Management Practices of School Administrators in Relation to Pupils' Achievement

Florife R. Bangcoyan

Student
Medina College
Philippines.

Abstract:
School administrators play a pivotal role in shaping the academic outcomes of students. Their management practices create a learning environment that either promotes or hinders academic success. Effective leadership is particularly critical in balancing administrative duties with instructional responsibilities. This descriptive-correlational study was conducted in the South 1 District, Division of Iligan City, involving all teachers from nine public elementary schools and 300 intermediate pupils selected through purposive sampling. A modified questionnaire, based on Merro (2015), was used to assess teachers' perceptions of administrative management practices across five domains: planning, organizing, directing, controlling, and instructing. Pupils' academic achievement was measured using percentage scores from Division Achievement Tests in English, Math, Science, and Social Studies. Descriptive statistics and the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient were employed to analyze data. Teachers rated administrative practices as "Often Practiced" in four domains, with "Instructing" rated as "Sometimes Practiced." Pupils' academic achievement was generally "Below Average," with scores ranging from 59.16% to 64.76%. A significant positive correlation was found between administrators' management practices and pupils' academic performance in Central School (r = .197, t = 3.37), but no significant relationship was found in Barangay Schools. Findings suggest a gap between administrative practice and instructional effectiveness, particularly in decentralized school settings. Contextual differences may explain why management efforts impact pupil achievement in some schools but not others.

Keywords: School administrators, management practices, academic achievement, instructional leadership, public elementary schools, South 1 District, Iligan City.

INTRODUCTION

The role of school administrators is crucial in shaping students' academic outcomes. Effective management practices in schools are essential for creating a conducive learning environment, which directly impacts students' academic achievement. Administrators who proactively address the needs of both teachers and students can establish an environment where learning thrives. However, the success of these efforts often hinges on how well administrators balance administrative duties with their leadership responsibilities. The quality of school management significantly influences students' academic success, setting the tone for the entire educational experience.

The research underscores the pivotal role of principal leadership in shaping student achievement through various influencing factors. According to Özdemir (2019), principals contribute to enhanced student outcomes by nurturing a professional community and refining teachers' instructional practices rather than directly impacting student achievement. Likewise, Kalkan et al. (2020) maintain that the leadership styles of school administrators significantly influence school culture and organizational image, which are essential for cultivating a positive educational environment. Gage et al. (2018) further delve into how effective classroom management, supported by strong leadership, improves student behavior, indirectly fostering academic success. Additionally, a study by Kitur, Choge, and Tanui (2020) revealed a positive correlation between

principals' transformational leadership. It enhanced academic performance in secondary schools, underscoring the broader impact of leadership styles on educational outcomes.

Despite the available research, there still needs to be more understanding of the specific management practices that most effectively contribute to student achievement, especially in diverse educational settings. Observing and interviewing educators in the South 1 District of the Iligan City Division, it became apparent that administrators need more consistency in implementing management strategies. Some teachers emphasized the importance of more consistent support from school leaders, particularly in professional development and resource allocation. Additionally, it was noted that while some administrators are highly effective, others struggle to meaningfully engage with teachers and students, resulting in varying academic outcomes across schools. These inconsistencies underscore the necessity for more targeted research on the relationship between specific management practices and student achievement in this context.

This study examines elementary school teachers' perceptions of the management practices implemented by administrators in the South 1 District of the Iligan City Division and their impact on student's academic achievement in the 2021-2022 school year. By delving into these perceptions, the study aims to pinpoint the most effective management practices and their correlation with student performance. The findings are expected to yield valuable insights that can guide policy and practice, ultimately improving the district's education quality

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive survey design using a questionnaire checklist. As Creswell (2014) explains, this method captures the current state of a phenomenon without manipulating variables, making it useful in educational and social sciences. It provides a clear snapshot of existing conditions and relationships within a population, enabling researchers to identify trends, patterns, and insights for informed decision-making.

Research Setting

The study was conducted in South 1 District, Division of Iligan City, chosen because it comprises nine schools with a population of over 10,000 pupils and provides a conducive environment for learning and talent development.

Research Respondents

The respondents were teachers from the nine elementary schools in South 1 District during SY 2021–2022, with all teachers included. For pupils, 50% of the intermediate level were selected through purposive sampling and identified by lottery, resulting in 300 pupil-respondents.

