselves higher in facilities management.

Table 16. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Age in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Focusing on Teaching and Learning	**21-30**		**31-40**		**41-50**		**51-60**		**F-value**	**p-value**
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH assists teachers in the review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards to make the curriculum relevant for learners.	4.92	MIP	4.31	IP	4.50	MIP	4.72	MIP	6.01*	.01
2. SH provides technical assistance to teachers on teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas to improve their teaching practice.	4.92	MIP	4.25	IP	4.50	MIP	4.68	MIP	4.63*	.01
3. SH uses validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance.	4.84	MIP	4.45	IP	4.28	IP	4.51	MIP	2.73*	.04
4. SH utilizes learning outcomes in developing	4.8	MI	4.1	IP	4.32	IP	4.72	MI	10.2	.01

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

data-based interventions to maintain learner achievement and attain other performance indicators.	4	P	7					P	5*	
5. SH provides technical assistance to teachers in using learner assessment tools, strategies and results consistent with curriculum requirements to ensure accountability in achieving higher learning outcomes.	5.00	MIP	4.15	IP	4.39	IP	4.82	MIP	10.15*	.01
6. SH manages a learner-friendly. inclusive and healthy learning environment.	4.92	MIP	4.62	MIP	4.60	MIP	4.75	MIP	1.44 ns	.23
7. SH ensures integration of career awareness and opportunities in the provision of learning experiences aligned with the curriculum.	4.84	MIP	4.33	IP	4.13	IP	4.65	MIP	4.08*	.01
8. SH implements learner discipline policies that are developed collaboratively with stakeholders including parents, school personnel and the community.	4.92	MIP	4.41	IP	4.34	IP	4.82	MIP	4.38*	.01

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings revealed that significant differences existed in the self-perceptions of school heads on Focusing on Teaching and Learning when grouped according to age, as shown in Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8. This means that age influenced how school heads rated most teaching and learning leadership practices.

Across almost all significant indicators, the 21–30 age group obtained the highest mean scores, while the 51–60 group consistently followed, whereas the 31–40 and 41–50 groups generally posted lower means. In assisting teachers in curriculum review and implementation, the 21–30 group (4.92) rated themselves highest, while 31–40 (4.31) had the lowest mean. The same pattern appeared in providing technical assistance on teaching standards and pedagogies, where 21–30 (4.92) was highest and 31–40 (4.25) was lowest.

For using validated feedback to improve teacher performance, the 21–30 group (4.84) again posted the highest mean, while 41–50 (4.28) rated themselves lowest. In utilizing learning outcomes for data-based interventions, 21–30 (4.84) and 51–60 (4.72) rated themselves higher than the middle age groups. Likewise, in providing assistance on learner assessment tools, the 21–30 group (5.00) obtained the highest mean, followed by 51–60 (4.82).

The same trend was observed in ensuring career awareness integration and implementing learner discipline policies, where the 21–30 and 51–60 groups rated themselves higher than the 31–40 and 41–50 groups.

A possible reason for these results is that the 21–30 age group, many of whom may be newly designated Teachers-in-Charge or young administrators, may possess strong enthusiasm, updated pedagogical knowledge, and confidence in current instructional practices. They may also be more familiar with recent curriculum reforms, assessment tools, and digital learning approaches. Meanwhile, the 51–60 group may rate themselves highly because of long years of

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

experience, extensive classroom supervision background, and deeper understanding of instructional systems.

On the other hand, the 31–40 and 41–50 groups may provide more moderate self-ratings because they are often in demanding career stages with heavier administrative workloads, family responsibilities, and heightened awareness of instructional challenges. Their broader experience may also make them more critical and realistic in self-assessment.

Recent literature supports these findings. OECD (2023) reported that younger school leaders often demonstrate strength in innovation, instructional technology, and reform implementation, while senior leaders show confidence rooted in experience and mentoring capacity. UNESCO (2021) likewise emphasized that leadership effectiveness may vary across career stages, with early-career leaders showing energy and adaptability, and veteran leaders demonstrating stability and institutional wisdom.

Overall, the findings imply that age significantly influenced most teaching and learning leadership practices, with the youngest and oldest school heads generally rating themselves higher than the middle age groups.

Table 17. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Age in terms of Developing Self and Others

Developing Self and Others	**21-30**		**31-40**		**41-50**		**51-60**		**F-value**	**p-value**
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH sets personal and professional development goals based on self-assessment aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads.	4.92	MIP	4.39	IP	4.54	MIP	4.65	MIP	3.55*	.01
2. SH applies professional reflection and learning to improve one's practice.	4.92	MIP	4.25	IP	4.54	MIP	4.51	MIP	5.82*	.01
3. SH participates in professional networks to upgrade knowledge and skills and to enhance practice.	5.00	MIP	4.27	IP	4.36	IP	4.62	MIP	6.01*	.01
4. SH implements the performance management system with a team to support the career advancement of school personnel, and to improve office performance.	4.92	MIP	4.60	MIP	4.47	IP	4.72	MIP	2.59ns	.06
5. SH implements professional development initiatives to enhance strengths and address performance gaps among school personnel.	5.00	MIP	4.49	IP	4.41	IP	4.62	MIP	4.01*	.01
6. SH provides opportunities to individuals and teams in performing leadership roles and responsibilities.	5.00	MIP	4.37	IP	4.52	MIP	4.68	MIP	4.22*	.01

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

7. SH implements laws, policies, guidelines and issuances on the rights, privileges and benefits of school personnel to ensure their general welfare.	4.92	MIP	4.39	IP	4.36	IP	4.62	MIP	3.48*	.01
8. SH implements a school reward system to recognize and motivate learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary performance and/or continued support.	4.92	MIP	4.58	MIP	4.45	IP	4.58	MIP	1.87ns	.13

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings revealed that significant differences existed in the self-perceptions of school heads on Developing Self and Others when grouped according to age, as shown in Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7. This means that age influenced several leadership practices related to professional growth, staff development, and welfare.

Across the significant indicators, the 21–30 age group consistently obtained the highest mean scores, while the 51–60 group generally ranked next. In contrast, the 31–40 and 41–50 groups commonly posted lower means. In setting personal and professional development goals, the 21–30 group (4.92) rated themselves highest, while 31–40 (4.39) had the lowest mean. The same pattern was observed in professional reflection and learning, where 21–30 (4.92) was highest and 31–40 (4.25) was lowest.

For participating in professional networks, the 21–30 group (5.00) obtained the highest mean, followed by 51–60 (4.62), while 31–40 (4.27) had the lowest mean. In implementing professional development initiatives, 21–30 (5.00) again rated themselves highest, while 41–50 (4.41) rated themselves lowest. Likewise, in providing leadership opportunities to individuals and teams, the 21–30 group (5.00) posted the highest mean, followed by 51–60 (4.68).

In implementing laws, policies, guidelines, and issuances on the rights and welfare of school personnel, the 21–30 group (4.92) rated themselves highest, while 41–50 (4.36) had the lowest mean.

A possible reason for these results is that the 21–30 age group, often younger administrators or newly designated school heads, may have stronger motivation for career growth, higher enthusiasm for leadership roles, and greater participation in trainings, mentoring, and professional networking. They may also be more eager to prove themselves in leadership positions, resulting in higher self-ratings. Meanwhile, the 51–60 group may draw confidence from long years of service, wider administrative experience, and deeper understanding of personnel development systems.

On the other hand, the 31–40 and 41–50 groups may provide more moderate ratings due to heavier responsibilities during mid-career stages, balancing administrative demands, family obligations, and greater awareness of gaps in leadership practice. Their broader experience may also lead to more cautious self-assessment.

Recent studies support these findings. OECD (2023) noted that younger leaders often show stronger engagement in professional learning, innovation, and networking, while experienced leaders demonstrate confidence in mentoring and people management. UNESCO

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

(2021) likewise emphasized that leadership development differs across career stages, with early-career leaders driven by advancement and senior leaders guided by accumulated expertise.

Overall, the findings imply that age significantly influenced several practices under Developing Self and Others, with the youngest school heads generally rating themselves highest, followed by older school heads, while middle-aged groups tended to give lower self-assessments.

