

School Administrators' Management Approaches and Performance of Teachers

MARY ARCELLE N. ANDUYO

Teacher II

Western Leyte College

Master of Arts in Education

Major in School Administration and Supervision

maryarcelle.anduyo029@deped.gov.ph

Abstract — This study was conducted to determine School Administrators' Management Approaches and Teachers' Performance in selected schools of Ormoc City District 1 in the Schools Division of Ormoc City. The findings of the study were the basis for the proposed Instructional Supervisory Plan. descriptive-correlational design was used in this study to investigate the relationship between School Administrators' Management Approaches and Teachers' Performance based on the Classroom Observation Tool (COT) results. Standardized questionnaires related to the management styles of School Heads were given to teachers, and data mining was also employed in the gathering of COT data. The results of the study served as the basis for a proposed instructional supervisory plan.

The Test of Relationship, which shows the statistical correlation between various school administrators' management approaches—such as planning, implementation, assessment, communication, supervision, community relations, staff development, conflict management—and the IPCRF (Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form) ratings of teachers. The table includes the correlation coefficient (r), computed t -values, the table value at a 0.05 significance level, the decision on the null hypothesis (H_0), and the interpretation of the relationship. The aim of this analysis is to determine whether these administrative functions significantly impact teacher performance.

All variables analyzed in this table showed a strong and significant relationship with teacher performance, as measured by the IPCRF. The highest correlation was observed between Communication and IPCRF, indicating that effective communication by administrators strongly enhances teacher performance. This was followed closely by Supervision vs IPCRF and Implementation vs IPCRF, both suggesting that regular guidance and efficient execution of school programs contribute significantly to professional excellence.

Other variables also demonstrated strong correlations: Planning, Community Relations, Staff Development, and Conflict Management. These results confirm that supportive leadership, community collaboration, and proactive conflict resolution contribute to a positive work environment and higher teacher effectiveness. Notably, Assessment vs IPCRF had a slightly lower but still strong correlation, emphasizing the value of ongoing evaluation and data-informed decisions in refining teacher practices.

Based on the computed values it implies that all variables exceeded the table value and led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, thereby confirming that there is a statistically significant relationship between school administrators' management approaches and teacher performance. The strength of these correlations suggests that administrators play a critical role in enabling and sustaining high-quality teaching. Consequently, investing in leadership training, communication practices, and strategic planning should be a priority to further elevate performance across educational institutions.

Keywords — School Administrator's Management Approaches, Performance, Teachers

I. Introduction

The implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum is being conducted in phases, beginning with Kindergarten, Grades 1, 4, and 7 in the 2024–2025 school year. However, its success depends on several key factors: the expertise of school administrators, teacher preparedness, available resources, community involvement, and continuous improvement efforts. In 2023, the MATATAG Curriculum: Bansang Makabata, Batang Makabansa was introduced as a significant reform in the Philippine education system. This aims to enhance the K–12 curriculum by promoting well-rounded individuals who are prepared to face future challenges. It focuses on improving the quality of education, modernizing teaching practices, and enhancing learning outcomes by integrating 21st-century skills and innovative pedagogical approaches.

This study aims to explore how school administrators' leadership and management approaches influence teacher performance and student academic achievement under the new curriculum. Understanding effective management strategies is crucial in ensuring the smooth transition and successful execution of the MATATAG Curriculum. School leaders, including principals and administrators, play a vital role in overseeing the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum. Effective execution requires careful planning, coordination, and continuous support from school administrators. They are responsible for shaping the school environment to align with the new curriculum's objectives. Translating curriculum goals into actionable strategies that teachers can implement in the classroom. Providing professional development opportunities to enhance teachers' skills, knowledge, and methodologies. Ensuring the availability of learning materials and creating conducive classroom settings for effective teaching and learning. Engaging stakeholders, including parents and the community, to strengthen support for the curriculum. Teachers are at the forefront of implementing the MATATAG Curriculum. However, this transition poses challenges, as they must adjust to new curriculum frameworks and adopt modern pedagogical approaches.

The success of this reform depends on how well-prepared, supported, and valued teachers feel in their roles. Teachers must develop the necessary skills and knowledge to align their teaching strategies with the curriculum's objectives and adapt to different learning styles and students need to create an inclusive and equitable learning environment. When school administrators implement strong leadership and management strategies, they create an environment where teachers can excel in their roles, ultimately improving student learning outcomes. Well-supported and motivated teachers are more effective at delivering lessons, leading to better student engagement, academic performance, and overall educational success. Examining school administrators' management approaches is essential for enhancing the quality of education by ensuring a smooth transition to the new curriculum and adapting to curriculum changes through effective leadership strategies. It will also promote student-centered learning that meets the needs of diverse learners.

Thus, this is one of the reasons why the researcher is trying to pursue her study on "School Administrator's Management Approaches and Teachers' Performance" aims to highlight the critical role of school leadership in shaping the quality of teaching and learning within the school environment. This study aims to find practical tactics that improve teaching methods and, eventually, student outcomes by examining how various management philosophies used by school administrators affect instructors' performance. It is essential to comprehend these dynamics in order to guide professional development programs and create a cooperative and encouraging atmosphere for educators. The ultimate goal of this study is to offer insightful information that will assist school administrators in improving their leadership techniques to foster an excellence-focused educational culture.