Research Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study was a modified version based on the work of Merro (2015) on “Teachers’ Perception on the Administration of Barangay Schools,” consisting of twenty-five items, with five items per variable. It was administered to the schools in the district after a dry run, with necessary corrections and refinements incorporated before the final draft was approved by the adviser. Data were quantified using a five-point scale: 5 (4.31–5.00) Always Practiced (AP), 4 (3.41–4.20) Often Practiced (OP), 3 (2.61–3.40) Sometimes Practiced (SP), 2 (1.81–2.60) Rarely Practiced (RP), and 1 (1.00–1.80) Never Practiced (NP). Additional data were gathered from the achievement test results in four subject areas, interpreted through a three-point scale of above average, average, and below average. These academic results were taken from intermediate pupils to ensure relevance to the administrators’ term of service. Permission was formally requested from the principals of each school to obtain the necessary information during the distribution of questionnaires to teachers and pupils who served as respondents.

Validity of Instrument

The research instrument was validated through a dry-run with 20 non-respondent teachers from the central school, leading to revisions for clarity and accuracy. A panel of experts in educational research and

administration also reviewed the tool to ensure content validity, after which the final version was reproduced for formal administration.

Data-Gathering Procedure

Formal permission was obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent and the school heads of South 1 District. The researcher coordinated with administrators to schedule distribution and personally administered the questionnaires to ensure clarity and confidentiality. Completed instruments were retrieved within a week, checked for completeness, and encoded for statistical analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Following the guidelines of the American Psychological Association (APA, 2020), informed consent was obtained from all participants, ensuring they understood the study's purpose, nature, and risks without coercion. Confidentiality was strictly observed by protecting identities and securing data. Honesty and integrity were maintained in reporting results, with all sources properly acknowledged to uphold academic standards.

Data Analysis

Data were scored, classified, and tabulated based on the research questions. Weighted mean was used to determine administrators' management practices as perceived by teachers. At the same time, pupils' academic achievement was measured through percentage scores from Division Achievement Tests in Mathematics, Science, English, and Social Studies. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was applied to examine the relationship between administrators' management practices and pupils' academic achievement.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 - Level of Management Practices of the School Administrators as Perceived by Teachers in Terms of Planning

Item	Schools		AWV	Description
	Barangay	Central		
	AWV	AWV		
1. How aware do you feel your administrator plans action programs to improve staff, students, staff, students and the community?	3.50	4.00	3.70	OP
2. How often do you feel your administrator plans for the efficient utilization of staff. Supporting programs, and improvement of learning and instruction?	3.10	3.90	3.53	OP
3. How often does your administrator allow teachers and students to identify problems in administration and plans solutions with them?	3.20	3.70	3.20	SP
4. How often does your administrator utilize community resources to enhance the environment of school instructional programs.	3.00	3.70	3.23	SP
5. How often does your administrator tap resources of the school and related organizations as partners in the instructional programs?	3.20	4.10	3.40	SP
Mean	**3.20**	**3.88**	**3.41**	**OP**

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 (Always Practiced); 3.41-4.20 (Often Practiced); 2.61-3.40 (Sometimes Practiced); 1.81-2.60 (Rarely Practiced); 1.00-1.80 (Never Practiced)

The data in Table 1 reveal the level of management practices of school administrators in terms of planning, as perceived by teachers from Barangay and Central schools. The computed mean score for Barangay school is 3.20, while Central school posted a higher mean of 3.88. When combined, the overall mean is 3.41, which falls under the descriptive equivalent "Often Practiced" (OP). This suggests that, in general, school administrators across both schools frequently engage in planning-related management practices. This finding implies that administrators are making regular efforts to fulfill their planning responsibilities; however, there

is a notable difference between schools, indicating a potential inconsistency in leadership styles and levels of engagement in planning activities.

Looking at the individual indicators, it is evident that Central school consistently rated higher across all five items, ranging from 3.70 to 4.10, suggesting that their administrators "Often" to "Always" Practice planning tasks, particularly in mobilizing community and school resources. On the other hand, Barangay schools' scores were notably lower, with three out of five indicators falling under "Sometimes Practiced" (SP). The lowest-rated items at Barangay school were on involving stakeholders in problem identification and solution planning (3.20), and using community resources to enhance the school environment (3.00), which reflect occasional rather than systematic planning efforts. These gaps imply a need for more inclusive and resource-oriented planning approaches in certain schools, especially those with lower engagement scores.

