

Educational Leadership and Resource Efficacy: Investigating the Relationship on the Schools' Performance

Erlinda Navarro Subijano

Erlinda.subijano@deped.gov.ph
Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Abstract

This study investigated the level of educational leadership, resource efficacy, significant relationship between the educational leadership and principals' resource efficacy and school performance. Specifically it aimed to answer the following: the level of educational leadership and resource efficacy in terms of human, financial and material resource management, significant relationship between the educational leadership and resource efficacy and school performance.

The purposive sampling implied to the 258 teachers in the central schools of Kalayaan, Lumban, Pagsanjan, Santa Cruz and Pila Sub-Offices. Tools designed by the researcher were created to collect the data required for this investigation. The collected data were analyzed and interpreted using the mean, standard deviation, and Pearson-r Correlation.

The findings indicate that the level of educational leadership and resource efficacy across various dimensions were highly evident. In the analysis of school performance, the majority were in Very High remarks except for the Drop-out rate and it was in Very Low. In the test of the relationship between the educational leadership and the school performance, analysis reveals a significant relationship. Moreover, in the test of the relationship between school principals' resource efficacy and school performance in terms of human, financial and material resource management do not exhibit significant relationships.

Based on the study's findings, the following conclusions were drawn; there is a significant relationship between the educational leadership and school performance and no significant relationship between the principals' resource efficacy and school performance. Therefore, the researcher rejected the first hypothesis and others accepted.

It is recommended that the District/Division Offices may prioritize implementing HRM practices that bolster decision-making processes and prioritize staff well-being, including providing training for principals and establishing wellness programs. Additionally, fostering strong stakeholder relations and maintaining updated personnel skills inventories were crucial for positively impacting school performance. To enhance educational outcomes, offices may focus on strategic resource allocation and interventions in financial resource management, providing support and training for principals in budget preparation and decision-making. Based on these findings, a resource management training program tailored to principals in SDO Laguna is recommended to further strengthen their capacity in strategic resource utilization and improve the totality of the school's effectiveness.

Keywords: educational leadership; principals' resource efficacy; Schools' Performance

1. Introduction

Educational institutions rely heavily on the resourceful leadership of their school principals to navigate the path to excellence. In elementary education, these principals assume a comprehensive role that extends far beyond mere administration, serving as the backbone of educational institutions and shaping the future trajectory of our students. At the core of their responsibilities lies the efficient management of resources, a critical yet often overlooked facet of their role that profoundly impacts the overall educational landscape.

This ignites the inspiration to understand how the competencies of elementary school principals within the Schools Division of Laguna in managing human, financial, and material resources reverberate within the school environment.

Despite the conventional wisdom acknowledging the significance of resource management, a comprehensive examination of its influence on crucial performance indicators such as school-based management levels, enrolment rates, and dropout rates remains relatively unexplored in this context.

In an era where educational outcomes face constant scrutiny, understanding the dynamics between resource management competencies and school performance is not just an academic pursuit; it is a pressing necessity. This study seeks to address this void in our understanding, emphasizing the timeliness and importance of elucidating these connections for achieving positive educational outcomes and fostering a conducive learning environment for all students.

Hence, this study endeavors to shed light on the intricate relationship between the resource management competencies of elementary school principals and various dimensions of school performance. The goal of this research is to gain important insights that can guide strategic interventions and policies aimed at improving educational outcomes and maximizing resource utilization for the benefit of current and future generations of learners by exploring this unexplored area within the Schools Division of Laguna.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Specifically, it seeks answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of educational leadership in terms of:
 - 1.1. affective qualities;
 - 1.2. action orientation; and
 - 1.3. mentoring and empowering?
2. What is the level of Resource Efficacy in terms of human resource management as to:
 - 2.1. decision making;
 - 2.2. training and development;
 - 2.3. staff relation;
 - 2.4. health and welfare; and
 - 2.5. personnel skills inventory?
3. What is the level of Resource Efficacy in terms of financial resource management as to:
 - 3.1. fund allocation;
 - 3.2. budget preparation; and
 - 3.3. transparency and accountability?
4. What is the level of Resource Efficacy in terms of material resource management as to:
 - 4.1. Procurement of Materials; and
 - 4.2. Physical Facilities and Maintenance?
5. What is the level of school performance in terms of:
 - 5.1. school-based management level;
 - 5.2. enrolment rate;

- 5.3. dropout rate;
- 5.4. completion/graduation rate;
- 5.5. achievement test mean scores;
- 5.6. cohort survival rate; and
- 5.7. literacy rate?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the educational leadership and the school's performance?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the school principals' resource efficacy in terms of human resource management and school performance?
8. Is there a significant relationship between the school principals' resource efficacy in terms of financial resource management and school performance?
9. Is there a significant relationship between the school principals' resource efficacy in terms of material resource management and school performance?
10. Based on the results and findings of the study, what resource management training can be made for principals in SDO Laguna?

