

**Management function, performance and school outcomes
towards a management-outcome alignment framework**

Rowena B. Abante*

Malago Mangyan School, Schools Division of Oriental Mindoro., Oriental Mindoro,
Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study focused on the relationship between management functions, school heads' performance, and school outcomes in public elementary schools in Oriental Mindoro. The study employed a descriptive quantitative design employing multiple linear regression analysis to analyze the relationships between the variables. The respondents were composed of 238, which is a combination of 119 head teachers and 119 teachers from public elementary schools in 14 Districts in the Division of Oriental Mindoro. Data were gathered through a self-made questionnaire, Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) and document analysis based on school record. The results indicated that the management functions were very high, while the performances were very satisfactory, especially in instructional leadership. The schools also produced favorable achievements with regard to a high rate of enrollment, promotion, retention, and cohort survival rate, but low repetition and school leavers. The study further found that leading was the strongest management function influencing school head performance and selected school outcomes, while organizing and controlling showed some negative effects on certain indicators. Instructional leadership was positively associated with student retention, whereas school leadership and management operations were negatively related to gross enrollment rate. Moreover, the performance of school heads did not mediate the relationship between management functions and school outcomes, suggesting that broader contextual and external factors also influence school performance. Based on these findings, the study proposed the Management-Outcome Alignment Framework (MOAF), which highlights the importance of integrating management functions, leadership performance, stakeholder participation, contextual factors, and continuous feedback mechanisms to improve school effectiveness and educational outcomes.

Keywords: Management function, performance, school outcomes, management-outcome alignment framework.

Date Submitted: July 13, 2026

Date Accepted: July 20, 2026

Date Published: August 13, 2026

*Corresponding author / Email: wenjerebecoy2022@gmail.com
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031456>

Recommended citation:

Abante, R. B. (2026). Management function, performance and school outcomes towards a management-outcome alignment framework. *Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (3), 3205-3217.
<http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031456>

INTRODUCTION

It is recognized that effective management practice is essential for enhancing the performance of students. Some studies have revealed that there is a relationship between effective management practice and success in schools since the rates of academic success are high in schools where there is good administration (Di Liberto, 2023). This dissertation argues that a clear, management-outcome aligned framework connecting management practices, teacher performance, and school outcomes is crucial to success and serves as a road map for achieving it. Effective management techniques are crucial for enhancing teachers' performance, which has a significant effect on the success of the entire school. According to Javornik & Mirazchiyski (2023), effective school leadership is linked to the benefits that students reap from their performances, which include high levels of accomplishments, as well as graduation rates. In contemporary schools, there is a need for structured management that focuses on specific goals to create an atmosphere in which both learners and tutors can thrive.

At the global level, efficient management plays a critical role in ensuring efficient teaching practices, leading to improved school performance. Important aspects include effective leadership, a collaborative organizational culture, professional development opportunities, decision-making based on evidence, and a focus on student-centered teaching. Poposa and Kumar (2019) assert that, in a highly globalized world, the ability of any organization to survive and succeed depends on the amount of priority and investment placed in the education and training of its staff to boost efficiency and maximize productivity. Literature shows that schools with efficient performance management systems usually perform better. It reveals that schools with efficient performance management systems tend to be more effective. Research studies have found a significant connection between classroom management techniques and academic performance of the students, implying that teachers need to possess these skills (Aquino et al., 2021). The performance of teachers determines the quality of education offered globally, and most efforts to improve education have been centered on this correlation. Teachers encounter numerous obstacles, such as increased workload, inadequate resources, and low salary compared to other occupations with similar.

There are different initiatives introduced by DepEd that help improve the process of school management. The Enhanced Basic Education Curriculum is focused on the concept of learner-centeredness and continuous improvement, which play a central role in achieving set educational objectives. Among those reforms is School-Based Management (SBM), which is a process meant to decentralize decision-making and increase educational efficiency. The legislation, specifically the Republic Act 9155 of 2001, promotes different local initiatives for school improvement. According to available research, SBM leads to improved results through enhanced involvement of local stakeholders in the management process as well as increased effectiveness of resource management (Melchor & Gamaya, 2021).