These findings align with the study by Flores and Abulencia (2020), who found that effective planning practices significantly contribute to improved school performance when administrators actively engage stakeholders and utilize available resources. However, in contrast, Genciana (2019) observed that in some public schools, administrators failed to translate planning into collaborative action, leading to gaps in teacher support and community involvement. The contrast highlights the importance of not only frequent planning but also the quality and inclusiveness of such practices, which remain variable across different schools.

Table 2 - Level of Management Practices of the School Administrators as Perceived by Teachers in Terms of Organizing

Item	**Schools**		**AWV**	**Description**
	Barangay	**Central**		
	AWV	AWV		
1. How aware do you feel you administrator organizes staff and students for more instructions	3.30	3.40	3.35	SP
2. How often do you feel your administrator priorities programs needed by the school?	3.40	4.40	3.4	SP
3. How often does your administrator provide for the application and practice of learning skills in the content subjects?	2.70	3.60	3.15	SP
4. How often does your administrator call for conferences or dialogue with you when problem arises?	3.40	4.70	4.05	OP
5. How often does your administrator delegates somebody to procure materials and equipment in anticipation for school needs?	3.50	4.30	3.90	OP
Mean	**3.34**	**2.90**	**3.57**	**OP**

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 (Always Practiced); 3.41-4.20 (Often Practiced); 2.61-3.40 (Sometimes Practiced); 1.81-2.60 (Rarely Practiced); 1.00-1.80 (Never Practiced)

The data in Table 2 present the level of management practices of school administrators in terms of organizing, as perceived by teachers from Barangay and Central schools. Barangay school reported a mean score of 3.34, categorized as "Sometimes Practiced" (SP), while Central school had a higher mean of 3.90, falling under "Often Practiced" (OP). The overall mean score of 3.57 suggests that, on average, organizational practices by school administrators are frequently carried out across both schools. This reflects a generally active involvement of administrators in structuring school operations, although Barangay school's slightly lower average implies some inconsistency or irregularity in organizational efforts.

A closer look at the indicators reveals that the Barangay school received mostly "Sometimes Practiced" ratings in the first three items, particularly low in providing for the application and practice of learning skills (2.70). In contrast, Central school consistently scored higher across all items, with particularly strong performance in calling for conferences or dialogues (4.70) and prioritizing programs (4.40). This suggests that Central school administrators are perceived as more proactive in engaging staff in problem-solving and resource

management, which are essential components of effective organizing. The contrast in delegation practices also shows a more anticipatory approach in Central school, which supports smoother school operations and responsiveness to needs.

These results align with the findings of Navera and Gonzales (2021), who emphasized that effective organizing practices, such as clear delegation and staff collaboration, significantly impact school functionality and academic delivery. However, the present findings contrast with Tamboong (2020), who found that many public-school administrators tend to overlook sustained organizational planning, leading to gaps in program implementation. The present study suggests that while some schools demonstrate strong organizational leadership, others still require capacity building and support to ensure consistent management practices.

Table 3 - Level of Management Practices of the School Administrators as Perceived by Teachers in Terms of Directing

Item	**Schools**		**AWV**	**Description**
	Barangay	**Central**		
	AWV	AWV		
1. How often do you feel your administrator directs the improvement of positive attitudes towards learning and instruction?	3.50	4.30	3.90	OP
2. How frequent does your administrator directs effective learning instructional programs and school activities?	3.50	3.90	3.70	OP
3. Does your administrator coordinate and direct teacher and students in the attainment of school programs and objectives?	3.00	4.40	3.70	OP
4. How often does your administrator aid you with specific suggestions that really work successfully?	3.00	3.70	3.35	SP
5. How often does your administrator help in providing solutions for the needs of teachers and students?	2.00	4.20	3.10	SP
Mean	**3.00**	**4.12**	**3.55**	**OP**

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 (Always Practiced); 3.41-4.20 (Often Practiced); 2.61-3.40 (Sometimes Practiced); 1.81-2.60 (Rarely Practiced); 1.00-1.80 (Never Practiced)

The data in Table 3 presents the level of management practices of school administrators in terms of directing, as perceived by teachers from Barangay and Central schools. The Barangay school posted a mean of 3.00, interpreted as "Sometimes Practiced" (SP), while Central school had a notably higher mean of 4.12, falling under "Often Practiced" (OP). The overall mean of 3.55 suggests that, collectively, school administrators often implement effective directing practices. This implies that while directing is a generally active component of school management, there are significant disparities in how consistently it is carried out across schools, highlighting a potential need for leadership training and support, especially in the Barangay school.