Table 18. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Age in terms of Building Connections

Building Connections	**21-30**		**31-40**		**41-50**		**51-60**		**F-value**	**p-value**
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH builds constructive relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents and other stakeholders to foster an enabling and supportive environment for learners.	4.92	MIP	4.29	IP	4.30	IP	4.34	IP	3.61*	.01
2. SH manages school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent-teacher associations, by applying relevant policies and guidelines to support the attainment of institutional goals.	4.53	MIP	4.50	MIP	4.26	IP	4.68	MIP	2.61 ns	.06
3. SH exhibits inclusive practices, such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness and culture responsiveness, to foster awareness, acceptance and respect.	4.92	MIP	4.45	IP	4.30	IP	4.44	IP	2.71*	.04
4. SH communicates effectively in speaking and writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders, through positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support.	4.84	MIP	4.62	MIP	4.43	IP	4.65	MIP	1.68 ns	.17
5. SH initiates partnerships with the community, such as parents, alumni. authorities, industries and other stakeholders, to strengthen support for learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	4.69	MIP	4.33	IP	4.34	IP	4.55	MIP	1.75 ns	.16

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

The findings revealed that significant differences existed in the self-perceptions of school heads on Building Connections when grouped according to age, particularly in Indicators 1 and 3. This means that age influenced selected leadership practices related to relationship-building and inclusive stakeholder engagement.

n building constructive relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents, and other stakeholders to foster an enabling and supportive environment for learners, the 21–30 age group obtained the highest mean (4.92), while the 31–40 (4.29) and 41–50 (4.30) groups posted the lowest means. The 51–60 group (4.34) also rated lower than the youngest group. This suggests that younger school heads perceived themselves as stronger in establishing professional relationships and stakeholder connections.

Likewise, in exhibiting inclusive practices such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness, and culture responsiveness, the 21–30 group again obtained the highest mean (4.92), while the 41–50 group (4.30) had the lowest mean, followed by 51–60 (4.44) and 31–40 (4.45). This indicates that younger school heads rated themselves higher in promoting inclusivity, awareness, and respect within the school community.

A possible reason for these results is that the 21–30 age group may be more socially engaged, approachable, and responsive to current issues related to inclusion, wellness, and stakeholder communication. Younger school heads may also be more active in using digital communication platforms, social media, and collaborative approaches that strengthen school-community relationships. Their recent exposure to updated leadership training and contemporary education practices may also contribute to higher self-ratings.

Meanwhile, the 31–40 and 41–50 groups may provide more moderate self-assessments because of increasing administrative demands, workload pressures, and a more critical understanding of the challenges involved in sustaining partnerships and inclusive practices. The 51–60 group, although experienced, may rely more on traditional leadership approaches rather than newer stakeholder engagement methods.

Recent studies support these findings. OECD (2023) noted that younger educational leaders often demonstrate stronger adaptability, digital communication skills, and openness to collaborative leadership practices. UNESCO (2021) also emphasized that early-career leaders tend to be more responsive to diversity, inclusion, and stakeholder participation, while veteran leaders contribute through experience and institutional stability.

Overall, the findings imply that age significantly influenced selected practices under Building Connections, with the youngest school heads rating themselves highest in relationship-building and inclusive leadership, while older and middle-aged groups tended to provide lower self-assessments.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 19. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment in terms of Leading Strategically

Leading Strategically	Bachelor's Degree		Master's Degree		Doctorate Degree		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH communicates the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to the wider school community to ensure shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs projects and activities.	4.60	MIP	4.43	IP	4.38	IP	1.47 ns	.23
2. SH develops and implement with the planning team school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	4.46	IP	4.56	MIP	4.38	IP	.07 ns	.49
3. SH undertakes policy implementation and review in the school to ensure that operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations and issuances.	4.63	MIP	4.54	MIP	4.69	MIP	.47 ns	.62
4. SH utilizes relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance.	4.10	IP	3.85	IP	3.61	IP	3.38 ns	.03
5. SH implements programs in the school that support the development of learners.	4.42	IP	4.63	MIP	4.53	MIP	1.72 ns	.18
6. SH utilizes learner voice, such as feelings, views and/or opinions to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement.	4.34	IP	4.59	MIP	4.46	IP	2.03 ns	.13
7. SH utilizes available monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	4.36	IP	4.52	MIP	4.53	MIP	1.00 ns	.37

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings showed that there was generally no significant difference in the self-perceptions of school heads on Leading Strategically when grouped according to highest educational attainment. However, Indicator 4 showed a significant difference (p = .03).

The significant difference was found in utilizing relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance. In this indicator, Bachelor's Degree holders obtained the highest mean (4.10), followed by Master's Degree holders (3.85), while Doctorate Degree holders obtained the lowest mean (3.61).

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

This result suggests that school heads with Bachelor's degrees rated themselves higher in applying research findings and evidence-based innovations than those with advanced degrees. A possible reason is that Bachelor's degree holders may rely more on practical school-based experiences and direct problem-solving in daily operations, leading them to perceive themselves as highly capable in using available data, reports, and workable strategies for school improvement. They may also interpret research utilization in practical terms such as using school records, performance data, and observed best practices.

Another possible explanation is that Bachelor's degree holders may provide more confident self-ratings based on visible accomplishments and actual implementation. In contrast, school heads with Master's and Doctorate degrees may assess themselves more cautiously because of greater exposure to formal research processes, academic standards, and critical evaluation methods. Their advanced studies may lead them to apply stricter criteria in judging their own performance, resulting in lower self-ratings despite possibly stronger actual competencies.

This interpretation is supported by recent literature. OECD (2023) emphasized that advanced preparation and continued professional learning strengthen school leaders' competencies in evidence-based decision-making, strategic planning, and organizational improvement. Likewise, UNESCO (2024) highlighted that specialized training and higher professional preparation contribute positively to leadership effectiveness.

These studies may refute the assumption that higher means among Bachelor's degree holders automatically indicate better actual performance. Instead, the lower means of Master's and Doctorate degree holders may reflect more reflective and conservative self-assessment.

Meanwhile, the absence of significant differences in the remaining indicators implies that educational attainment did not substantially influence perceptions in communicating vision, planning, policy implementation, learner development, learner voice, and monitoring systems. This suggests that these strategic leadership practices are shaped not only by academic qualifications but also by leadership experience and actual school management responsibilities.

Overall, the findings imply that highest educational attainment had limited influence on Leading Strategically, except in research-based innovation, where Bachelor's degree holders rated themselves highest and Doctorate degree holders lowest, possibly due to differences in practical orientation, confidence level, and self-evaluation standards rather than actual leadership effectiveness.

Table 20. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources

Managing School Operations and Resources	**Bachelor's Degree**		**Master's Degree**		**Doctorate Degree**		**F-value**	**p-value**
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH utilizes school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations.	4.20	IP	4.47	IP	4.61	MIP	4.25*	.01

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

2. SH manages finances adhering to policies, guidelines, and issuances in allocation, procurement, disbursement, and liquidation aligned with the school plan.	4.44	IP	4.52	MIP	4.61	MIP	.41 ns	.66
3. SH oversees school facilities and equipment in adherence to policies, guidelines and issuances on acquisition, recording, utilization, repair and maintenance, storage and disposal.	4.18	IP	4.56	MIP	4.69	MIP	7.80 *	.01
4. SH supervises staffing such as teaching load distribution and grade level and subject area assignment in adherence to laws, policies, guidelines and issuances based on the needs of the school.	4.42	IP	4.64	MIP	4.84	MIP	3.63 *	.02
5. SH ensures school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation and resiliency to ensure continuous delivery of instruction.	4.65	MIP	4.66	MIP	4.92	MIP	1.36 ns	.25
6. SH manages emerging opportunities and challenges to encourage equality and equity in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel and other stakeholders.	4.42	IP	4.66	MIP	4.46	IP	2.42 ns	.09

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings showed that selected indicators under Managing School Operations and Resources significantly differed when grouped according to highest educational attainment. Significant differences were noted in Indicators 1, 3, and 4, while the remaining indicators showed no significant difference.

In utilizing school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations, Doctorate Degree holders obtained the highest mean (4.61), followed by Master's Degree holders (4.47), while Bachelor's Degree holders posted the lowest mean (4.20) ($p = .01$). This suggests that school heads with higher educational attainment perceived themselves as more capable in using ICT, data systems, and technology-driven management tools. A possible reason is that graduate studies often expose school heads to research tools, digital systems, and evidence-based management practices, which may strengthen confidence in technology integration.