This study was conducted to determine School Administrators' Management Approaches and Teachers' Performance in selected schools of Ormoc City District 1 in the Schools Division of Ormoc City. The findings of the study were the basis for the proposed Instructional Supervisory Plan.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the of school administrators' management approaches in terms of:
 - 1.1 planning;
 - 1.2 implementation;
 - 1.3 assessment;
 - 1.4 communication;
 - 1.5 supervision;
 - 1.6 community relations;
 - 1.7 staff development; and
 - 1.8 conflict management?
2. What is the performance level of the Teachers based IPCRF?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the School Head's Management Approaches and Teachers Performance based on IPCRF?
4. What Instructional Supervisory plan can be proposed on the findings of the study?

Statement of Hypothesis:

Ho : There is no significant relationship between the School Head's Management Approaches and Teachers Performance based on IPCRF.

II. Methodology

Design. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between the management approaches used by school administrators and the performance of teachers. This design was appropriate as it aimed to describe current practices in school leadership and determine whether there is a significant correlation between these approaches and how teachers perform in their roles. The study focused on identifying which administrative strategies—such as transformational leadership, instructional supervision, participative management, and performance monitoring—are most commonly practiced, and how these relate to measurable indicators of teacher effectiveness such as classroom instruction, student engagement, professional growth, and punctuality in accomplishing tasks. Data were gathered through a researcher-made questionnaire distributed to both school administrators and teachers. The questionnaire was designed to capture the frequency and perceived effectiveness of different management styles as well as self-reported or supervisor-rated teacher performance. Quantitative data collected from the responses were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools such as weighted mean, Pearson's r , to determine the strength of relationships between variables. This design enabled the researcher not only to profile current leadership approaches but also to assess how these approaches impact the performance of teachers in various dimensions. The findings were expected to guide educational leaders in adopting more effective management strategies that promote professional excellence and student achievement. The main local of the study were the selected schools in the Ormoc City District 1, in the schools Division of Ormoc City. To gather the necessary data needed in the study, The researcher used The main research instrument used in this study was a researcher-made survey questionnaire, designed to collect data on two key variables: the management approaches of school administrators and the performance of teachers based on the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part focused on the various management approaches employed by school administrators, including but not limited to transformational leadership, participative leadership, instructional supervision, and transactional or directive approaches. Respondents—composed of teachers—were asked to rate the frequency and effectiveness of these practices as they observed or experienced them in their respective schools. A 4-point Likert Scale was used with options ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” The second part of the instrument captured the teachers' performance based on their IPCRF ratings. This section was aligned with the Key Result Areas (KRAs) and objectives outlined in the Department of Education's Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). It included performance indicators such as content knowledge and pedagogy, classroom management, learning outcomes, and professional development. Teachers were asked to indicate their most recent performance

rating per objective or domain, while some data were verified or supplemented through school records when permitted. The proposed instructional Supervisory Plan was taken based on the findings of the study.

Sampling. The respondents of the study were the selected teachers of Ormoc City District 1 in the Schools Division of Ormoc City. There are 14 males and 36 females with a total of 50 respondents that were involved in this study were being identified and the primary means of reach is during the actual conduct of the study as well as during the gathering of data in the school where the study was conducted.

Research Procedure. In order to gather the necessary data within one month (30 days), the researcher sought permission from the Office of the Schools Division, headed by the Schools Division Superintendent, through a Transmittal Letter. The same letter content was provided to the Public School District Supervisor, School Principal, and the teachers under whose care the respondents were.

The researcher distributed the survey questionnaires to the School Head as well as to all the teachers for them to answer. The researcher also requested the IPCRF results. After one month, the questionnaires were retrieved and consolidated, and subsequently subjected to statistical treatment using Pearson's r .

The data were collated and analyzed through appropriate statistical methods to determine the relationship between the variables studied.

Ethical Issues. The right to conduct the study was strictly adhered through the approval of the principal, approval of the Superintendent of the Division. The orientation of the respondents both School Principal, teachers and parents were done.

Treatment of Data. The following statistical formulas were used in this study:

The quantitative responses were tallied and tabulated. The data were treated statistically using the following statistical tool.

The quantitative responses were tallied and tabulated. The data was treated statistically using the following statistical tools.

Pearsons- r - This tool was used to test the relationship between School Administrator's Management Approaches and Teachers' Performance.