A closer examination of the individual indicators shows that teachers in the Central school perceive their administrators as consistently effective in directing key activities, with all items rated as "Often Practiced." In particular, the highest ratings were given to coordinating teachers and students toward school goals (4.40) and promoting positive attitudes toward instruction (4.30). In contrast, Barangay school received lower ratings across all indicators, with two items— "providing solutions for the needs of teachers and students" (2.00) and "aiding teachers with specific suggestions" (3.00)—falling into the "Sometimes Practiced" range. This suggests that in Barangay schools, support for teaching challenges and strategic direction may be insufficient or inconsistent, potentially affecting staff morale and instructional quality.

These findings resonate with Bernardo and Ramos (2021), who emphasized that strong directing practices—such as providing clear instructional guidance and emotional support—are crucial for achieving school objectives and sustaining teacher performance. However, the results contrast with Sarmiento (2020), who found that many rural school leaders struggle with consistent implementation of directing practices due to limited administrative training and resource constraints. The contrast underscores the value of continuous

professional development for school administrators to bridge gaps in instructional leadership and ensure equitable support across all schools.

Table 4 - Level of Management Practices of the School Administrators as Perceived by Teachers in Terms of Controlling

Item	Schools		AWV	Description
	Barangay	Central		
	AWV	AWV		
1. Does your administrator administer the implementation of innovation effectively?	3.00	3.72	3.36	SP
2. Do you feel your administrator is active in carrying out policies and their thorough implementation?	3.40	4.20	3.80	OP
3. Does your administrator inspect school plant and facilities regularly?	3.60	4.40	4.00	OP
4. How often do you feel your administrator wants that reports and other requirements will be submitted in due time?	4.00	4.20	4.18	OP
5. How often does your administrator require teachers and students to follow standard rules and regulations?	4.00	4.30	4.15	OP
Mean	**3.60**	**4.20**	**3.88**	**OP**

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 (Always Practiced); 3.41-4.20 (Often Practiced); 2.61-3.40 (Sometimes Practiced); 1.81-2.60 (Rarely Practiced); 1.00-1.80 (Never Practiced)

The data in Table 4 illustrates the level of management practices in terms of controlling as perceived by teachers from Barangay and Central schools. The Barangay school obtained a mean score of 3.60, which falls under "Often Practiced" (OP), while the Central school earned a higher mean of 4.20, also under "Often Practiced" but nearing the "Always Practiced" range. The overall mean score of 3.88 indicates that controlling practices are generally perceived as often implemented by school administrators across both schools. This suggests that monitoring performance, enforcing policies, and ensuring compliance with regulations are essential elements of administrative practice that are widely recognized and regularly executed.

In the analysis of individual indicators, Central school administrators were perceived to be more consistent in all controlling aspects. The highest ratings were given to requiring adherence to standard rules and regulations (4.30) and regular inspection of school facilities (4.40). These high marks reflect strong accountability mechanisms and a structured environment in Central school. Meanwhile, Barangay school had slightly lower but still notable ratings, with the lowest score (3.00) observed in the administration of innovations—suggesting that efforts to lead change or implement new strategies may be less visible or less effective in that setting. However, both schools show a shared strength in enforcing timely submission of reports and compliance with regulations, underscoring the emphasis on operational discipline.

These findings are consistent with Delos Santos and Alvior (2022), who concluded that effective control practices, such as regular evaluations, strict policy enforcement, and timely communication, contribute significantly to improving school management and educational outcomes. However, this contrasts with Ligaya (2021), who noted that some public schools face challenges in maintaining consistent control mechanisms due to insufficient manpower and lack of support from higher education authorities. The present study highlights that while controlling is generally practiced well, there remains room for enhancing innovation management and consistency in monitoring efforts—especially in less-resourced schools.