Likewise, in overseeing school facilities and equipment, Doctorate Degree holders again obtained the highest mean (4.69), followed by Master's Degree holders (4.56), while Bachelor's Degree holders had the lowest mean (4.18) ($p = .01$). This may indicate that school heads with advanced degrees perceive themselves as stronger in managing physical resources, compliance procedures, inventory systems, and maintenance planning. Advanced academic preparation may enhance administrative competence and systems thinking needed in resource management.

In supervising staffing such as teaching load distribution and grade level and subject area assignment based on school needs, Doctorate Degree holders also posted the highest mean (4.84),

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

followed by Master's Degree holders (4.64), while Bachelor's Degree holders obtained the lowest mean (4.42) (p = .02). This suggests that higher educational attainment may contribute to stronger confidence in personnel supervision, deployment decisions, and workforce management. Those with advanced studies may have broader exposure to organizational leadership, human resource principles, and strategic decision-making.

These findings are supported by recent literature. OECD (2023) emphasized that advanced preparation and continuous professional learning strengthen school leaders' competencies in data use, organizational management, and strategic decision-making. UNESCO (2024) likewise noted that educational leaders with specialized preparation are often better equipped to manage complex administrative responsibilities and school improvement processes.

Meanwhile, the indicators on financial management, school safety, and managing emerging opportunities and challenges showed no significant difference. This implies that these practices may be learned largely through actual field experience, policy compliance, and daily administrative responsibilities regardless of educational attainment.

Overall, the findings imply that higher educational attainment was associated with higher self-perceptions in ICT use, facilities management, and staffing supervision, particularly among Doctorate Degree holders, while other operational practices were perceived similarly across groups.

Table 21. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Bachelor's Degree		Master's Degree		Doctorate Degree		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH assists teachers in the review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards to make the curriculum relevant for learners.	4.47	IP	4.57	MIP	4.46	IP	.53 ns	.58
2. SH provides technical assistance to teachers on teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas to improve their teaching practice.	4.34	IP	4.57	MIP	4.84	MIP	3.64*	.02
3. SH uses validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance.	4.40	IP	4.54	MIP	4.23	IP	1.45 ns	.23
4. SH utilizes learning outcomes in developing data-based interventions to maintain learner achievement and attain other performance indicators.	4.36	IP	4.49	IP	4.23	IP	1.44 ns	.24

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

5. SH provides technical assistance to teachers in using learner assessment tools, strategies and results consistent with curriculum requirements to ensure accountability in achieving higher learning outcomes.	4.37	IP	4.50	MIP	4.61	MIP	.92 ns	.39
6. SH manages a learner-friendly. inclusive and healthy learning environment.	4.63	MIP	4.64	MIP	5.00	MIP	2.50 ns	.08
7. SH ensures integration of career awareness and opportunities in the provision of learning experiences aligned with the curriculum.	4.43	IP	4.43	IP	3.84	IP	3.55*	.03
8. SH implements learner discipline policies that are developed collaboratively with stakeholders including parents, school personnel and the community.	4.56	MIP	4.47	IP	4.53	MIP	.23 ns	.79

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings showed that significant differences existed only in Indicators 2 and 7 under Focusing on Teaching and Learning when grouped according to highest educational attainment.

In providing technical assistance to teachers on teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas to improve their teaching practice, Doctorate Degree holders obtained the highest mean (4.84), followed by Master's Degree holders (4.57), while Bachelor's Degree holders posted the lowest mean (4.34) ($p = .02$). This suggests that school heads with higher educational attainment perceived themselves as more capable in coaching teachers, guiding instructional strategies, and supporting classroom improvement. A possible reason is that advanced studies often provide deeper exposure to curriculum leadership, supervision, educational research, and current pedagogical approaches, which may strengthen confidence in giving technical assistance.

Likewise, in ensuring integration of career awareness and opportunities in the provision of learning experiences aligned with the curriculum, Bachelor's Degree and Master's Degree holders obtained equal higher means (4.43), while Doctorate Degree holders posted the lowest mean (3.84) ($p = .03$). This may imply that Bachelor's and Master's degree holders perceived themselves as more actively involved in practical learner guidance, career orientation activities, and curriculum integration of real-life opportunities. In contrast, Doctorate degree holders may assess themselves more critically or may focus more on broader administrative and strategic responsibilities rather than day-to-day career integration activities.

These findings are supported by recent literature. OECD (2023) emphasized that advanced academic preparation enhances school leaders' capacity in instructional supervision, mentoring, and evidence-based teaching support, which supports the higher mean of Doctorate holders in technical assistance. UNESCO (2024) also noted that leaders with graduate preparation often demonstrate stronger competencies in instructional leadership and teacher development.

However, the lower mean of Doctorate holders in career awareness may refute the assumption that higher degrees always result in higher ratings across all indicators. This may be explained by role specialization or stricter self-evaluation standards. UNESCO (2024) noted that

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

highly qualified leaders may focus more on strategic management functions, while practical learner-support programs are often delegated or shared with teachers and guidance personnel.

Overall, the findings imply that higher educational attainment was associated with stronger self-perceptions in teacher mentoring and pedagogical support, while Bachelor's and Master's degree holders rated themselves higher in practical career awareness integration. This shows that educational attainment may influence leadership strengths differently depending on the task or indicator assessed.

Table 22. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment in terms of Developing Self and Others

Developing Self and Others	Bachelor's Degree		Master's Degree		Doctorate Degree		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH sets personal and professional development goals based on self-assessment aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads.	4.53	MIP	4.50	MIP	4.76	MIP	1.09 ns	.33
2. SH applies professional reflection and learning to improve one's practice.	4.30	IP	4.56	MIP	4.92	MIP	8.24*	.01
3. SH participates in professional networks to upgrade knowledge and skills and to enhance practice.	4.27	IP	4.63	MIP	4.53	MIP	5.31*	.01
4. SH implements the performance management system with a team to support the career advancement of school personnel, and to improve office performance.	4.65	MIP	4.61	MIP	4.46	IP	.61 ns	.54
5. SH implements professional development initiatives to enhance strengths and address performance gaps among school personnel.	4.55	MIP	4.54	MIP	4.46	IP	.13 ns	.87
6. SH provides opportunities to individuals and teams in performing leadership roles and responsibilities.	4.40	IP	4.63	MIP	4.92	MIP	4.66*	.01
7. SH implements laws, policies, guidelines and issuances on the rights, privileges and benefits of school personnel to ensure their general welfare.	4.43	IP	4.54	MIP	4.46	IP	.45 ns	.63

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

8. SH implements a school reward system to recognize and motivate learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary performance and/or continued support.	4.52	MIP	4.59	MIP	4.76	MIP	.87 ns	.41

*Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The findings showed that significant differences existed only in Indicators 2, 3, and 6 under Developing Self and Others when grouped according to highest educational attainment.

In applying professional reflection and learning to improve one's practice, Doctorate Degree holders obtained the highest mean (4.92), followed by Master's Degree holders (4.56), while Bachelor's Degree holders posted the lowest mean (4.30) (p = .01). This suggests that school heads with higher educational attainment perceived themselves as more engaged in reflective practice and continuous learning. A possible reason is that advanced studies require research, self-evaluation, and scholarly reflection, which may strengthen habits of professional inquiry and self-improvement.

Likewise, in participating in professional networks to upgrade knowledge and skills and to enhance practice, Master's Degree holders obtained the highest mean (4.63), followed by Doctorate Degree holders (4.53), while Bachelor's Degree holders had the lowest mean (4.27) (p = .01). This may imply that school heads pursuing or completing graduate studies are more exposed to seminars, academic associations, research circles, and professional linkages, which contribute to stronger confidence in networking and professional collaboration.

In providing opportunities to individuals and teams in performing leadership roles and responsibilities, Doctorate Degree holders again obtained the highest mean (4.92), followed by Master's Degree holders (4.63), while Bachelor's Degree holders posted the lowest mean (4.40) (p = .01). This indicates that school heads with advanced qualifications perceived themselves as more capable in mentoring others, delegating responsibilities, and developing future leaders. Their broader leadership preparation may contribute to stronger confidence in empowering personnel.

These findings are supported by recent literature. OECD (2023) emphasized that advanced academic preparation and continuous professional learning enhance leaders' reflective practice, mentoring capacity, and staff development competencies. UNESCO (2024) also noted that school leaders with graduate education are often more active in professional collaboration, instructional leadership, and succession-building practices.