On the other hand, effective teachers and quality education are also influenced greatly by the leadership traits of the administrators of these institutions. Leaders create good environments where teachers grow and students participate actively (Aquino, 2021). In addition to this, recent studies suggest that headmasters' effectiveness also contributes considerably towards successful schools and is largely influenced by the adoption of different leadership styles in urban as well as rural areas. As noted by Malik et al. (2022), urban headmasters exhibit better leadership qualities compared to their rural counterparts.

The management practices and challenges at the local level, especially in Oriental Mindoro, various issues and advantages that impact the learning environment and system used by the schools. There is a need for an effective system in these areas due to the diversity of cultures available in this region. The schools in this province have started implementing some new methods of teaching and assessing which are based on national standards while keeping

in view the local context, as stated by the Provincial Planning and Development Office of Oriental Mindoro (2020). This strategy not only helps them in gaining knowledge but also in growing up in all aspects. The management of teachers and their performance in classes is quite similar to that in other schools, but they have been adjusted in light of regional problems. Various studies have shown that teachers in such schools are highly skilled while administrators have strong leadership qualities.

Findings obtained from the study have shown that particular teaching approaches are very important in enhancing the performance of learners (Hattie, 2015). Whereas many studies indicate a positive correlation between efficient management structures and good performance, there is an evident problem on the inability to gauge the level of correlation between certain aspects of management and success in schools. Another problem is the lack of a framework linking certain management approaches to teacher performance. This paper attempts to solve this problem by examining it from different angles. What are the management functions of head teachers and teachers? How do teachers perform at work? What are the school outcomes? How does the management function correlate with the performance of the school heads? How does the management function correlate with school outcomes? How does the performance of teachers correlate with school outcomes? These questions will allow the researcher to explore and answer all the research inquiries.

The purpose or objectives of the research were based on investigating the existence or lack of a correlation between the management functions and the performance of school heads. The research objectives were to establish the extent of influence of management functions, which include planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. Meanwhile, the performance of the school heads was based on instructional leadership, the learning environment, human resources management and development, parents' involvement, community partnership, and school leadership and management operations. It will also be important to develop ways of measuring the performance of academic programs.

Importance of the study is justified on the basis of how the findings of the research could enhance the quality of education and learning process. Also, by analyzing how certain management practices affect the performance of schools, the present research can identify those methods which would improve the performance of schools.

In addition, creation of a management-outcome alignment framework can provide an opportunity for examining learning outcomes, aligning them with organizational objectives, and finally improving educational quality and relevancy. This paper seeks to investigate the Management-Outcome Alignment Framework, which will combine successful management techniques and performance measures. In addition, the research contributes to academic literature and provides useful information for school administrators who want to enhance their work. The following chapters will discuss the theoretical underpinning of this framework, as well as its influence on school performance and suggestions for applying it in practice.

Statement of the problem

The purpose or objectives of the research were based on investigating the existence or lack of a correlation between the management functions and the performance of school heads.

This research aimed:

1. To access the extent of influence of management functions, which include planning, organizing, leading, and controlling.
2. To evaluate the performance of the school heads was based on instructional leadership, the learning environment, human resources management and development, parents'

involvement, community partnership, and school leadership and management operations.

3. To access the level of school outcomes of the school of the school heads in terms of access indicators, efficiency indicators, and ratio and proportion.
4. To determine if there is a significant relationship between the management functions of the school heads and school outcomes.
5. To determine if there is a significant relationship between the management functions and performance of the school heads.
6. To determine if there is a significant relationship between the performance of the school heads and school outcomes.
7. To investigate the performance of the school heads mediate the effect of management functions to school outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a descriptive-quantitative research design to provide a systematic and accurate description of the management functions, performance levels, and school outcomes of public elementary school head teachers and teachers in the Division of Oriental Mindoro. The descriptive approach was employed to assess management functions based on their indicators and to determine the levels of performance and school outcomes among the respondents. To examine the relationships among the variables, multiple linear regression analysis was used. This statistical technique enabled the researcher to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between management functions and the performance of school heads and teachers, as well as their influence on school outcomes, in line with the Management–Outcome Alignment Framework.