Table 5 - Level of Management Practices of the School Administrators as Perceived by Teachers in Terms of Instructing

Item	Schools		AWV	Description
	Barangay AWV	Central AWV		
1. How aware do you feel your administrator helps the teachers and students to improve teaching and learning in the classrooms?	3.40	3.40	3.40	SP
2. Does you administrator provide facilities for the improvement of your skills in oral and written communications?	2.00	3.40	2.70	SP
3. Does your administrator hold seminars and trainings so that teachers can cope-up with latest thrust and innovation?	1.40	2.30	1.85	RP
4. Does your administrator persuade teachers to attend leadership training?	2.40	3.30	2.85	SP
5. Does your administrator encourage teachers to conduct demonstration?	2.20	2.70	2.45	RP
Mean	**2.28**	**3.02**	**2.65**	**SP**

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 (Always Practiced); 3.41-4.20 (Often Practiced); 2.61-3.40 (Sometimes Practiced); 1.81-2.60 (Rarely Practiced); 1.00-1.80 (Never Practiced)

The data in Table 5 show the level of management practices in terms of instruction as perceived by teachers from Barangay and Central schools. The Barangay school had a mean score of 2.28, interpreted as "Rarely Practiced" (RP), while Central school scored 3.02, indicating "Sometimes Practiced" (SP). The overall mean of 2.65 suggests that instructional leadership is only sometimes implemented, implying that administrators are not consistently or strongly performing their role as instructional leaders. This may affect teacher growth, innovation in teaching practices, and ultimately the quality of learning outcomes among students.

Examining the individual indicators, the lowest rating from Barangay school was in the encouragement of teacher-led demonstrations (1.40), while the Central school's lowest was in holding seminars and trainings (2.30). These low ratings point to a lack of consistent professional development activities. On the other hand, both schools received their highest scores for awareness that administrators help improve teaching and learning (3.40), suggesting that while administrators are perceived as generally supportive, their support does not always translate into tangible actions such as seminars, facilities for communication skills enhancement, or leadership training opportunities.

These findings imply the need for school administrators to strengthen their instructional leadership by providing more structured professional development programs and fostering a culture of collaborative learning among teachers. Without consistent guidance and support, teachers may rely solely on individual effort rather than collective innovation, which could limit the overall effectiveness of instruction. Thus, enhancing instructional leadership practices has direct implications for teacher development, student achievement, and the school's capacity to adapt to the evolving demands of education.

Table 6 - Summary of the Level of Management Practices of the School Administrators as Perceived by Teachers

Item	Schools		AWV	Description
	Barangay AWV	Central AWV		
1. Planning	3.20	3.88	3.54	OP
2. Organizing	3.34	4.06	3.70	OP
3. Directing	3.00	4.12	3.56	OP
4. Controlling	3.60	4.20	3.90	OP
5. Instrumenting	2.28	3.02	2.65	SP

Mean	**3.47**	**OP**

Scale: 4.21 – 5.00 (Always Practiced); 3.41-4.20 (Often Practiced); 2.61-3.40 (Sometimes Practiced); 1.81-2.60 (Rarely Practiced); 1.00-1.80 (Never Practiced)

The summary of data in Table 6 reveals the overall level of management practices of school administrators as perceived by teachers in Barangay and Central schools. The grand mean of 3.47, interpreted as "Often Practiced" (OP), indicates that administrators generally demonstrate management practices at a satisfactory level. This suggests that school leaders in the South 1 District are perceived to carry out their managerial roles effectively, particularly in planning, organizing, directing, and controlling, though there are areas that need improvement to ensure consistency across all aspects of school leadership.

When analyzed by indicator, Controlling (M = 3.90) received the highest overall rating, followed closely by Directing (M = 3.56) and Organizing (M = 3.70), all falling under the "Often Practiced" category. This implies that administrators are highly involved in monitoring, policy implementation, and coordinating staff to meet goals. On the other hand, Instructing (M = 2.65) received the lowest mean and was rated only as "Sometimes Practiced", reflecting a gap in instructional leadership functions such as facilitating professional development, conducting trainings, and supporting teacher-led initiatives. This disparity shows that while administrative and operational tasks are well managed, efforts to lead in curriculum and instruction are less emphasized.

These findings align with Hallinger's (2021) model of instructional leadership, which emphasizes the critical role of school heads in not just managing but actively leading teaching and learning processes. Similarly, Aladano (2022) found that while public school administrators in the Philippines are strong in strategic and operational domains, they often lag behind in sustaining instructional support for teachers. The present study affirms these patterns and reinforces the call for school leaders to balance managerial functions with more direct involvement in teaching and learning support, which is key to driving student achievement.