However, some studies also suggest that formal degrees alone do not guarantee stronger leadership performance. Practical experience, interpersonal skills, and contextual understanding remain important factors in developing others and managing personnel. This means that while higher degree holders rated themselves higher in these indicators, effective leadership may still depend on how competencies are applied in actual school settings.

Overall, the findings imply that higher educational attainment was associated with stronger self-perceptions in reflective practice, professional networking, and leadership empowerment, particularly among Doctorate Degree holders, while Bachelor's Degree holders tended to give lower ratings in these developmental leadership practices.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 23. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment in terms of Building Connections

Building Connections	Bachelor's Degree		Master's Degree		Doctorate Degree		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH builds constructive relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents and other stakeholders to foster an enabling and supportive environment for learners.	4.24	IP	4.45	IP	4.61	MIP	4.64 ns	.07
2. SH manages school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent-teacher associations, by applying relevant policies and guidelines to support the attainment of institutional goals.	4.37	IP	4.66	MIP	4.07	IP	5.47*	.01
3. SH exhibits inclusive practices, such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness and culture responsiveness, to foster awareness, acceptance and respect.	4.34	IP	4.59	MIP	4.30	IP	2.26 ns	.10
4. SH communicates effectively in speaking and writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders, through positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support.	4.55	MIP	4.63	MIP	4.61	MIP	.24 ns	.78
5. SH initiates partnerships with the community, such as parents, alumni. authorities, industries and other stakeholders, to strengthen support for learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	4.30	IP	4.54	MIP	4.46	IP	2.29 ns	.10

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings showed that significant differences existed only in Indicators 2, 3, and 6 under Developing Self and Others when grouped according to highest educational attainment.

In applying professional reflection and learning to improve one's practice, Doctorate Degree holders obtained the highest mean (4.92), followed by Master's Degree holders (4.56), while Bachelor's Degree holders posted the lowest mean (4.30) (p = .01). This suggests that school heads with higher educational attainment perceived themselves as more engaged in reflective practice and continuous learning. A possible reason is that advanced studies require

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

research, self-evaluation, and scholarly reflection, which may strengthen habits of professional inquiry and self-improvement.

Likewise, in participating in professional networks to upgrade knowledge and skills and to enhance practice, Master's Degree holders obtained the highest mean (4.63), followed by Doctorate Degree holders (4.53), while Bachelor's Degree holders had the lowest mean (4.27) ($p = .01$). This may imply that school heads pursuing or completing graduate studies are more exposed to seminars, academic associations, research circles, and professional linkages, which contribute to stronger confidence in networking and professional collaboration.

In providing opportunities to individuals and teams in performing leadership roles and responsibilities, Doctorate Degree holders again obtained the highest mean (4.92), followed by Master's Degree holders (4.63), while Bachelor's Degree holders posted the lowest mean (4.40) ($p = .01$). This indicates that school heads with advanced qualifications perceived themselves as more capable in mentoring others, delegating responsibilities, and developing future leaders. Their broader leadership preparation may contribute to stronger confidence in empowering personnel.

These findings are supported by recent literature. OECD (2023) emphasized that advanced academic preparation and continuous professional learning enhance leaders' reflective practice, mentoring capacity, and staff development competencies. UNESCO (2024) also noted that school leaders with graduate education are often more active in professional collaboration, instructional leadership, and succession-building practices.

However, some studies also suggest that formal degrees alone do not guarantee stronger leadership performance. Practical experience, interpersonal skills, and contextual understanding remain important factors in developing others and managing personnel. This means that while higher degree holders rated themselves higher in these indicators, effective leadership may still depend on how competencies are applied in actual school settings.

Overall, the findings imply that higher educational attainment was associated with stronger self-perceptions in reflective practice, professional networking, and leadership empowerment, particularly among Doctorate Degree holders, while Bachelor's Degree holders tended to give lower ratings in these developmental leadership practices.

Table 24. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Position in terms of Leading Strategically

Leading Strategically	OIC/TIC		Head Teacher		Principal I-IV		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH communicates the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to the wider school community to ensure shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs projects and activities.	4.35	IP	4.54	MIP	4.65	MIP	2.57 ns	.08
2. SH develops and implement with the planning team school plans aligned with	4.31	IP	4.52	MIP	4.65	MIP	4.05*	.01

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

institutional goals and policies.								
3. SH undertakes policy implementation and review in the school to ensure that operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations and issuances.	4.51	MIP	4.64	MIP	4.65	MIP	.72 ns	.48
4. SH utilizes relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance.	3.80	IP	3.92	IP	4.16	IP	2.87 ns	.06
5. SH implements programs in the school that support the development of learners.	4.55	MIP	4.45	IP	4.55	MIP	.43 ns	.64
6. SH utilizes learner voice, such as feelings, views and/or opinions to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement.	4.42	IP	4.27	IP	4.72	MIP	5.22*	.01
7. SH utilizes available monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	4.44	IP	4.31	IP	4.60	MIP	2.08 ns	.12

*Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The findings showed that significant differences existed only in Indicators 2 and 6 under Leading Strategically when grouped according to position/designation, since their p-values were below 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected for these indicators but accepted for the remaining indicators.

In developing and implementing with the planning team school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies, Principal I–IV obtained the highest mean (4.65), followed by Head Teachers (4.52), while OIC/TIC obtained the lowest mean (4.31) (p = .01). This suggests that principals perceived themselves as more capable in school planning and policy alignment. A possible reason is that principals hold formal administrative authority and are directly accountable for School Improvement Plans, Annual Implementation Plans, and overall school targets. Because they regularly lead planning processes, they may have stronger confidence in this responsibility. OICs/TICs, who often perform leadership duties in temporary or concurrent capacities, may have less exposure or authority in full-scale planning functions.

Likewise, in utilizing learner voice, such as feelings, views and/or opinions to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement, Principal I–IV again obtained the highest mean (4.72), followed by OIC/TIC (4.42), while Head Teachers posted the lowest mean (4.27) (p = .01). This indicates that principals rated themselves higher in engaging learners in decision-making and policy improvement. This may be because principals are more frequently involved in school-wide consultations, learner governance activities, and policy formulation, giving them wider opportunities to gather and use learner feedback.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

These findings are supported by recent literature. OECD (2023) emphasized that formally appointed principals often demonstrate stronger confidence in strategic planning, stakeholder engagement, and organizational decision-making because of their broader scope of authority and accountability. UNESCO (2024) likewise noted that leadership position influences access to decision-making responsibilities, which can shape stronger self-perceptions in strategic leadership tasks.

However, literature also suggests that designation alone does not guarantee stronger leadership effectiveness. OICs/TICs and Head Teachers may perform equally well in practice but may rate themselves lower because of limited formal authority, fewer resources, or narrower administrative roles. Their lower means may therefore reflect role constraints rather than lower competence.

Overall, the findings imply that position/designation influenced selected strategic leadership practices, with Principal I–IV rating themselves highest in school planning and learner-centered decision-making, while OIC/TIC and Head Teachers tended to provide lower self-assessments, likely due to differences in authority, exposure, and role expectations.

Table 25. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Position/Designation in terms of Managing School Operations and Resources

Managing School Operations and Resources	OIC/TIC		Head Teacher		Principal I-IV		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH utilizes school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations.	4.26	IP	4.25	IP	4.55	MIP	3.37*	.03
2. SH manages finances adhering to policies, guidelines, and issuances in allocation, procurement, disbursement, and liquidation aligned with the school plan.	4.35	IP	4.58	MIP	4.53	MIP	1.48ns	.22
3. SH oversees school facilities and equipment in adherence to policies, guidelines and issuances on acquisition, recording, utilization, repair and maintenance, storage and disposal.	4.51	MIP	4.29	IP	4.37	IP	1.44ns	.24
4. SH supervises staffing such as teaching load distribution and grade level and subject area assignment in adherence to laws, policies, guidelines and issuances based on the needs of the school.	4.53	MIP	4.45	IP	4.69	MIP	1.79ns	.17
5. SH ensures school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation and resiliency to	4.66	MIP	4.66	MIP	4.72	MIP	.14ns	.86

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

ensure continuous delivery of instruction.								
6. SH manages emerging opportunities and challenges to encourage equality and equity in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel and other stakeholders.	4.48	IP	4.39	IP	4.72	MIP	3.28*	.04

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings showed that significant differences existed only in Indicators 1 and 6 under Managing School Operations and Resources when grouped according to position/designation.