III. Results and Discussion

Table 1
School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Planning

	Planning	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	The administrator sets clear and measurable goals aligned with the school's vision.	3.65	Very High
2	Strategic plans are developed collaboratively with stakeholders.	3.50	Very High
3	Action plans include timelines, responsible people, and resources.	3.40	Very High
4	School priorities are identified based on needs assessment.	3.35	Very High
5	Annual improvement plans are reviewed and updated regularly.	3.45	Very High
6	Planning includes input from teachers, parents, and learners.	3.50	Very High
7	Data is used to inform school planning.	3.70	Very High
8	Risk management is considered in planning processes.	3.30	Very High
9	Planning involves curriculum alignment and learner performance.	3.38	Very High
10	Planning outcomes are communicated to all staff.	3.40	Very High
	Mean	3.46	Very High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High
 2.51-3.25 – High
 1.76- 2.50- Low
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

Table 1 presents the School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Planning, presents the perceptions of respondents regarding the planning practices carried out by school administrators. It evaluates various indicators that reflect how effectively and inclusively planning is conducted within the school system. Each indicator was rated and analyzed using a weighted mean, with all results falling within the "Very High" interpretation range. This suggests that planning as a management function is strongly observed and implemented in the schools covered by the study. The results reveal that administrators consistently demonstrate strong leadership in planning processes. The highest-rated indicator is the use of data to inform school planning with a weighted mean of 3.70, reflecting a very high practice of evidence-based decision-making. This is followed by the setting of clear and measurable goals aligned with the school's vision (3.65), and the collaborative development of strategic plans with stakeholders (3.50). These findings highlight that school leaders are proactive in aligning school objectives with their long-term vision and in engaging various stakeholders during the strategic planning process.

Other highly rated indicators include planning with input from teachers, parents, and learners (3.50), and the regular review and updating of annual improvement plans (3.45). Furthermore, planning outcomes being communicated to all staff (3.40) and the inclusion of timelines, responsible people, and resources in action plans (3.40) indicate a comprehensive and

transparent approach. These practices suggest that administrators are committed to ensuring that planning is both participatory and results driven. Additional indicators that received “Very High” ratings include the identification of school priorities through needs assessments (3.35), curriculum alignment and focus on learner performance in planning (3.38), and consideration of risk management (3.30). While slightly lower in score than others, these results still reflect a high level of diligence in addressing essential factors affecting school operations and learner outcomes. Together, these indicators show that administrators do not only plan for present needs but also anticipate future challenges and educational alignment.

Based on the results in table 1 having the overall mean rating of 3.46, interpreted as Very High, it implies that school administrators in the study area exhibit strong and effective planning practices. The results reflect a systematic, inclusive, and data-informed approach to planning that prioritizes continuous improvement and stakeholder engagement. This level of performance suggests that planning is not merely procedural but is viewed as a strategic tool in achieving school goals and improving learner outcomes. However, to sustain this, regular capacity-building and resource support for administrators remain essential.

Table 2
School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Implementation

	Implementation	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Programs and projects are implemented according to the school plan.	3.40	Very High
2	Resources are efficiently allocated for program execution.	3.45	Very High
3	Staff are involved in the implementation process.	3.42	Very High
4	Implementation schedules are strictly followed.	3.38	Very High
5	Adjustments are made when challenges arise during implementation.	3.40	Very High
6	Administrative support is provided throughout the implementation.	3.40	Very High
7	Stakeholders are engaged in the implementation of initiatives.	3.30	Very High
8	Instructional programs are carried out as planned.	3.50	Very High
9	School policies are enforced during implementation.	3.48	Very High
10	Implementation progress is regularly reviewed.	3.50	Very High
	Mean	3.42	Very High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High
 2.51-3.25 – High
 1.76- 2.50- Low
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

Table 2, presents the School Administrators’ Management Approaches in Terms of Implementation," presents data on how effectively school administrators execute their planned

programs, policies, and initiatives. The table includes ten indicators that measure key aspects of the implementation process, such as resource allocation, stakeholder involvement, adherence to schedules, and administrative support. All indicators received a "Very High" interpretation, with an overall weighted mean of 3.42, indicating that implementation practices in the schools involved in the study are carried out with strong consistency and effectiveness.

Among the indicators, the highest-rated are the implementation of instructional programs as planned and regular review of implementation progress, both with a weighted mean of 3.50. These reflect a strong commitment to maintaining instructional quality and monitoring outcomes. Close behind are enforcement of school policies during implementation (3.48) and efficient allocation of resources (3.45), suggesting that administrators are diligent in applying structured guidelines and making full use of available resources. Staff involvement (3.42) and providing administrative support (3.40) also scored very high, highlighting the importance of collaboration and leadership presence throughout the process.

Equally significant are the ratings for programs being implemented according to the school plan (3.40), making adjustments when challenges arise (3.40), and strictly following implementation schedules (3.38), which demonstrate that while administrators stick closely to established plans, they are also flexible and responsive to unforeseen situations. Stakeholder engagement received the lowest rating among the indicators at 3.30, though it still falls within the "Very High" category. This suggests room for strengthening community involvement in executing school initiatives, possibly through deeper partnerships with parents and local organizations.

The overall mean rating of 3.42, interpreted as "Very High," implies that school administrators in the study exhibit a highly effective and responsive approach to implementation. Their ability to translate planning into action while maintaining alignment with timelines, policies, and resources speaks to a well-managed school environment. However, the slightly lower rating on stakeholder engagement hints at a potential area for improvement to ensure that implementation becomes more participatory and community-driven, which could enhance sustainability and ownership of school programs.