2. Methodology

The research design utilized in this study was descriptive method of research in exploring the connections between the resource management competencies of elementary school principals and school performance as basis for resource management training for principals in SDO Laguna. According to Bhandari (2023), a correlational research design investigates relationships between variables without the researcher controlling or manipulating any of them. A correlation reflects the strength and/or direction of the relationship between two (or more) variables. The direction of a correlation can be either positive or negative.

3. Results and Discussion

This chapter entails the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of data gathered to answer the problem of this study. This part reveals the findings of the study based on the research questions.

Level of Educational Leadership

In this study, the level of Educational Leadership refers to Affective Qualities, Action Orientation and Mentoring and Empowering.

The following tables shows the mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation.

Evaluating the effectiveness and performance of a school environment requires an understanding of the degree of educational leadership present. This component explores the degree to which leaders direct the educational institution by exhibiting essential leadership traits and behaviors. Evaluating educational leadership levels offers important insights into the dynamics of leadership that influence corporate culture, professional growth, and student results.

Table 1 illustrates the level of educational leadership in terms of affective qualities.

Results indicate that the highest mean scores in terms of Educational Leadership for Affective Qualities are attributed to statements such as "treats all teachers with respect and empathy" (mean = 4.76, SD = 0.43) and "encourages open communication and dialogue among teachers" (mean = 4.76, SD = 0.46). Similarly, "actively seeks and values input from teachers" (mean = 4.75, SD = 0.47) and "is transparent in communication, fostering a trusting environment" (mean = 4.75, SD = 0.45) received high scores.

Table 1 *Level of Educational Leadership in terms of Affective Qualities*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My school heads...</i>			
1. actively seeks and values input from teachers.	4.75	.47	Strongly Agree
2. treats all teachers with respect and empathy.	4.76	.43	Strongly Agree
3. is transparent in communication, fostering a trusting environment.	4.75	.45	Strongly Agree
4. promotes a positive and collaborative atmosphere among teachers.	4.75	.45	Strongly Agree
5. encourages open communication and dialogue among teachers.	4.76	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.75	
<i>SD</i>		0.38	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		Highly Evident	

Overall, with a weighted mean of 4.75 and a standard deviation of 0.38, the level of educational leadership in terms of affective qualities is highly evident.

The results suggests that principals in the study demonstrate strong affective qualities in their leadership approach, promoting positive relationships and communication within their schools. The implication of this is the potential for enhanced teacher morale, cooperation, and school climate, which were critical factors for promoting student success and academic achievement.

Table 2 illustrates the level of educational leadership in terms of action orientation.

Based on the results, the highest mean scores in terms of Educational Leadership for Action Orientation are attributed to statements such as "demonstrates a proactive approach to implementing positive change" (mean = 4.74, SD = 0.45) and "actively involve teachers in the creation and implementation of new projects" (mean = 4.74, SD = 0.45). Similarly, "actively seeks feedback from teachers to inform improvement efforts" (mean = 4.72, SD = 0.48) received a high score.

Table 2 Level of Educational Leadership in terms of Action Orientation

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Head..</i>			
demonstrates a proactive approach to implementing positive change.	4.74	.45	Strongly Agree
is willing to take calculated risks for the benefit of the school.	4.69	.50	Strongly Agree
has a vision for long-term transformation in the school and teachers were informed about the long-term goals and vision of the school.	4.69	.47	Strongly Agree
actively involve teachers in the creation and implementation of new projects.	4.74	.45	Strongly Agree
actively seeks feedback from teachers to inform improvement efforts.	4.72	.48	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.72	
<i>SD</i>		0.40	

*Verbal Interpretation**Highly Evident*

Overall, the weighted mean of 4.72 and a standard deviation of 0.40 suggest that action-oriented leadership qualities are highly evident among the respondents, indicating a strong consensus among participants.

The results suggest that principals exhibit a proactive stance in driving positive change and fostering teacher involvement, indicative of a dynamic leadership approach geared toward long-term transformation and continuous improvement. Consequently, such leadership practices may cultivate an environment conducive to innovation, adaptability, and sustained growth within the school community, contributing to enhanced student outcomes and overall school success.

Table 3 illustrates the level of educational leadership in terms of mentoring and empowering.

Results indicate that the highest mean scores in terms of Educational Leadership for Mentoring and Empowering are observed in statements such as "demonstrates a proactive approach to implementing positive change" (mean = 4.75, SD = 0.42) and "actively seeks feedback from teachers to inform improvement efforts" (mean = 4.75, SD = 0.42). Likewise, "is willing to take calculated risks for the benefit of the school" (mean = 4.74, SD = 0.44) received a high score.