Sample/population of the study

The respondents were composed of two hundred thirty-eight (238) which is a combination of one hundred nineteen (119) head teachers and one hundred nineteen (119) teachers from public elementary schools in different Districts in the Division of Oriental Mindoro. The sample was drawn from a population of three hundred forty-two (342) public elementary head teachers and teachers who have worked in a specific public elementary school in the Division of Oriental Mindoro. The participants could be male or female and there is no age limitation.

The participants sampling pool was limited to those participants solicited for this research as defined in this study. An informed consent form, as shown in Appendix, was required for each participant prior to participating. The researcher anticipated approximately 238 participants for this study, as respondents have the right to discontinue their involvement in the study at any point as part of ethical consideration.

Data gathering tools

This study utilized two primary data gathering tools. The first one is a self-made questionnaire that will measure management functions of the school heads. The second one is Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) specifically for measuring performance of the school heads.

And the last instrument is gathered through documentary analysis based on records for school outcome. These were constructed based on pertinent DEPED Orders, Memoranda and the DepEd Resource Utilization Manual. Intensive reading of the reviewed body of literature

and studies also will help the researcher gather information to support the solicitation of response on the three variables on management.

Data gathering procedure

The initial part of data gathering involved conducting a pilot test on the researcher-made questionnaire to confirm the validity and reliability of the instrument. Once the validity and reliability of the tool were validated, the researcher distributed the questionnaire via Google Forms, along with the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) for the academic year 2023-2024 to evaluate the performance of school heads. The school outcome data were collected from previous school records to augment the information obtained from the survey and performance assessment tools. Google Forms made data gathering easy as well as data storage with reduced data entry errors. During data gathering, the researcher adhered to all ethical principles, including obtaining the consent of the respondents and enough time for completing the assessment tools.

Treatment of data

Several statistical methods were adopted to measure the results obtained from the data collected during the research process. Mean was applied to calculate and measure management functions, performance of principals and school outcome levels by calculating their averages. Rank was adopted to rank and distinguish management functions and performance measures depending on their level of significance. Regression was utilized to determine the magnitude and nature of relationships that exist between dependent and independent variables, as well as to find out the influence of management functions on school outcome level. In addition, mediation was used to examine whether performance acts as a mediator in influencing school outcome depending on management functions.

Ethical considerations

The school heads and teachers were informed in detail about the study's objectives, procedures, risks, and benefits prior to the data collection. Each respondent's informed consent was sought, highlighting their voluntary participation, right to withdraw at any time, and confidentiality guarantee. There was ample time for them to read the consent form, ask questions, and decide whether or not they wanted to participate. They were also asked when they found it easiest to respond to the survey questionnaire about the best management functions, performances and institutional performances. During the data collection, strict measures were taken to keep school heads' confidentiality. Anonymization and secure storage of all collected data will be used. Each respondent was given a unique identifier, and the data was kept separate from any personal identifying information. Throughout the study, confidentiality was upheld, and only the researcher has access to the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study examined the management functions, performance, and school outcomes of school heads in public elementary schools within the Division of Oriental Mindoro, drawing on data gathered from head teacher and teacher respondents through a descriptive correlational research design. A structured survey questionnaire served as the primary data collection

instrument, and the data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as means and interpretive descriptors, as well as regression and correlation analyses to determine the relationships among management functions, performance indicators, and school outcome measures, alongside a mediation analysis to test whether performance mediates the effect of management functions on outcomes. The discussion that follows is grounded entirely in the data gathered, and all results are interpreted in direct relation to the objectives of the study, which sought to assess the management functions and performance of school heads, describe school outcomes, and examine the relationships and mediating pathways among these variables.