Table 3
School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Assessment

	Assessment	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	The administrator regularly evaluates school programs and activities.	3.45	Very High
2	Assessment tools are used to measure effectiveness of school plans.	3.42	Very High
3	Staff performance is evaluated using clear and fair criteria.	3.52	Very High
4	Feedback is collected from stakeholders to assess school effectiveness.	3.48	Very High
5	Data-driven decision-making is evident in school operations.	3.50	Very High
6	Learning outcomes are assessed regularly to guide instruction.	3.60	Very High
7	School facilities and resources are periodically evaluated.	3.40	Very High
8	Assessment results are discussed during meetings.	3.30	Very High
9	Assessments are used to improve school processes.	3.25	Very High
10	There is a follow-through after evaluation findings.	3.30	Very High
	Mean	3.42	Very High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High
2.51-3.25 – High
1.76- 2.50- Low
1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the results of the School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Assessment, which evaluates how school leaders implement assessment-related functions in managing school operations. It consists of ten indicators reflecting various assessment practices, including program evaluation, staff performance review, data utilization, and follow-through mechanisms. The responses were rated using a Likert scale, and the results were interpreted through the weighted mean. All indicators in this table fall within the “Very High” range, with an overall mean of 3.42, indicating a strong implementation of assessment strategies by school administrators.

Among the ten indicators, the highest-rated item is “Learning outcomes are assessed regularly to guide instruction” with a weighted mean of 3.60, emphasizing that school leaders prioritize academic achievement and instructional improvement. This is closely followed by “Staff performance is evaluated using clear and fair criteria” (3.52) and “Data-driven decision-making is evident in school operations” (3.50), showing that administrators rely heavily on accurate and objective data in guiding their decisions and performance evaluations. Likewise, “Feedback is collected from stakeholders” (3.48) and “Regular evaluation of school programs and activities” (3.45) suggest a strong commitment to continuous improvement and stakeholder involvement in the assessment process.

The other indicators, while slightly lower, still received a “Very High” interpretation. These include the use of assessment tools to measure school plan effectiveness (3.42) and periodic evaluation of school facilities and resources (3.40). Discussion of assessment results during meetings (3.30) and follow-through after evaluation findings (3.30) indicate that administrators promote transparency and accountability, although these areas might benefit from more systematic approaches. The lowest-rated indicator, “Assessments are used to improve school processes” (3.25), although still high, points to an area where more focused integration of assessment data into school development efforts may be necessary.

The overall mean of 3.42, interpreted as “Very High”, implies that school administrators demonstrate strong capabilities in the assessment domain. Their emphasis on regular program and performance evaluations, evidence-based decision-making, and stakeholder engagement indicates a well-rounded and strategic use of assessment to enhance school operations. However, the slightly lower ratings on process improvement and follow-through highlight areas that can be further strengthened to close the loop between assessment and action. Enhancing these areas can ensure that evaluation does not only inform but actively transform school practices.

Table 4
School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Communication

	Communication	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Build a community of learners among teachers	3.35	Very High
2	Open and transparent communication is practiced.	3.30	Very High
3	Information is disseminated clearly and timely.	3.50	Very High
4	Administrators actively listen to feedback from stakeholders.	3.40	Very High
5	Communication tools (e.g., memos, group chats, announcements) are used effectively.	3.55	Very High
6	Meetings are held regularly to address school concerns.	3.65	Very High
7	Teachers and staff feel heard and valued in discussions.	3.30	Very High
8	Concerns from parents and students are addressed promptly.	3.25	Very High
9	Communication supports collaboration and teamwork.	3.30	Very High
10	Builds a community of learners among teachers	3.35	Very High
	Mean	3.40	Very High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High
 2.51-3.25 – High
 1.76- 2.50- Low
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents Table 4 “School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Communication, which illustrates how school administrators foster effective communication within their schools. It includes ten indicators assessing key aspects of communication practices, such as transparency, responsiveness, feedback mechanisms, and the use of communication tools. Each item was rated using a Likert scale and interpreted through the weighted mean. With an overall mean of 3.40, the results fall within the “Very High” category, indicating that communication strategies are strongly implemented by school leaders. Among the indicators, the highest-rated is “Meetings are held regularly to address school concerns” with a weighted mean of 3.65, reflecting administrators’ commitment to routine and structured communication. This is followed closely by “Effective use of communication tools” (3.55) and “Information is disseminated clearly and timely” (3.50), emphasizing the importance of accessible and prompt information sharing in managing school operations. Similarly, “Actively listening to feedback from stakeholders” (3.40) and “Building a community of learners among teachers” (3.35) suggest that administrators are intentional about cultivating a collaborative and inclusive school culture.

Meanwhile, indicators such as “Open and transparent communication is practiced” (3.30), “Teachers and staff feel heard and valued in discussions” (3.30), and “Communication supports collaboration and teamwork” (3.30) affirm that communication is not only top-down but also encourages engagement and mutual respect. Although “Concerns from parents and students are addressed promptly” received the lowest score of 3.25, it still falls within the “Very High” category, indicating strong performance but also highlighting an opportunity to strengthen responsiveness to external stakeholders. The presence of duplicate entries like “Builds a community of learners among teachers” shows consistency in valuing professional relationships.