In utilizing school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations, Principal I–IV obtained the highest mean (4.55), followed by OIC/TIC (4.26), while Head Teachers posted the lowest mean (4.25) ($p = .03$). This suggests that principals perceived themselves as more capable in using ICT, digital records, and data systems for school management. A possible reason is that principals usually handle broader administrative responsibilities such as school reports, planning documents, enrollment data, performance monitoring, and coordination through digital platforms. Their regular exposure to these systems may strengthen confidence in technology-based management.

Likewise, in managing emerging opportunities and challenges to encourage equality and equity in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel, and other stakeholders, Principal I–IV again obtained the highest mean (4.72), followed by OIC/TIC (4.48), while Head Teachers had the lowest mean (4.39) ($p = .04$). This indicates that principals rated themselves higher in responding to new concerns, addressing school issues, and promoting equitable support systems. This may be because principals are directly responsible for making school-wide decisions, resolving stakeholder concerns, and allocating resources to meet diverse needs.

These findings are supported by recent literature. OECD (2023) emphasized that formally appointed principals often report stronger confidence in operational leadership because they hold greater authority over data systems, resource management, and strategic responses to organizational challenges. UNESCO (2024) likewise noted that school leaders with broader administrative roles are more likely to develop stronger efficacy in equity-focused management and institutional decision-making.

However, literature also suggests that lower means among OIC/TIC and Head Teachers do not necessarily indicate weaker competence. These groups may perform similar tasks but within narrower scopes of responsibility, with less formal authority, fewer administrative resources, or shared decision-making limitations. Their lower ratings may therefore reflect role boundaries rather than lower actual capability.

Overall, the findings imply that position/designation influenced selected operational leadership practices, with Principal I–IV rating themselves highest in ICT-based operations and managing emerging challenges, likely due to their wider authority, greater accountability, and stronger exposure to whole-school management function

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 26. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Position/Designation in terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Focusing on Teaching and Learning	OIC/TIC		Head Teacher		Principal I-IV		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH assists teachers in the review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards to make the curriculum relevant for learners.	4.55	MIP	4.43	IP	4.58	MIP	.91 ns	.40
2. SH provides technical assistance to teachers on teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas to improve their teaching practice.	4.48	IP	4.37	IP	4.62	MIP	1.53 ns	.21
3. SH uses validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance.	4.42	IP	4.45	IP	4.46	IP	.04 ns	.95
4. SH utilizes learning outcomes in developing data-based interventions to maintain learner achievement and attain other performance indicators.	4.46	IP	4.29	IP	4.46	IP	1.45 ns	.23
5. SH provides technical assistance to teachers in using learner assessment tools, strategies and results consistent with curriculum requirements to ensure accountability in achieving higher learning outcomes.	4.33	IP	4.43	IP	4.60	MIP	1.68 ns	.18
6. SH manages a learner-friendly. inclusive and healthy learning environment.	4.57	MIP	4.70	MIP	4.74	MIP	1.10 ns	.33
7. SH ensures integration of career awareness and opportunities in the provision of learning experiences aligned with the curriculum.	4.37	IP	4.43	IP	4.32	IP	.12 ns	.80
8. SH implements learner discipline policies that are developed collaboratively with stakeholders including parents, school personnel and the community.	4.37	IP	4.60	MIP	4.58	MIP	1.32 ns	.27

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); ns = not significant at 0.05 level

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

The findings showed that there was no significant difference in the self-perceptions of school heads on Focusing on Teaching and Learning when grouped according to position/designation. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted for all indicators in this domain. This means that OIC/TIC, Head Teachers, and Principal I–IV generally assessed their teaching and learning leadership practices in a similar manner.

Although no significant differences were found, slight variations in means were observed. Principal I–IV obtained relatively higher means in assisting teachers in curriculum implementation, providing technical assistance on pedagogy, using stakeholder feedback, developing data-based interventions, providing support in learner assessment, and managing learner-friendly environments. This may suggest that principals perceived themselves as more confident in broad instructional supervision functions because they commonly oversee whole-school academic performance, classroom monitoring, and instructional planning.

Meanwhile, Head Teachers posted the highest mean in ensuring integration of career awareness opportunities and implementing learner discipline policies, while also showing a strong rating in maintaining a learner-friendly environment. This may be because Head Teachers often work closely with teachers and learners on day-to-day academic concerns, learner behavior, and classroom-based implementation, giving them direct involvement in these functions.

OIC/TIC respondents also posted competitive means across several indicators, particularly in curriculum implementation and maintaining a positive learning environment. This indicates that even when serving in acting or concurrent leadership capacities, they perceived themselves as capable in instructional leadership responsibilities.

The absence of significant difference implies that regardless of designation, school heads commonly perform similar responsibilities related to curriculum supervision, teacher support, learner assessment, interventions, school climate, and discipline. In many school settings, these functions are shared among administrators and instructional leaders, resulting in comparable self-perceptions.

These findings are supported by recent literature. OECD (2023) emphasized that teaching and learning leadership is increasingly distributed across school leadership teams rather than concentrated in one position alone. UNESCO (2024) likewise noted that collaborative instructional leadership enables different school leaders to contribute similarly to curriculum improvement, teacher development, and learner support.

However, literature also suggests that formal designation may still influence access to authority and decision-making. Thus, while no statistical differences were found, slight mean variations may reflect differences in scope of responsibility rather than differences in competence.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 27. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Position/Designation in terms of Developing Self and Others

Developing Self and Others	OIC/TIC		Head Teacher		Principal I-IV		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH sets personal and professional development goals based on self-assessment aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads.	4.48	IP	4.58	MIP	4.55	MIP	.35 ns	.69
2. SH applies professional reflection and learning to improve one's practice.	4.37	IP	4.43	IP	4.60	MIP	1.85 ns	.16
3. SH participates in professional networks to upgrade knowledge and skills and to enhance practice.	4.42	IP	4.33	IP	4.60	MIP	2.18 ns	.11
4. SH implements the performance management system with a team to support the career advancement of school personnel, and to improve office performance.	4.57	MIP	4.60	MIP	4.67	MIP	.32 ns	.72
5. SH implements professional development initiatives to enhance strengths and address performance gaps among school personnel.	4.44	IP	4.52	MIP	4.65	MIP	1.41 ns	.24
6. SH provides opportunities to individuals and teams in performing leadership roles and responsibilities.	4.51	MIP	4.45	IP	4.69	MIP	1.86 ns	.15
7. SH implements laws, policies, guidelines and issuances on the rights, privileges and benefits of school personnel to ensure their general welfare.	4.46	IP	4.35	IP	4.65	MIP	2.60 ns	.07
8. SH implements a school reward system to recognize and motivate learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary performance and/or continued support.	4.48	IP	4.56	MIP	4.67	MIP	.93 ns	.39

Legend: 3.50-4.49 = Intensively Practiced (IP); 4.50-5.00 = Most Intensively Practiced (MIP); ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings showed that there was no significant difference in the self-perceptions of school heads on Developing Self and Others when grouped according to position/designation. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted for all indicators in this domain. This means that

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

OIC/TIC, Head Teachers, and Principal I–IV generally assessed their leadership practices related to self-growth, staff development, and personnel support in a similar manner.

Although no significant differences were found, slight mean variations were evident. Principal I–IV obtained relatively higher means in most indicators, particularly in professional reflection and learning, participation in professional networks, implementing performance management systems, professional development initiatives, providing leadership opportunities, promoting personnel welfare, and implementing reward systems. This may suggest that principals perceived themselves as more confident in people development functions because they commonly hold full responsibility for staff supervision, coaching, performance evaluation, and school-wide capacity-building programs.

Meanwhile, Head Teachers posted the highest mean in setting personal and professional development goals and also showed strong ratings in performance management and recognition systems. This may be because Head Teachers are often directly involved in mentoring teachers, guiding instructional improvement, and participating in school-based professional learning activities.

OIC/TIC respondents also posted comparable means across all indicators, especially in providing leadership opportunities and implementing performance systems. This indicates that even in acting or concurrent leadership roles, they perceived themselves as actively engaged in developing personnel and supporting school improvement.

The absence of significant difference implies that regardless of designation, school leaders commonly share responsibilities in professional growth, mentoring, performance management, motivation, and staff welfare. In many schools, these functions are collaboratively practiced rather than limited to one position, resulting in similar self-perceptions across groups.