With respect to the management function of planning, results showed a Very High degree of management activities among the school heads, as reflected in the average total mean score of 4.25 for the headteachers and 4.33 for the teachers. This implies that the school heads are very efficient when it comes to strategic, tactical, and operational planning. Other areas rated lower but still classified under a High degree included understanding stakeholders' roles, measuring their performance, and working together to develop the yearly work plan. In terms of organizing, the school heads demonstrated a Very High level of management functions, with a total mean score of 4.43 for the headteachers and 4.30 for the teachers. The highest rated areas included creating a school environment that promotes efficient work, assigning tasks based on teachers' strengths, and encouraging the sharing of ideas and best practices among teachers, while lower rated areas included assigning tasks according to designated roles, monitoring progress based on resource allocation, and strengthening leadership support, indicating a need for improvement in role clarification, supervision, and leadership practices. With regard to leading, both the head teachers, with a mean of 4.20, and the teachers, with a mean of 4.32, rated the performance of the heads in their role as leaders as Very High, denoting high performance in communicating, motivating, delegating, and developing professionally. The most highly rated practices were maintaining communication, displaying leadership behavior, and fostering the professional development of teachers, implying that the school heads are able to foster a productive and cooperative school environment, although practices such as monitoring students' progress, appreciating the efforts of teachers, and assessing delegated activities were rated lower. For controlling, the head teachers (4.35) and the teachers (4.21) viewed the performance of the school heads as Very High, meaning the school heads were very effective in managing budgets, staffing, and accountability processes. The areas where the school heads scored very high included analysis of the teacher to student ratio, budgetary control and audit measures, and budget communication, meaning that the school heads give priority to fair distribution of resources and a favorable learning environment; however, hiring of skilled teachers was the worst performing area among others. As summarized in Table 1, planning obtained an overall mean of 4.29 (Very High), organizing obtained an overall mean of 4.37 (Very High), leading obtained an overall mean of 4.27 (Very High), and controlling obtained an overall mean of 4.28 (Very High), yielding an overall management functions mean of 4.31 (Very High) for the head teachers and 4.29 (Very High) for the teachers, with a combined overall mean of 4.30 (Very High). Of the four functions of management, planning obtained the best scores from the two groups, implying high efficiency on the part of the managers in achieving organizational objectives. Similarly, the other functions, organizing, leading, and controlling, also obtained good scores from the two sets of respondents, though minor challenges were observed in the aspects of coordination, leadership uniformity, and supervision. From these findings, it is evident that school heads are efficient in the performance of all the functions of management, with planning being their most effective function, while leadership and controlling should be improved upon. The findings validate the theory posited by Robbins and Coulter (2018), that management is more than just planning and organizing. Turning to the performance of the school heads, instructional leadership obtained a

mean of 4.73 (quality = 4.68, efficiency = 4.77, timeliness = 4.75), described as Very High and very satisfactory, and was the highest rated performance indicator among all domains assessed. The learning environment domain came fourth from the highest performance indicators with a mean of 4.40 (quality = 4.38, efficiency = 4.38, timeliness = 4.43), described as High and very satisfactory. Human resource management and development came second from the highest performance indicators with a mean of 4.61 (quality = 4.56, efficiency = 4.59, timeliness = 4.68), described as Very High and very satisfactory. Parents' involvement and community partnership came third from the highest performance indicators with a mean of 4.57 (quality = 4.44, efficiency = 4.71, timeliness = 4.57), described as Very High and very satisfactory. School leadership and management operations came last among the performance indicators with a mean of 4.11 (quality = 4.00, efficiency = 4.18, timeliness = 4.15), described as High and very satisfactory. As summarized in Table 2, the overall performance ratings were 4.41 for quality, 4.53 for efficiency, and 4.52 for timeliness, yielding an overall performance mean of 4.48, described as High. The school heads showed very high performance in areas such as efficiency ($M = 4.53$) and effectiveness, referring to timeliness ($M = 4.52$), whereas the quality of results was still not up to par relative to the other measures ($M = 4.41$). The highest rated domain was instructional leadership ($M = 4.73$, Very High), showing that school principals have put great effort into their focus on learning, teaching, and curriculum leadership, which helps increase students' achievement. Other domains where school heads performed highly included human resource management and development ($M = 4.61$) and parents' involvement and community partnership ($M = 4.57$). On the other hand, school leadership and management operations received the lowest rating ($M = 4.11$, High) because of low participation in school research, which is crucial for decision making and innovations in education. Moreover, the learning environment domain ($M = 4.40$, High) reflected a medium implementation of health and sanitation programs, although school leaders managed to implement strategies connected with safety and disaster management well.