Table 7- Academic Achievement Profile of the Public School Pupils

Subject Areas	School	Grade V Mean	Grade VI Mean	Mean	%	Desc.	Rank
SCIENCE	Central	33.94	42.02	37.98	75.96	A	1
	Brgy	26.02	16.99	21.51	42.35	BA	2
	Ave.	29.98	29.51	29.75	59.16	BA	
MATH	Central	23.75	18.77	21.26	42.52	BA	2
	Brgy	35.51	43.72	39.62	79.24	A	1
	Ave.	29.63	31.25	30.44	60.88	BA	
ENGLISH	Central	42.51	41.32	41.92	83.84	A	1
	Brgy	20.92	23.74	22.84	45.68	BA	2
	Ave.	31.72	32.53	32.38	64.76	BA	

SOCIAL STUDIES	Central	37.88	37.49	37.68	75.36	A	1
	Brgy	15.50	31.00	23.25	46.50	BA	2
	Ave.	26.69	34.25	30.46	60.93	BA	

Legend: AA – Above Average, A – Average, BA – Below Ave.

Table 7 shows the academic achievement profile of the public elementary school pupils. As to the Science subject, the table revealed that the students of Central School have a weighted mean of 37.98, which is equivalent to 75.96 percent, described as an average category, and is ranked one. School B has a below-average mean of 21.51, which is 42.45 percent, ranked second. The average mean of both schools in this subject area is 29.75, which is 59.16 percent, and is in the below-average category.

As revealed in the aforementioned table, Central School ranks first in the mathematics subject. It has an average of 39.62, which is 79.24 percent, described as average. Second in rank is barangay schools with an average mean of 21.26, which is 42.52 percent, and is in the below average category. The weighted mean of both schools in the subject area is 30.44, which is 60.88 percent, described as below average.

In English, the first in rank is Central with an average of 41.92, which is 83.84 percent, described as average. Second in rank is barangay school which has a weighted mean of 22.84, that is 45.68 percent, and is below average. The weighted mean of both schools in this subject area is 32.38, which is 64.76 percent, described as average.

In Social Studies, Central has an average mean of 37.68, which is 75.36 percent, and is on the average mean of 23.25, which is 46.50 percent, and falls below average, and ranks second. The average mean of both schools is 30.46, which is 60.93 percent, and is in the below-average category.

In totality, the student respondents got higher means in English of 64.76, but were still categorized as below average. This was followed by social studies with a mean of 60.93, then Science and Mathematics. This means that the pupils find math the hardest subject, and they like English as their subject.

Table 8 - Relationship Between the Level of Management Practices the Administrators and the Academic Achievements of Pupils

Schools	**Variables**	**Means**	**Computed r**	**Computed t**	**Tabled Value**
Brgy	Management Practices	3.08	.104	ns .31	1.98
	Pupil Achievement	2.17			
Central	Management Practices	3.87	.197	* 3.37	1.98
	Pupil Achievement	3.42			

* significant ns = not significant

Table 8 presents the relationship between the level of management practices of school administrators and the academic achievements of pupils in Barangay and Central schools. The data indicate a weak and non-significant correlation between management practices and pupil achievement in the Barangay school, with a computed r = 0.104 and t = 0.31, which is less than the tabled value of 1.98. This suggests that in Barangay schools, administrators' management practices had no significant effect on pupils' academic performance.

The weak correlation implies that other factors, such as teaching quality, learning resources, or socio-economic conditions, might have had a greater influence on pupil outcomes in this setting.

In contrast, results from the Central school reveal a significant positive correlation, with r = 0.197 and a computed t = 3.37, which is greater than the critical value of 1.98 at the 0.05 significance level. This implies that in Central schools, higher levels of management practices by administrators were associated with better academic performance among pupils. The statistically significant relationship suggests that effective planning, organizing, directing, controlling, and instructing practices by school heads could play a meaningful role in shaping learning environments that support academic success.