The overall mean rating of 3.40 signifies that school administrators have established very effective communication systems. This fosters trust, promotes collaboration, and enables a more responsive school environment. Effective communication is critical in ensuring all stakeholders, teachers, parents, students, and staff—are informed, engaged, and part of the decision-making process. However, the slightly lower score for addressing parent and student concerns suggests that while internal communication is strong, outreach and response mechanisms toward external stakeholders may need more attention.

Table 5
School Administrators' Management Approaches In Terms Of Supervision

	SUPERVISION	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Classroom observations are conducted regularly.	3.40	Very High
2	Constructive feedback is given after classroom observations.	3.35	Very High
3	Teachers are monitored for instructional effectiveness.	3.40	Very High
4	Supervisory visits are scheduled and documented.	3.28	Very High
5	Performance issues are addressed through coaching and mentoring.	3.56	Very High
6	Supervisory practices are non-threatening and developmental.	3.60	Very High
7	Monitoring extends to support staff performance.	3.40	Very High
8	Observation tools are aligned with professional standards.	3.55	Very High
9	Supervision contributes to continuous improvement.	3.60	Very High
10	Supervisory outcomes are used for staff development planning.	3.65	Very High
	Mean	3.48	Very High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High
 2.51-3.25 – High
 1.76- 2.50- Low
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the findings of Table 5 “School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Supervision, which outlines how school leaders carry out supervisory functions to support teaching and learning. The table features ten key indicators, each rated through a Likert scale and interpreted via weighted mean, covering aspects such as classroom observations, coaching, instructional monitoring, and the use of supervision data for staff development. With an overall average rating of 3.48, all indicators fall under the “Very High” interpretation, indicating a strong and consistent implementation of supervision practices among school administrators.

The highest-rated indicator is “Supervisory outcomes are used for staff development planning” with a weighted mean of 3.65, highlighting how administrators link supervision results to long-term professional growth. Following closely are “Supervisory practices are non-threatening and developmental” (3.60) and “Supervision contributes to continuous improvement” (3.60), emphasizing a positive and forward-looking approach to instructional leadership. The indicator “Performance issues are addressed through coaching and mentoring” (3.56) and “Observation tools are aligned with professional standards” (3.55) also received strong ratings, indicating that feedback mechanisms are both structured and aligned with quality benchmarks.

Other indicators such as “Classroom observations are conducted regularly”, “Teachers are monitored for instructional effectiveness”, and “Monitoring extends to support staff performance” each earned a rating of 3.40, suggesting that administrators maintain consistent oversight of teaching and non-teaching personnel. Additionally, “Constructive feedback after observations” (3.35) and “Supervisory visits are scheduled and documented” (3.28) demonstrate attention to the formal processes involved in supervision. Though slightly lower than the rest, these still received a “Very High” interpretation, confirming the structured and ongoing nature of supervision in the school setting.

The overall mean of 3.48, interpreted as “Very High”, implies that supervision is not only present but actively used to enhance the quality of instruction and staff performance. The data suggest that administrators are not merely evaluative in their supervision but adopt a developmental approach that prioritizes growth, mentoring, and alignment with professional standards. These practices help create a school culture that values continuous learning and collaborative improvement. However, to further elevate impact, administrators could ensure timely feedback cycles and broaden supervisory engagement with all levels of staff.

Table 6
School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Community Relations

	COMMUNITY RELATIONS	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	The administrator fosters strong partnerships with parents.	3.45	Very High
2	The school collaborates with local government and community organizations.	3.55	Very High
3	Programs involve community volunteers or stakeholders.	3.60	Very High
4	The school participates in community events or services.	3.70	Very High
5	Parent-teacher associations are active and engaged.	3.60	Very High
6	Regular updates are provided to the community about school activities.	3.75	Very High
7	Community support is mobilized for school initiatives.	3.60	Very High
8	The administrator addresses community concerns regarding the school.	3.60	Very High
9	Stakeholders are invited to participate in school decision-making.	3.80	Very High
10	The administrator fosters strong partnerships with parents.	3.85	Very High
	Mean	3.65	Very High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High
 2.51-3.25 – High
 1.76- 2.50- Low
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the findings under Table 6 “School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Community Relations, which evaluates how school leaders engage and collaborate with external stakeholders such as parents, community organizations, and local government units. The data reflects ten specific indicators, all receiving a “Very High” interpretation based on their weighted mean scores, which range from 3.45 to 3.85. The table

illustrates the administrators' efforts to strengthen ties between the school and the broader community, fostering a culture of partnership and shared responsibility for educational success.

The highest-rated indicator is “The administrator fosters strong partnerships with parents” with a weighted mean of 3.85, showing a robust effort to maintain family-school collaboration. This is followed closely by “Stakeholders are invited to participate in school decision-making” (3.80), which underscores the inclusive nature of leadership in the school. Additionally, “Regular updates are provided to the community about school activities” (3.75) and “The school participates in community events or services” (3.70) reflect the active involvement of schools in local community engagement and the transparent flow of communication with stakeholders.