With respect to school outcomes, access indicators revealed that the public elementary schools in the Division of Oriental Mindoro obtained a generally very high overall gross enrollment rate (GER) of 98.36%, indicating near universal access to schooling, and a transition rate of 99.57%, indicating that most students are able to move on to the next level due to effective retention and promotion practices. In terms of efficiency indicators, the promotion or graduation rate was 99.29%, indicating that the majority of students graduate on time; the repetition rate was low at 1.50%, indicating effective learning and teaching processes; and the school leaver rate was low at 1.25%. The cohort survival rate (CSR) was high at 96.43%, demonstrating that most students remain in school throughout their expected years, while the retention rate was high at 98.50%, indicating support for sustained student attendance. With regard to ratio and proportion indicators, the teacher-learner ratio was high at 49:1, suggesting that classrooms may be large, potentially impacting individual attention; the classroom-learner ratio was likewise high at 49:1, indicating a similarly large class size; and the computer-learner ratio was high at 12:1, suggesting that students have access to computer resources.

Regarding the relationship between the management functions of the school heads and school outcomes, findings revealed that most school outcome measures, namely gross enrollment rate, transition rate, promotion or graduation rate, repetition rate, school leaver rate, retention rate, and computer-learner ratio, were not significantly predicted by organizing, leading, or controlling ($p > 0.05$ for all), leading to a failure to reject the null hypothesis for these outcome variables. In contrast, as shown in Table 3, cohort survival rate was significantly predicted by organizing ($B = -3.070$), leading ($B = 5.705$), and controlling ($B = -3.608$);

teacher-learner ratio was significantly predicted by organizing ($B = -4.701$), leading ($B = 8.250$), and controlling ($B = -3.716$); and classroom-learner ratio was significantly predicted by the same coefficients as teacher-learner ratio, namely organizing ($B = -4.701$), leading ($B = 8.250$), and controlling ($B = -3.716$), all at $p < 0.05$, resulting in a rejection of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship for these three outcome variables. Specifically, leading had a positive effect on cohort survival rate, teacher-learner ratio, and classroom-learner ratio, indicating that successful leadership helps achieve high student retention as well as proper teacher and classroom allocation, whereas organizing and controlling exerted a negative effect on these same outcome measures.

With respect to the relationship between the management functions and performance of the school heads, as summarized in Table 4, all four management functions showed statistically significant relationships with performance across all fields assessed, leading to a rejection of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship. Planning showed a low to moderate positive relationship with performance indicators, with standardized beta values ranging from approximately 0.21 to 0.41, consistently significant across all areas. Organizing demonstrated a moderate positive relationship, with beta values ranging from approximately 0.20 to 0.52, highlighting its importance in resource coordination and system efficiency. Leading exhibited the strongest and most consistent positive influence, with beta values ranging from approximately 0.30 to 0.62, reinforcing its critical role in school effectiveness. Controlling showed a moderate positive relationship, with beta values ranging from approximately 0.19 to 0.43, indicating that monitoring and evaluation contribute to improved school performance. Of the four management functions tested, leading proved to have the strongest and most consistent relationship with performance, stressing the significance of guidance and motivation in managing schools, while organizing also showed significant relationships across all fields, underscoring the necessity of coordination; planning and controlling showed moderate positive correlations with performance across all fields, pointing to their significance in goal-setting and performance monitoring.