This finding supports previous studies such as that of Bush and Glover (2020), who emphasized that instructional and strategic leadership practices contribute significantly to improved student outcomes when consistently implemented. Similarly, Day and Sammons (2019) found that schools with highly engaged leaders who foster collaboration and instructional support tend to see measurable gains in student achievement. Therefore, while the Barangay context may reflect external limitations or implementation gaps, the positive result in the Central school highlights the potential impact of strong leadership practices on academic performance when such practices are actively and effectively applied.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The management practices of administrators in South 1 District were generally perceived as often applied in planning, organizing, directing, and controlling, while instructing was less consistent. However, pupils' academic performance remained below average, indicating a gap between management efforts and instructional outcomes. A significant relationship was found between administrators' practices and pupil achievement in the Central School but not in Barangay Schools, suggesting that the impact of leadership on academic performance may vary depending on school context.

Recommendations

Administrators are encouraged to strengthen instructional leadership, particularly in instructing, by enhancing teacher training and support to improve pupil performance. Teachers are urged to collaborate with administrators in planning and instructional development, fostering teamwork and innovation. Schools need to implement interventions to address pupils' academic weaknesses, while parents are encouraged to increase involvement and maintain strong communication with schools to reinforce learning at home. Community stakeholders are likewise urged to sustain collaboration with schools to help bridge resource gaps and promote an environment conducive to educational success.

REFERENCES:

1. Aladano, C. M. (2022). Instructional leadership practices of school heads and teachers' performance in selected public schools in the Philippines. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 3(7), 1235–1245. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.07.14
2. American Psychological Association. (2020). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). American Psychological Association.
3. Bernardo, A. R., & Ramos, C. M. (2021). Instructional leadership practices of school heads and its impact on teacher performance. International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies, 2(1), 85–97. https://doi.org/10.53378/ijemds.2021.2.1.7
4. Bush, T. (2020). Theories of educational leadership and management. [Publisher details needed].
5. Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2020). School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 48(1), 8–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219879292
6. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
7. Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2019). Successful school leadership. Education Development Trust.

8. Delos Santos, R. A., & Alvior, M. G. (2022). Control mechanisms and their influence on school performance: A management perspective. International Journal of Educational Management, 36(1), 112–124. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-09-2021-0372
9. Flores, A. S., & Abulencia, A. A. (2020). Strategic planning practices of school heads and their relationship to school performance. International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies, 1(1), 14–28. https://doi.org/10.53378/345879
10. Gage, N. A., Scott, T., Hirn, R., & MacSuga-Gage, A. S. (2018). The relationship between teachers' implementation of classroom management practices and student behavior in elementary school. Behavioral Disorders, 43(2), 302–315.
11. Genciana, D. L. (2019). Human relations in educational administration: A case study of a public city high school in Manila. Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 5(2), 45–53.
12. Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46(1), 5–24.
13. Hallinger, P. (2021). A review of research on educational leadership and management in Southeast Asia: Balancing local relevance and global influence. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 49(5), 688–706. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220935454
14. Hallinger, P., Gümüş, S., & Bellibaş, M. Ş. (2020). Are principals instructional leaders yet? A science map of the knowledge base on instructional leadership, 1940–2018. Scientometrics, 122(3), 1629–1650.
15. Kalkan, Ü., Altınay Aksal, F., Altınay Gazi, Z., Atasoy, R., & Dağlı, G. (2020). The relationship between school administrators' leadership styles, school culture, and organizational image. SAGE Open, 10(1), Article 2158244020902081. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020902081
16. Kitur, S. C., Choge, J. R., & Tanui, E. K. (2020). Relationship between principals' transformational leadership style and secondary school students' academic performance in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in Bomet County, Kenya. International Journal of Current Aspects in Education (IJCAES), 4(1), 38–51. https://doi.org/10.35942/ijcaes.v4i1.108
17. Ligaya, M. L. (2021). Challenges in implementing control functions among public school administrators in the Philippines. Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 7(1), 27–35.
18. Navera, J. A., & Gonzales, M. D. (2021). Organizational effectiveness of school heads and its impact on school performance. International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies, 2(2), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.53378/ijemds.2021.2.2.4
19. Özdemir, N. (2019). Principal leadership and students' achievement: Mediated pathways of professional community and teachers' instructional practices. KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, 16(1).
20. Sarmiento, J. P. (2020). Challenges in school leadership among rural public elementary administrators in the Philippines. Journal of Educational Management and Practice, 8(2), 44–52.
21. Tamboong, R. V. (2020). Challenges in the organizational management of public elementary school administrators. Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 6(1), 23–31.