The remaining indicators also received commendable ratings: “Programs involve community volunteers or stakeholders”, “Parent-teacher associations are active and engaged”, “Community support is mobilized for school initiatives”, and “The administrator addresses community concerns” each received a consistent score of 3.60. These results suggest a well-established framework for involving external parties in school programs and maintaining mutual support. Meanwhile, “The school collaborates with local government and community organizations” (3.55) and “The administrator fosters strong partnerships with parents” (repeated indicator, 3.45) further reinforce the commitment to holistic community involvement.

The overall average rating of 3.65, interpreted as “Very High,” implies that school administrators are highly effective in maintaining productive relationships with the broader community. This result highlights a strong culture of partnership that supports school operations, enriches student learning experiences, and strengthens the institution’s role as a community pillar. The data suggests that when schools maintain open lines of communication and shared decision-making, they gain not only logistical support but also trust and long-term engagement from stakeholders.

Table 7
School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Staff Development

	STAFF DEVELOPMENT	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Training needs of staff are assessed regularly.	3.40	Very High
2	Professional development programs are aligned with staff needs.	3.50	Very High
3	Opportunities for continuing education are encouraged.	3.55	Very High
4	Learning from trainings is applied in classroom practice	3.55	Very High
5	Peer mentoring and coaching are practiced.	3.50	Very High
6	Teachers are supported in implementing innovations.	3.45	Very High
7	Performance evaluation informs development plans.	3.40	Very High
8	The administrator provides recognition for professional growth.	3.65	Very High
9	CPD (Continuing Professional Development) activities are documented.	3.75	Very High
10	A culture of lifelong learning is promoted.	3.80	Very High
	Mean	3.56	Very High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High
2.51-3.25 – High
1.76- 2.50- Low
1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the findings from Table 7 “School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Staff Development. The table outlines ten indicators used to evaluate how effectively school administrators support and promote professional growth among teaching and non-teaching staff. Each indicator was rated using a weighted mean scale, and all were interpreted as "Very High," reflecting a strong commitment to continuous staff capacity-building within the school system.

The indicator with the highest weighted mean is “A culture of lifelong learning is promoted” with a score of 3.80, emphasizing the school's emphasis on instilling continuous growth mindsets among staff. This is followed by “CPD (Continuing Professional Development) activities are documented” with 3.75, and “The administrator provides recognition for professional growth” at 3.65. These results signify not only the implementation of staff development initiatives but also the recognition and institutionalization of such practices. Additional strong indicators include “Opportunities for continuing education are encouraged” and “Learning from trainings is applied in classroom practice”, both with a mean of 3.55, indicating that professional development activities have practical relevance and are encouraged within the school. Peer mentoring (3.50), alignment of training with staff needs (3.50), and support for innovation (3.45) reflect the collaborative and adaptive nature of the administrators’ approach. Regular assessment of training needs and data-informed development planning, both scoring 3.40, also highlight a proactive approach to staff growth.

The overall mean of 3.56, interpreted as "Very High," implies that school administrators place significant importance on staff development as a key component of school improvement. These results suggest that administrators not only provide ample training opportunities but also ensure that these are aligned with teacher needs, embedded in classroom practice, and recognized formally. This high level of support can contribute to improved instructional practices, increased teacher motivation, and ultimately, better learner outcomes.

Table 8
School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Conflict Management

	CONFLICT MANAGEMENT	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Conflicts are addressed promptly and fairly.	3.30	Very High
2	The administrator listens to all sides before making decisions.	3.35	Very High
3	Conflict resolution processes are in place.	3.45	Very High
4	Staff feel safe reporting issues or concerns.	3.40	Very High
5	Conflicts are used as opportunities for growth and learning.	3.40	Very High
6	Confidentiality is maintained during conflict resolution.	3.35	Very High
7	Interpersonal issues are addressed before they escalate.	3.25	Very High
8	The administrator acts as a neutral mediator in conflicts.	3.35	Very High
9	Training on conflict resolution is available to staff.	3.55	Very High
10	Conflict resolution leads to improved team dynamics.	3.40	Very High
	Mean	3.38	Very High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High
 2.51-3.25 – High
 1.76- 2.50- Low
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the findings from Table 8 “School Administrators' Management Approaches in Terms of Conflict Management. It provides insights into how school leaders address conflicts within the school setting, as evaluated through ten key indicators. Each indicator was rated based on a weighted mean scale and interpreted using a standard legend, with all results falling within the "Very High" range. This suggests a strong presence of proactive and effective conflict management strategies in the schools surveyed. Among the ten indicators, “Training on conflict resolution is available to staff” received the highest rating with a weighted mean of 3.55, reflecting a commitment to equipping school personnel with the skills to handle conflicts constructively. This was followed closely by “Conflict resolution processes are in place” (3.45) and “Conflicts are used as opportunities for growth and learning” (3.40), both indicating a systems-based and developmental approach to conflict resolution. The same rating was given to “Staff feel safe reporting issues or concerns” and “Conflict resolution leads to improved team dynamics”, which highlights a psychologically safe and collaborative work environment.