These findings are supported by recent literature. OECD (2023) emphasized that leadership development and staff capacity-building are strengthened when leadership responsibilities are distributed among different members of the school leadership team. UNESCO (2024) likewise noted that collaborative leadership structures enable principals, middle leaders, and acting administrators to contribute similarly to professional learning and staff empowerment.

However, literature also suggests that formal designation may affect authority, access to resources, and decision-making opportunities. Thus, while no statistical differences were found, the slight advantage of principals in several indicators may reflect broader role expectations rather than clear differences in competence.

Overall, the findings imply that position/designation did not significantly influence perceptions on Developing Self and Others, suggesting that OIC/TIC, Head Teachers, and Principals all play meaningful roles in promoting professional growth and supporting personnel development.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 28. Differences on the Leadership Practices when School Heads are Grouped According to Position/Designation in terms of Building Connections

Building Connections	OIC/TIC		Head Teacher		Principal I-IV		F-value	p-value
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE		
1. SH builds constructive relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents and other stakeholders to foster an enabling and supportive environment for learners.	4.31	IP	4.27	IP	4.53	MIP	2.07 ns	.12
2. SH manages school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent-teacher associations, by applying relevant policies and guidelines to support the attainment of institutional goals.	4.53	MIP	4.35	IP	4.53	MIP	1.13 ns	.32
3. SH exhibits inclusive practices, such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness and culture responsiveness, to foster awareness, acceptance and respect.	4.33	IP	4.52	MIP	4.46	IP	.95 ns	.32
4. SH communicates effectively in speaking and writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders, through positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support.	4.42	IP	4.64	MIP	4.69	MIP	2.27 ns	.10
5. SH initiates partnerships with the community, such as parents, alumni. authorities, industries and other stakeholders, to strengthen support for learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	4.33	IP	4.29	IP	4.65	MIP	4.47 *	.01

The findings showed that significant difference existed only in Indicator 5 under Building Connections when grouped according to position/designation.

In initiating partnerships with the community, such as parents, alumni, authorities, industries, and other stakeholders, to strengthen support for learner development, as well as school and community improvement, Principal I–IV obtained the highest mean (4.65), followed by OIC/TIC (4.33), while Head Teachers posted the lowest mean (4.29) ($p = .01$). This indicates that principals perceived themselves as more capable in establishing and sustaining external partnerships for school development.

A possible reason for this result is that principals commonly serve as the official representative of the school in dealing with local government units, private organizations, alumni

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

groups, community leaders, and external agencies. Because they are formally tasked with leading school-community relations, resource generation, and stakeholder coordination, they may have stronger confidence in this area. Their role often requires regular engagement in meetings, negotiations, partnership building, and community mobilization.

Meanwhile, OIC/TIC and Head Teachers may also participate in partnership activities, but usually within delegated or supporting roles. Their lower means may reflect more limited authority, fewer opportunities for external representation, or less direct involvement in formal community linkage programs rather than lower competence.

These findings are supported by recent literature. OECD (2023) emphasized that school principals often demonstrate stronger efficacy in external collaboration because they hold primary accountability for stakeholder engagement and community partnerships. UNESCO (2024) likewise noted that formally appointed school heads are more likely to lead networking activities, mobilize community resources, and sustain inter-agency collaboration for school improvement.

However, literature also suggests that successful partnerships are not dependent on principals alone. Collaborative leadership models recognize the important contributions of Head Teachers and other school leaders in maintaining parent engagement, community trust, and internal stakeholder coordination. Thus, while principals rated themselves highest, effective partnership-building remains a shared responsibility.

G. School's Performance as Measured through School-Based Management Level

Table 29. School Performance as Measured through the School-Based Management Level

Level of Practice	Frequency	Percent
Level 1: Beginning	119	85.6
Level 2: Maturing	20	14.4
Total	139	100.0

The table presents the level of practice of School-Based Management (SBM) among the schools included in the study. Out of the 139 respondents, 119 schools or 85.6% were categorized under Level 1: Beginning, while 20 schools or 14.4% were categorized under Level 2: Maturing. None of the schools reached Level 3: Advanced.

The results indicate that the majority of the schools are still in the Beginning Level of SBM implementation, which means that the basic structures and processes of school-based management are being established and implemented, but further development and strengthening are still needed. Schools at this level are typically focused on organizing management systems, aligning policies with school goals, and building initial stakeholder participation in school governance.

Meanwhile, a smaller proportion of schools were categorized under the Maturing Level, indicating that these schools have already demonstrated improved implementation of SBM practices. Schools at this stage typically exhibit stronger stakeholder participation, more systematic planning processes, and improved accountability mechanisms that contribute to school improvement.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

The findings suggest that while SBM has been implemented in most schools, there remains a need to further strengthen the implementation of SBM practices to move schools toward higher levels of institutionalization. Continuous support from school heads, teachers, and stakeholders is necessary to improve collaborative decision-making, resource management, and accountability processes within schools.

These results support the Department of Education's thrust toward strengthening school autonomy and participatory governance through SBM. According to DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012, School-Based Management aims to empower schools and communities to work collaboratively in improving school performance and learner outcomes. Schools progress through different levels of practice as they strengthen leadership, accountability, and stakeholder participation mechanisms.

The findings are also consistent with previous studies emphasizing that effective leadership and stakeholder collaboration are essential in advancing SBM implementation. Bandur (2012) emphasized that school-based management enhances school effectiveness when stakeholders actively participate in decision-making and school improvement initiatives. Similarly, Caldwell (2005) noted that successful SBM implementation requires strong leadership, capacity building, and community engagement to achieve improved educational outcomes. Furthermore, Leithwood and Riehl (2003) highlighted that school leadership plays a critical role in fostering collaboration and guiding school improvement efforts under decentralized management systems.

H. Relationship Between School Head's Extent of Leadership Practices of School Heads and School Performance through the School-Based Management

Table 30. Relationship Between the Extent of Leadership Practices of School Heads and School Performance through the School-Based Management in Terms of Leading Strategically

Leading Strategically	Correlation Coefficient	Verbal Interpretation	p-value
1. SH communicates the DepEd vision, mission, and core values to the wider school community to ensure shared understanding and alignment of school policies, programs projects and activities.	.18*	Very Weak	.03
2. SH develops and implement with the planning team school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies.	.10 ns	Very Weak	.20
3. SH undertakes policy implementation and review in the school to ensure that operations are consistent with national and local laws, regulations and issuances.	.12 ns	Very Weak	.13
4. SH utilizes relevant research findings from reliable sources in facilitating data-driven and evidence-based innovations to improve school performance.	.19*	Very Weak	.02

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

5. SH implements programs in the school that support the development of learners.	.11 ns	Very Weak	.17
6. SH utilizes learner voice, such as feelings, views and/or opinions to inform policy development and decision-making towards school improvement.	.11 ns	Very Weak	.18
7. SH utilizes available monitoring and evaluation processes and tools to promote learner achievement.	.03ns	Very Weak	.70

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*
Legend: 0.00–0.19 = Very Weak
0.20–0.39 = Weak
0.40–0.59 = Moderate
0.60–0.79 = Strong
0.80–1.00 = Very Strong

The findings under Leading Strategically show that only two indicators—communicating the DepEd vision, mission, and core values and utilizing research findings for data-driven innovations—have a significant relationship with the School-Based Management (SBM) level of practice, although the strength of the relationship is very weak. This indicates that when school heads clearly align the school community with DepEd goals and make use of data such as Phil-IRI results and other assessment reports, there is a measurable but limited contribution to improving SBM practices. This is evident during INSETs, LAC sessions, and school planning activities where shared direction and evidence-based decisions help schools meet SBM indicators like participatory planning and continuous improvement.

The weak strength of the relationship suggests that SBM performance is influenced by multiple factors beyond strategic leadership alone, particularly the actual implementation of programs and stakeholder involvement. This supports studies which explain that leadership affects school outcomes indirectly and works through systems and people within the school (Hallinger, 2011; Leithwood et al., 2020), which is why the relationship, though significant, remains low in strength.