Concerning the relationship between the performance of the school heads and school outcomes, as summarized in Table 5, the performance of school heads was not significantly correlated with most school outcome measures, including transition rate, promotion or graduation rate, school leaver rate, cohort survival rate, teacher-learner ratio, and classroom-learner ratio and computer-learner ratio, resulting in a failure to reject the null hypothesis for these variables. Gross enrollment rate showed a significant negative correlation only with school leadership and management operations ($p = 0.036$), while other leadership dimensions were not significant predictors, leading to a rejection of the null hypothesis specifically for this leadership indicator. For repetition rate, human resource management and development ($p = 0.260$) and school leadership and management operations ($p = 0.354$) were noted in the summary table, but since both p values exceed the 0.05 level of significance, these correlations were not statistically significant, and the null hypothesis was not rejected for repetition rate. Retention rate showed a significant positive correlation with instructional leadership ($p = 0.043$), resulting in a rejection of the null hypothesis for this relationship and highlighting the importance of instructional leadership in keeping students engaged and participative. Overall, these findings indicate that instructional leadership plays an important role in improving retention among school performance indicators, while the remaining performance domains do not significantly affect most school outcome measures.

With regard to whether the performance of the school heads mediates the effect of management functions on school outcomes, the necessary statistical assumptions were evaluated prior to conducting the mediation analysis, specifically the presence of significant relationships between the independent variable of management functions, the mediator of performance, and the dependent variable of school outcomes, as well as linearity, normality of

residuals, absence of multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity. Upon analysis, the assumption regarding significant relationships between the variables was not met, as the correlation analyses indicated that there were no statistically significant relationships between management functions and performance, and between performance and school outcomes. Because a significant relationship between variables is a prerequisite for mediation analysis, the mediation model could not be validly tested, and the null hypothesis regarding the mediating role of performance could not be rejected on the basis of a valid mediation test. Drawing on Systems Theory (Katz and Kahn, 1978), school outcomes are shaped by many interconnected factors, and leadership alone may not predict change; furthermore, Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) elaborates that broader community and systemic variables such as poverty, infrastructure, and policy may override or mask the effect of school head performance. Within the Management-Outcome Alignment Framework (MOAF), it became clear that despite the relevance of management activities and performance of school principals to school achievement, there was no correlation between them and school achievement, and hence any attempt aimed at improving performance in schools should focus on the incorporation of management activities within a broader context that takes into account various enabling factors, feedback systems, and the participation of stakeholders.

Taken together, the findings of this study demonstrate that school heads exhibit consistently Very High levels of management functions across planning (overall mean = 4.29), organizing (overall mean = 4.37), leading (overall mean = 4.27), and controlling (overall mean = 4.28), alongside generally High to Very High performance across instructional leadership ($M = 4.73$), human resource management and development ($M = 4.61$), parents' involvement and community partnership ($M = 4.57$), learning environment ($M = 4.40$), and school leadership and management operations ($M = 4.11$), and favorable school outcome indicators across access, efficiency, and ratio measures. At the same time, the data reveal a nuanced and selective pattern of relationships, wherein leading emerges as a consistently significant and positive predictor of both performance and select outcome measures such as cohort survival rate, teacher-learner ratio, and classroom-learner ratio, while organizing and controlling, despite their significant relationships with performance, exert negative effects on these same outcome variables, and instructional leadership alone shows a significant positive relationship with retention rate among the outcome measures. Furthermore, the failure to meet the statistical assumptions required for mediation analysis indicates that performance does not serve as a validly testable mediating mechanism linking management functions to school outcomes in this dataset, a result that resonates with Systems Theory and Ecological Systems Theory in underscoring that school outcomes are shaped by a wider network of interconnected and contextual factors beyond leadership and management practices alone. These findings collectively address the objectives of the study by characterizing the management functions and performance of school heads, describing school outcomes, and clarifying the specific, limited, and directionally varied pathways through which management functions and performance relate to these outcomes, thereby contributing to the literature on educational leadership and management by offering an empirically grounded, context-specific account of how these constructs interact within the Division of Oriental Mindoro. These findings set the foundation for the discussion presented in the succeeding chapter, which addresses the summary of findings, conclusions drawn from the data, and recommendations for strengthening school leadership and management practices toward improved educational outcomes.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study lead to the conclusion that the heads of schools in the Division of Oriental Mindoro are exemplary managers, demonstrating consistent proficiency across the fundamental functions of planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. This managerial competence has translated into the efficient overall administration of their respective schools, reflecting an ability to align organizational processes with institutional goals. Complementing this managerial strength, the performance of these school heads is likewise excellent, particularly in the areas of instructional leadership, human resource management, and community partnerships. Their effectiveness in these domains has fostered productivity and cooperation among stakeholders, reinforcing the notion that strong management practices and strong leadership performance operate hand in hand to sustain a well-functioning school environment.