Other notable indicators include “The administrator listens to all sides before making decisions” and “Confidentiality is maintained during conflict resolution”, both at 3.35, indicating fairness and ethical standards in handling disputes. Similarly, “The administrator acts as a neutral mediator in conflicts” was rated 3.35, reinforcing the impartiality of administrators. The lowest, though still “Very High,” rating was 3.25 for “Interpersonal issues are addressed before they escalate,” pointing to a possible area for more proactive engagement.

With an overall mean of 3.38, interpreted as “Very High,” the results imply that school administrators are generally effective in managing conflicts in a fair, timely, and professional manner. These practices help build a supportive school climate and minimize disruptions that

could affect teaching and learning. The slightly lower rating in early conflict identification suggests an opportunity for administrators to enhance their responsiveness before issues grow into formal conflicts. Strengthening early intervention strategies and increasing awareness among staff may further improve the school climate.

Table 9
IPCRF of the Teachers

A.	Performance Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.45	Outstanding
2	Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	4.55	Outstanding
3	Curriculum and Planning, Reporting and Assessment	4.60	Outstanding
4	Community Linkages & Professional Engagement	4.40	Outstanding
5	Professional Growth and Development	4.48	Outstanding
	AVERAGE	4.37	Outstanding

Legend: 4.21- 5.00 – Outstanding
 3.41- 4.20 – Very Satisfactory
 2.61-3.40 - Satisfactory
 1.81- 2.60- Fairly Satisfactory
 1.00-1.80- Needs Improvement

This table presents Table 9 “IPCRF of the Teachers, which outlines the performance ratings of teachers based on the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). The IPCRF is a standard tool used by the Department of Education to assess and monitor the performance of teachers in various key result areas. The table includes five performance indicators; each rated with a weighted mean and interpreted using a five-point performance scale. The results reflect the overall effectiveness of teachers in their professional roles during the evaluation period. Among the five indicators, the highest weighted mean was recorded in "Curriculum and Planning, Reporting and Assessment" with a score of 4.60, interpreted as Outstanding. This indicates that teachers are highly competent in planning lessons, delivering instruction aligned with the curriculum, and assessing learners accurately. It was followed closely by "Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners" at 4.55, which suggests that teachers are creating inclusive and supportive environments that respect the diverse backgrounds and needs of their students.

Other indicators such as "Professional Growth and Development" (4.48), "Content Knowledge and Pedagogy" (4.45), and "Community Linkages & Professional Engagement" (4.40) were also rated as Outstanding. These results reflect a teaching force that is not only knowledgeable and skilled but also actively engaged in continuous learning and collaborative work with parents, stakeholders, and the broader community. The consistently high ratings across all areas suggest strong commitment and professionalism among the teaching staff.

The overall average rating of 4.37, which falls under the Outstanding category, implies that the teachers have exceeded performance expectations in all measured competencies. This level of performance supports high-quality instruction, positive learner outcomes, and effective school

operations. It also reflects the successful implementation of professional development programs and school leadership initiatives aimed at enhancing teaching practices.

Table 10
Test Of Relationship

Variables Correlated	r	Computed value or t	Table Value @.05	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Planning vs IPCRF	0.65	3.221	0.956	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Strong)
Implementation VS IPCRF	0.67	3.422	0.956	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Strong)
Assessment VS IPCRF	0.62	3.041	0.956	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Strong)
Communication VS IPCRF	0.71	3.938	0.956	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Strong)
Supervision VS IPCRF	0.68	3.624	0.956	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Strong)
Community relations VS IPCRF	0.66	3.410	0.956	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Strong)
Staff development VS IPCRF	0.65	3.221	0.956	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Strong)
Conflict Management VS IPCRF	0.66	3.410	0.956	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Strong)

This table presents Table 10 “Test of Relationship, which shows the statistical correlation between various school administrators’ management approaches—such as planning, implementation, assessment, communication, supervision, community relations, staff development, and conflict management—and the IPCRF (Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form) ratings of teachers. The table includes the correlation coefficient (r), computed t-values, the table value at a 0.05 significance level, the decision on the null hypothesis (Ho), and the interpretation of the relationship. The aim of this analysis is to determine whether these administrative functions significantly impact teacher performance.

All variables analyzed in this table showed a strong and significant relationship with teacher performance, as measured by the IPCRF. The highest correlation was observed between Communication and IPCRF ($r = 0.71$), indicating that effective communication by administrators strongly enhances teacher performance. This was followed closely by Supervision vs IPCRF ($r =$

0.68) and Implementation vs IPCRF ($r = 0.67$), both suggesting that regular guidance and efficient execution of school programs contribute significantly to professional excellence.

Other variables also demonstrated strong correlations: Planning ($r = 0.65$), Community Relations ($r = 0.66$), Staff Development ($r = 0.65$), and Conflict Management ($r = 0.66$). These results confirm that supportive leadership, community collaboration, and proactive conflict resolution contribute to a positive work environment and higher teacher effectiveness. Notably, Assessment vs IPCRF had a slightly lower but still strong correlation of 0.62, emphasizing the value of ongoing evaluation and data-informed decisions in refining teacher practices.