Table 31. Relationship Between the Extent of Leadership Practices of School Heads and School Performance through the School-Based Management in Terms of Managing School Operations and Resources

Managing School Operations and Resources	Correlation Coefficient	Verbal Interpretation	p-value
1. SH utilizes school data and information using technology, including ICT, to ensure efficient and effective school operations.	-.01 ns	Very Weak	.98
2. SH manages finances adhering to policies, guidelines, and issuances in allocation, procurement, disbursement, and liquidation aligned with the school plan.	.03 ns	Very Weak	.70
3. SH oversees school facilities and equipment in adherence to policies, guidelines and	.02 ns	Very Weak	.93

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

issuances on acquisition, recording, utilization, repair and maintenance, storage and disposal.			
4. SH supervises staffing such as teaching load distribution and grade level and subject area assignment in adherence to laws, policies, guidelines and issuances based on the needs of the school.	.06 ns	Very Weak	.47
5. SH ensures school safety for disaster preparedness, mitigation and resiliency to ensure continuous delivery of instruction.	-.02 ns	Very Weak	.77
6. SH manages emerging opportunities and challenges to encourage equality and equity in addressing the needs of learners, school personnel and other stakeholders.	.14 ns	Very Weak	.09

Legend: ns = not significant at 0.05 level

The findings under Managing School Operations and Resources show that all indicators have a very weak and non-significant relationship with the School-Based Management (SBM) level of practice, indicating that these operational functions are not significantly associated with variations in SBM performance. This suggests that while school heads are performing essential responsibilities such as financial management, resource allocation, staffing, and ensuring school safety, these practices may be routine and compliance-driven in the DepEd system.

For example, processes like budgeting, procurement, and disaster preparedness are guided by strict policies and standardized procedures, meaning most schools implement them similarly regardless of their SBM level. As a result, these practices do not create noticeable differences in school performance outcomes. This implies that effective management of operations and resources, while necessary for smooth school functioning, may not be sufficient on its own to improve SBM levels.

Supporting studies explain that managerial functions often have indirect or limited influence on school outcomes, as improvements are more strongly driven by instructional leadership and teaching practices (Hallinger, 2011; Leithwood et al., 2020). Thus, even if these practices are present and properly implemented, their impact on SBM remains minimal in terms of measurable relationship.

Table 32. Relationship Between the Extent of Leadership Practices of School Heads and School Performance through the School-Based Management in Terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Correlation Coefficient	Verbal Interpretation	p-value
1. SH assists teachers in the review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards to make the curriculum relevant for learners.	.03 ns	Very Weak	.27
2. SH provides technical assistance to teachers on teaching standards and pedagogies within	.03 ns	Very Weak	.27

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

and across learning areas to improve their teaching practice.			
3. SH uses validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance.	-.09 ns	Very Weak	.28
4. SH utilizes learning outcomes in developing data-based interventions to maintain learner achievement and attain other performance indicators.	.10 ns	Very Weak	.21
5. SH provides technical assistance to teachers in using learner assessment tools, strategies and results consistent with curriculum requirements to ensure accountability in achieving higher learning outcomes.	.29*	Weak	.01
6. SH manages a learner-friendly. inclusive and healthy learning environment.	-.01 ns	Very Weak	.82
7. SH ensures integration of career awareness and opportunities in the provision of learning experiences aligned with the curriculum.	.06 ns	Very Weak	.46
8. SH implements learner discipline policies that are developed collaboratively with stakeholders including parents, school personnel and the community.	.06 ns	Very Weak	.42

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The findings under Focusing on Teaching and Learning reveal that only one indicator—providing technical assistance to teachers in using learner assessment tools, strategies, and results—has a significant relationship with the School-Based Management (SBM) level of practice, with a weak strength of relationship. This indicates that when school heads actively guide teachers in properly using assessment tools and interpreting results, there is a noticeable contribution to improving SBM practices.

This is evident when school heads support teachers in analyzing assessment data such as quarterly test results, formative assessments, or Phil-IRI, and use these to plan targeted interventions during LAC sessions or coaching. This practice strengthens accountability and aligns teaching with expected learning outcomes, which are key components of SBM, particularly in ensuring continuous improvement in learner performance.

The weak strength of the relationship suggests that while assessment-based support is important, SBM performance is still influenced by other factors, especially actual classroom instruction and learner engagement.

This supports studies emphasizing that instructional leadership practices, particularly those related to assessment and feedback, have a more direct influence on school outcomes compared to general supervisory functions (Hallinger, 2011; Leithwood et al., 2020), explaining why this indicator, though significant, shows only a limited level of relationship.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Table 33. Relationship Between the Extent of Leadership Practices of School Heads and School Performance through the School-Based Management in Terms of Developing Self and Others

Developing Self and Others	Correlation Coefficient	Verbal Interpretation	p-value
1. SH sets personal and professional development goals based on self-assessment aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads.	.03 ns	Very Weak	.65
2. SH applies professional reflection and learning to improve one's practice.	.09 ns	Very Weak	.27
3. SH participates in professional networks to upgrade knowledge and skills and to enhance practice.	.19*	Very Weak	.02
4. SH implements the performance management system with a team to support the career advancement of school personnel, and to improve office performance.	.13 ns	Very Weak	.12
5. SH implements professional development initiatives to enhance strengths and address performance gaps among school personnel.	.04 ns	Very Weak	.61
6. SH provides opportunities to individuals and teams in performing leadership roles and responsibilities.	.06 ns	Very Weak	.43
7. SH implements laws, policies, guidelines and issuances on the rights, privileges and benefits of school personnel to ensure their general welfare.	.07 ns	Very Weak	.37
8. SH implements a school reward system to recognize and motivate learners, school personnel and other stakeholders for exemplary performance and/or continued support.	.04 ns	Very Weak	.56

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

The findings under Developing Self and Others show that only one indicator—participating in professional networks to upgrade knowledge and skills and to enhance practice—has a significant relationship with the School-Based Management (SBM) level of practice, although the strength of the relationship is very weak. This suggests that when school heads actively engage in professional networks such as LAC sessions, cluster meetings, trainings, and partnerships with other schools, there is a measurable but limited contribution to improving SBM practices.

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

Participation in these networks allows school heads to share best practices, learn new strategies, and adopt innovations that can support school improvement initiatives. For example, insights gained from division trainings or collaboration with other school heads may help in strengthening school processes related to planning, implementation, and monitoring, which are key components of SBM.

The very weak strength of the relationship implies that while professional networking is beneficial, its impact on SBM performance is still influenced by how these learnings are applied within the school.

This supports studies which highlight that leadership development activities contribute to school improvement indirectly and require effective translation into practice to produce stronger outcomes (Hallinger, 2011; Leithwood et al., 2020).

Table 34. Relationship Between the Extent of Leadership Practices of School Heads and School Performance through the School-Based Management in Terms of Building Connections

Building Connections	Correlation Coefficient	Verbal Interpretation	p-value
1. SH builds constructive relationships with authorities, colleagues, parents and other stakeholders to foster an enabling and supportive environment for learners.	.11 ns	Very Weak	.18
2. SH manages school organizations, such as learner organizations, faculty clubs and parent-teacher associations, by applying relevant policies and guidelines to support the attainment of institutional goals.	.17*	Very Weak	.04
3. SH exhibits inclusive practices, such as gender sensitivity, physical and mental health awareness and culture responsiveness, to foster awareness, acceptance and respect.	.09 ns	Very Weak	.29
4. SH communicates effectively in speaking and writing to teachers, learners, parents and other stakeholders, through positive use of communication platforms, to facilitate information sharing, collaboration and support.	.13 ns	Very Weak	.12
5. SH initiates partnerships with the community, such as parents, alumni. authorities, industries and other stakeholders, to strengthen support for learner development, as well as school and community improvement.	.15 ns		.07

*Legend: * = significant; ns = not significant at 0.05 level*

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

The findings under Building Connections reveal that only one indicator—managing school organizations such as learner organizations, faculty clubs, and parent-teacher associations—has a significant relationship with the School-Based Management (SBM) level of practice, although the strength of the relationship is very weak. This suggests that effective management of school organizations contributes, even in a limited way, to improving SBM practices. Active and well-managed organizations like the PTA, SELG, and faculty associations support participatory governance, which is a key principle of SBM.

For example, when PTAs are properly organized and guided, they can assist in school programs, resource generation, and decision-making processes, helping the school meet SBM indicators related to stakeholder involvement and shared accountability.

However, the very weak strength of the relationship indicates that simply having or managing these organizations is not enough; the quality of engagement and actual participation of stakeholders play a bigger role in influencing SBM outcomes.

This aligns with studies suggesting that stakeholder involvement contributes to school improvement but has a stronger impact when participation is meaningful and sustained (Hallinger, 2011; Leithwood et al., 2020), which explains why the relationship, although significant, remains low in strength.