Despite these commendable managerial and leadership qualities, the study also revealed a more complex picture when examining actual school outcomes. Public elementary schools in the Division of Oriental Mindoro have generally produced positive results in terms of promotion, graduation, and retention of students, yet they continue to grapple with high drop out and repetition rates. Large classroom sizes were identified as a persistent hindrance to personalized teaching, suggesting that structural and resource related constraints may temper the otherwise positive effects of competent school management. This finding indicates that while leadership and management practices are strong contributors to school success, they are not the sole determinants of favorable outcomes.

Further analysis showed that positive results in student retention and the attainment of optimum teacher student ratios can be attributed to good leadership, whereas organizational and control activities may yield either positive or negative effects depending on the context in which they are applied. Notably, enrollment and graduation rates appeared to be largely unaffected by management activities, pointing to the influence of factors beyond the direct control of school administrators. In particular, the instructional leadership performance of school heads was found to exert a significant influence on student retention rates, while an overemphasis on managerial activities may inadvertently contribute to lower enrollment rates. This suggests that a careful balance must be struck between administrative oversight and instructional focus in order to optimize school performance.

Taken together, these findings underscore that school outcomes are shaped not only by the leadership and managerial performance of school heads but also by numerous extraneous variables, including environmental and policy influences as well as broader organizational issues. This implies that leadership performance, while essential, functions within a wider ecosystem of factors that collectively determine the success or limitations of a school. In light of these conclusions, it is recommended that further research be conducted to examine how the demonstrated excellence in planning, organizing, leading, and controlling among head teachers translates into measurable impacts on learner and teacher performance, as well as how such practices compare across other divisions or sections. Similarly, the excellence observed in instructional leadership, human resource management, and community relations warrants deeper investigation into the specific practices that could inform and strengthen leadership development programs for school administrators.

To address the persistent challenges of dropout rates, repetition, and large class sizes, future research should explore innovative teaching approaches, more effective resource management strategies, the integration of technology, and targeted measures aimed at improving student retention. School administrators are encouraged to adopt a balanced approach to leadership, one that supports learner survival within cohorts and improves teacher to pupil ratios, while being mindful of the potential drawbacks of over organizing or over

controlling school operations. Equal consideration should be given to the impact of external forces that lie beyond the school's immediate influence. Future studies are also encouraged to investigate the limitations of planning and controlling practices, alongside strategies that could further enhance overall school performance.

Moreover, subsequent research should examine instructional leadership practices that effectively increase student engagement and retention, while also analyzing how variables such as school size, community involvement, and resource availability shape the relationship between leadership efficiency and school performance. Finally, given that the role of school administrators appears minimal in mediating the relationship between managerial activities and school performance, future studies are encouraged to explore the extent to which external factors independently influence school outcomes. Collectively, these conclusions and recommendations highlight the need for a holistic understanding of school performance, one that recognizes the vital contributions of effective leadership and management while accounting for the broader environmental, organizational, and policy related factors that ultimately shape educational outcomes in the Division of Oriental Mindoro.