Based on the computed values it implies that all variables exceeded the table value of 0.956 and led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, thereby confirming that there is a statistically significant relationship between school administrators' management approaches and teacher performance. The strength of these correlations suggests that administrators play a critical role in enabling and sustaining high-quality teaching. Consequently, investing in leadership training, communication practices, and strategic planning should be a priority to further elevate performance across educational institutions.

IV. Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, the results of the Test of Relationship clearly demonstrate that all aspects of school administrators' management approaches—ranging from planning to conflict management—have a strong and statistically significant relationship with teachers' performance as measured by the IPCRF. The rejection of the null hypothesis across all variables confirms that effective school leadership is a vital contributor to teacher effectiveness. With the highest correlation found in communication, followed closely by supervision and implementation, it becomes evident that administrators who actively engage, guide, and support their teachers create an environment that fosters professional growth and improved instructional quality. These findings underscore the need for sustained investment in leadership development, collaborative culture, and evidence-based decision-making to maximize educational outcomes.

V. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that the utilization of the intervention plan be Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed to various stakeholders to enhance the effectiveness of school administrators' management approaches and improve teacher performance:

1. Teachers are encouraged to actively engage in open communication with school administrators and provide constructive feedback that can guide managerial improvements. They should also participate in capacity-building activities and embrace supervision and mentoring as opportunities for growth and professional advancement.

2. School administrators must prioritize consistent, transparent, and inclusive communication practices. They are urged to strengthen implementation, supervision, and planning processes by involving all stakeholders and aligning efforts with clear goals. Investing in leadership training and fostering a collaborative school environment will contribute significantly to improved teacher performance.
3. The PSDS should monitor and support the continuous professional development of school leaders, ensuring that they are equipped with the skills to implement effective management practices. Regular training on strategic planning, instructional supervision, conflict resolution, and stakeholder engagement should be institutionalized.
4. Parents should be encouraged to actively participate in school programs and collaborate with school personnel. Their involvement in decision-making processes and support for school activities play a crucial role in enhancing the overall educational climate, which in turn influences teacher motivation and performance.
5. The researcher recommends sharing these findings with stakeholders through professional learning communities or conferences to promote awareness of the vital role of administrative approaches in improving educational outcomes. Continued monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations is also suggested to assess long-term impact.
6. Future researchers may consider conducting similar studies in other districts or regions to validate these findings. They are also encouraged to explore the influence of other variables such as student performance, school climate, or parental involvement on teacher effectiveness to gain a more comprehensive understanding of school improvement dynamics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to praise and thank God, the Almighty, for His countless blessings, knowledge, and opportunities granted to me, enabling me to pursue graduate studies.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to those who have been instrumental in the successful completion of this thesis.

Dr. Bryant C. Acar, Chairman, for his meticulous review and indefatigable effort in improving the study.

I would also like to express my deep and sincere gratitude to my research adviser, Dr. Annabelle A. Wenceslao, for her encouragement, enthusiasm, and guidance throughout this research and the writing of this thesis. I cannot thank her enough for her tremendous help.

My sincere thanks go to the rest of the thesis committee— Dr. Bryant C. Acar, Jasmine B. Misa and Dr. Elvin H. Wenceslao—for their valuable assistance and recommendations toward the realization of this study.

I wish to acknowledge the help provided by my co-teachers in the distribution and retrieval of the School Administration Management Approaches tool

Lastly, I would like to express my deep appreciation to my family for being with me throughout the entire journey of my Master's. Your love, support, and encouragement have meant everything to me.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brown, C., & Johnson, M. (2018). Transactional leadership styles and teacher performance in Australian secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(4), 321-335
- [2] Hallinger, P. (2011). *Leadership for 21st century schools: From instructional leadership to leadership for learning*. Springer.
- [3] Lopez, C., & Kim, S. (2018). Managerial competence of school heads, teacher satisfaction, and student performance in Technology and Livelihood Education. *Journal of School Leadership*, 15(1), 102-115.
- [4] Santos, R. M. (2020). Impact of managerial competence on teacher satisfaction and student performance in Technology and Livelihood Education. *Journal of Educational Management*, 35(3), 215-230.

AUTHOR'S PROFILE



MARY ARCELLE N. ANDUYO

The author was born on February 21, 1996, in Ormoc City, Leyte, Philippines. She earned her Bachelor's degree in Elementary Education from Saint Peter's College of Ormoc. During her high school and college years, she developed a strong interest in supervision and leadership, actively serving as a leader in various student organizations. These experiences inspired her to pursue a specialization in administration and supervision. She is currently finishing her Master of Arts in Education, major in School Administration and Supervision, at Western Leyte College of Ormoc City.

She is currently a Teacher II under the Department of Education and serves as a Grade – I Teacher at Donghol Integrated School in Barangay Donghol Ormoc City, Leyte, Philippines. She serves as both a School Records Coordinator, and a School Guidance Designate. She believes that supervising and monitoring student performance and behavior are essential to support student success and overall well-being.