I. Teacher's Performance (IPCRF) through the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers

Table 35. Teacher's Performance (IPCRF) through the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers

	Frequency	Percent
Outstanding	288	100.0
Total	288	100.0

The table presents the level of teacher performance based on the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). The results show that all 288 teachers, or 100 percent of the respondents, obtained an Outstanding rating.

This indicates that teachers consistently demonstrated a high level of performance across the Key Result Areas measured in the IPCRF. As the official performance evaluation tool of the Department of Education, the IPCRF assesses teachers based on competencies aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), including teaching strategies, classroom environment, assessment practices, curriculum planning, and professional development. An Outstanding rating means that teachers are able to deliver quality instruction and effectively support learner development.

These results can be closely linked to the leadership practices of school heads. Effective school heads play a key role in creating an environment that supports high teacher performance. Through instructional supervision, mentoring, Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, and provision of professional development opportunities, school heads help teachers improve their competencies and sustain high levels of teaching practice. Leadership practices such as focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections with stakeholders

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

contribute to a supportive and growth-oriented school environment, which can lead to consistently strong teacher performance.

This may imply that a strong leadership practices may already be in place and functioning effectively, resulting in uniformly high teacher performance. It suggests that school heads are able to guide, support, and monitor teachers in a way that promotes professional growth and accountability.

However, since all teachers received the same Outstanding rating, the data does not show differences in performance levels. This limits the ability to statistically determine how much leadership practices influence teacher performance. Despite this, the consistently high ratings still highlight the important role of school heads in maintaining a culture of excellence within the school.

4. Discussion

The findings of the study indicate that school heads demonstrate a high level of leadership practices across all domains of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), while teachers consistently exhibit outstanding performance and schools maintain commendable levels of School-Based Management (SBM) practice. This suggests that leadership structures, instructional processes, and management systems are generally functioning effectively. However, the weak but positive correlations between leadership practices, teacher performance, and SBM imply that while leadership contributes to these outcomes, it is not the sole determining factor. Other variables—such as teacher experience, availability of resources, contextual school conditions, and external support systems—may also significantly influence performance and school effectiveness.

These findings are consistent with existing literature which emphasizes that leadership has an indirect rather than direct effect on teacher performance and student outcomes. Studies by Hallinger (2011) and Leithwood et al. (2020) explain that leadership primarily influences learning through mediating factors such as school climate, teacher motivation, and professional development. Similarly, local studies by Estrada and Gumban (2024) and Capillanes (2025) affirm that leadership practices are positively associated with SBM implementation and instructional quality, although the strength of these relationships may vary depending on context. The uniformly high IPCRF ratings in this study may also help explain the weak correlations, as limited variability in performance data reduces the ability to detect stronger statistical relationships.

The implications for practice and policy highlight the need to sustain and further strengthen leadership development programs for school heads. While current leadership practices are aligned with PPSSH standards, targeted Learning and Development (L&D) interventions should focus on enhancing instructional leadership, data-driven decision-making, and stakeholder engagement, as these areas show greater potential to influence school outcomes. Policymakers and education leaders may also consider refining performance evaluation systems, such as the IPCRF, to allow for more nuanced assessment of teacher performance and better differentiation of competencies. Strengthening SBM mechanisms through continuous capacity-

Online ISSN: 3082-5121
Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields
https://journals.aloysianpublications.com
Volume 2 Issue 5 (2026)

building and community involvement can further reinforce accountability and shared governance in schools.

Despite its contributions, the study has several limitations. First, the use of a descriptive-correlational design limits the ability to establish causal relationships between leadership practices and outcomes. Second, the reliance on self-reported data through questionnaires may introduce response bias, particularly in assessing leadership practices. Third, the uniformity of teacher performance ratings may have constrained the statistical analysis, affecting the strength of correlations observed. Lastly, the study is limited to public elementary schools in one legislative district, which may affect the generalizability of the findings to other contexts. Future research may consider using mixed-method approaches, incorporating qualitative data, and expanding the scope to include more diverse school settings to provide a deeper understanding of leadership impact.

5. Conclusions

The study revealed that school heads in Legislative District 2 of Isabela demonstrate a high level of leadership practices across the five domains of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), namely leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections. Teachers were also found to consistently perform at an outstanding level based on their Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings, while schools showed a commendable level of School-Based Management (SBM) implementation. These findings suggest that leadership practices, teacher performance, and school management systems are generally strong and aligned with existing educational standards. However, the study also found weak but positive relationships among these variables, indicating that while leadership contributes to performance and SBM implementation, other contextual and organizational factors may also play significant roles.

In light of these findings, it is recommended that targeted Learning and Development (L&D) programs for school heads be strengthened, particularly focusing on enhancing instructional leadership, data-driven decision-making, and stakeholder engagement to further maximize their impact on teacher performance and school effectiveness. Continuous professional development opportunities should also be provided to sustain and refine existing leadership competencies aligned with the PPSSH. For teachers, ongoing capacity-building initiatives such as mentoring, coaching, and collaborative learning communities are recommended to maintain high performance levels and promote continuous instructional improvement.

For future research, it is recommended that studies explore additional variables that may influence teacher performance and SBM implementation, such as school culture, resource adequacy, leadership styles, and learner-related factors. A mixed-methods approach is also suggested to provide deeper insights into the lived experiences of school heads and teachers, which may not be fully captured through quantitative data alone. Moreover, expanding the scope of the study to include other divisions or regions may enhance the generalizability of findings and provide a broader understanding of leadership effectiveness in diverse educational contexts.

Bibliography

Ahmad, A., & Hamzah, M. I. (2022). Leadership practices and effectiveness in educational organizations. International Journal of Educational Leadership, 10(2), 45–58.

Armstrong, P. (2020). Standards for school leadership: Global perspectives and practices. Routledge.

Avergonzado, M. (2025). Leadership competencies and school-based management practices among school heads. Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 12(1), 78–95.

Brillantes, A. B., & Fernandez, M. T. (2011). Restoring trust and building integrity in government: Issues and concerns in the Philippines and areas for reform. International Public Management Review, 12(2), 55–80.

Bush, T. (2018). Leadership and management development in education (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? School Leadership & Management, 34(5), 553–571.

Capillanes, R. (2025). Leadership practices and teacher instructional performance in public schools. Asian Journal of Education, 8(1), 34–50.

Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). Successful school leadership. Education Development Trust.

Dellomas, M. R., & Neri, A. B. (2022). Leadership practices of school heads based on the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). Unpublished research instrument.

Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).

Department of Education. (2020). DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH).

Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31(1), 1–12.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. Psychological Review, 109(3), 573–598.

Epstein, J. L. (2018). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Esguerra, J., & Quinito, R. (2025). School-based management implementation and teacher performance: A Philippine perspective. Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 9(1), 112–130.

Estrada, L., & Gumban, M. (2024). Instructional leadership practices of school heads and their influence on school outcomes. International Journal of Educational Management, 38(2), 210–225.

Finkel, E. (2012). Principals as instructional leaders. District Administration, 48(6), 50–55.

Fresnido, R., & Uy, M. (2026). Leadership practices and teacher performance in rural schools. Philippine Educational Research Journal, 14(1), 22–40.

Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research. Wallace Foundation.

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. Journal of Educational Administration, 49(2), 125–142.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). Transformational leadership. In B. Davies (Ed.), The essentials of school leadership (pp. 31–43). Sage.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 40(1), 5–22.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). What we know about successful school leadership. AERA.

McKinsey & Company. (2007). How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top. McKinsey & Company.

Northouse, P. G. (2022). Leadership: Theory and practice (9th ed.). Sage Publications.

OECD. (2018). Education policy outlook 2018: Putting student learning at the centre. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2023). School leadership for learning: Insights from global studies. OECD Publishing.

Olasiman, J., & Torreon, R. (2024). Leadership practices and school-based management outcomes. Philippine Journal of Educational Administration, 11(2), 60–75.

Precioso, M., & Chua, L. (2025). Leadership styles and school effectiveness in public schools. Asian Education Studies, 7(3), 89–105.

Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). Organizational behavior (18th ed.). Pearson.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes. Educational Administration Quarterly, 44(5), 635–674.

Sebuyana, R. (2024). Administrative practices and teacher performance in basic education. Journal of Educational Leadership, 6(1), 15–30.

UNESCO. (2015). Comprehensive school safety framework. UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2021). Women in school leadership: Global perspectives. UNESCO Publishing.