REFERENCES

- Acera, J., & Tan, M. R. (2023). The influence of the school head's competencies and leadership practices towards their performance. <https://ijsshr.in/v6i5/60.php>
- Afalla, B. T. (2020). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*. <https://ijere.iaescore.com/index.php/IJERE/article/downloadSuppFile/21518/3171>
- Afram, K. O. O., Okeyo, W., & Kwarteng, C. (2024). Effect of school leadership on academic performance of public senior high schools in Ghana. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/effect-of-school-leadership-on-academic-performance-of-public-senior-high-schools-in-ghana/>
- Aquino, C. J. C., Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(4), 1325–1333. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21518>
- Battad, J. L. (2024). Instructional leadership skills of school heads and its relation to the self-efficacy of elementary teachers in Castillejos District. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(8), 3071–3078. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.08.12>
- Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dayuha, M. (2024). Management competence of school heads and the academic performance of secondary schools in Eastern Visayas. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 16(9), 956–966. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10578662>

Department of Education. (2020). National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf

Department of Education. (2024). Policy guidelines on the implementation of the revised School-Based Management System (DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2024_007.pdf

Devanadera, C., & Ching, D. (2023). School head's managerial roles as correlates of organizational performance. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 4(3), 110–133. <https://doi.org/10.53378/353015>

Di Liberto, A., Giua, L., Schivardi, F., Sideri, M., & Sulis, G. (2023). Managerial practices and student performance: Evidence from changes in school principals. *IZA Institute of Labor Economics*. <https://docs.iza.org/dp16203.pdf>

Fontillas, E., & Cabal, E. (2023). School management practices, pupils' academic achievement, and teachers' work performance during COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4, 976–986. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.03.27>

Gamala, J. J., & Marpa, E. P. (2022). School environment and school heads' managerial skills: Looking into their relationships to school's performance. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 4(2), 218–235. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonses.285>

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980–1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0924345980090203>

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>

Hasriani, H., Rosma, R., & Kasmawati, L. (2023). The role of principal management in improving teacher performance. *QISTINA: Jurnal Multidisiplin Indonesia*, 2, 796–804. <https://doi.org/10.57235/qistina.v2i2.714>

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40, 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>

Lustestica, J., & Digo, G. (2024). Assessment of school heads' management practices on teachers' professional development. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Educational Research Studies*, 4(6). <https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers/V04I6Y2024-02>

Malik, M. I., Akram, M., & Iqbal, Z. (2022). Comparing head teachers' effectiveness and school performance through teachers' ratings. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*. <https://pssr.org.pk/issues/v6/2/comparing-head-teachers-effectiveness-and-school-performance-through-teachers-ratings.pdf>

Memela, G. K. S., & Ramrathan, L. (2022). The perspective of school leadership and management: The role of the school principal in academic learner performance. *South African Journal of Education*, 42(2), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje>

Pacumba, A. A. (2024). Instructional leadership of school heads and followership styles of teachers as constructs of work performance of public elementary teachers of Cotabato City Division. *International Journal of Progressive Research in Engineering Management and Science*, 4(6), 162–168.

Quimerista, A. H. (2022). Leadership matters: An in-depth analysis of school heads' professional profile, leadership styles, and management functions in shaping teachers and school performance. *International Journal of Management and Research*, 10(3), 1–15. <https://eprajournals.com/IJMR/article/14067>

Sariakin, S., Yeni, M., Usman, M. B., Mare, A. S., Munzir, M., & Saleh, M. (2025). Fostering a productive educational environment: The roles of leadership, management practices, and teacher motivation. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1499064>

Silva, P., & Andal, E. (2023). School head's governance in managing school operations and resources as correlate of public elementary school's performance. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 127. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001271620235130>

Valenzuela, E., & Buenvinida, L. (2021). Managing school operations and resources in the new normal and performance of public schools in one school division in the Philippines. *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 3, 149–157. <https://doi.org/10.54476/iimrj296>

Willis, M., & Varner, L. (2010). Factors that affect teacher morale. *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal*, 8(4), 24. <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1524&context=alj>

Zhang, S. & Usaho, K. (2018). Factors affecting School Administration Effectiveness in Public Upper Secondary Schools of Heze City, Shandong Provinve, the People's Republic of China. Master's Thesis, Eastern Asia University