Table 3 *Level of Educational Leadership in terms of Mentoring and Empowering*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Head...</i>			
<i>demonstrates a proactive approach to implementing positive change.</i>	4.75	.42	Strongly Agree
<i>is willing to take calculated risks for the benefit of the school.</i>	4.74	.44	Strongly Agree
<i>has a vision for long-term transformation in the school and teachers were informed about the long-term goals and vision of the school.</i>	4.74	.43	Strongly Agree
<i>actively involve teachers in the creation and implementation of new projects.</i>	4.73	.45	Strongly Agree
<i>actively seeks feedback from teachers to inform improvement efforts.</i>	4.75	.42	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.78	
<i>SD</i>		0.39	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		<i>Highly Evident</i>	

Overall, the weighted mean of 4.78 and a standard deviation of 0.39 indicate that mentoring and empowering leadership qualities are highly evident among the participants, highlighting the significant role of principals in fostering collaboration and empowerment within the school community.

The results suggest that principals exhibit proactive engagement in fostering positive change, risk-taking, and long-term visioning while actively involving and seeking feedback from teachers. Such leadership practices indicate a commitment to empowering and developing educators, encouraging a collaborative and supportive school culture conducive to professional growth and continuous improvement. Consequently, this approach may lead to increased teacher efficacy, job satisfaction, and ultimately, improved student outcomes and school performance.

Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Human Resource Management

The Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Human Resource Management refers to the extent to which principals effectively utilize human resources within the school, encompassing decision-making, training, staff relations, and personnel skill inventory.

The following tables shows the mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation.

Table 4 illustrates the level of resource efficacy human resource management as to decision making.

Results show that the highest mean scores in terms of Human Resource Management decision-making are attributed to statements such as "makes effective decisions regarding personnel allocation in my school" (mean = 4.74, SD = 0.45) and "prioritizes resource allocation to areas that will benefit students and school performance" (mean = 4.73, SD = 0.47). Conversely, statements like "considers the input and needs of teaching and non-teaching staff when making decisions" (mean = 4.69, SD = 0.48) and "involves staff in decision-making processes related to resource allocation" (mean = 4.69, SD = 0.50) received slightly lower scores, yet all indicators remain in the "Strongly Agree" range.

Table 4 Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Human Resource Management as to Decision Making

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Heads...</i>			
<i>makes effective decisions regarding personnel allocation in my school.</i>	4.74	.45	Strongly Agree
<i>considers the input and needs of teaching and non-teaching staff when making decisions.</i>	4.69	.48	Strongly Agree
<i>involves staff in decision-making processes related to resource allocation.</i>	4.69	.50	Strongly Agree
<i>prioritizes resource allocation to areas that will benefit students and school performance.</i>	4.73	.47	Strongly Agree
<i>regularly reviews and adapts resource allocation decisions based on changing needs.</i>	4.73	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.71	
<i>SD</i>		0.41	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		Highly Evident	

Overall, the weighted mean of 4.71 with a standard deviation of 0.41 suggests a highly evident level of resource efficacy in human resource management decision-making.

Based on the results, principals demonstrate effectiveness in personnel allocation, considering the input of both teaching and non-teaching staff, involving them in decision-making processes, and prioritizing resource allocation for student and school performance improvement. Such practices reflect a commitment to inclusive and strategic decision-making processes aimed at optimizing resource utilization and enhancing overall school effectiveness.

Table 5 illustrates the level of resource efficacy in terms of human resource management as to training and development.

Results show that the highest mean scores in terms of Human Resource Management training and development are attributed to statements such as "actively promotes professional growth and development among teaching and non-teaching staff" (mean = 4.79, SD = 0.42) and "recognizes and rewards staff for their professional development achievements" (mean = 4.78, SD = 0.44). Similarly, statements like "provides opportunities for staff to participate in workshops and training programs" (mean = 4.77, SD = 0.43) and

"supports and encourages staff in pursuing further education and certifications" (mean = 4.77, SD = 0.44) received slightly lower scores, yet all indicators remain in the "Strongly Agree" range.

Table 5 Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Human Resource Management as to Training and Development

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Head...</i>			
<i>actively promotes professional growth and development among teaching and non-teaching staff.</i>	4.79	.42	Strongly Agree
<i>provides opportunities for staff to participate in workshops and training programs.</i>	4.77	.43	Strongly Agree
<i>supports and encourages staff in pursuing further education and certifications.</i>	4.77	.44	Strongly Agree
<i>regularly assesses the training needs of staff and address them accordingly.</i>	4.75	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>recognizes and rewards staff for their professional development achievements.</i>	4.78	.44	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.77	
<i>SD</i>		0.37	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		Highly Evident	

Overall, the weighted mean of 4.77 with a standard deviation of 0.37 suggests a highly evident level of resource efficacy in human resource management training and development.

This implies that the principals actively promote professional growth and development among both teaching and non-teaching staff, offering opportunities for participation in workshops and training programs, supporting further education initiatives, and regularly assessing staff training needs.

Table 6 illustrates the level of resource efficacy in terms of human resource management as to staff relations.

Results show that the highest mean scores in terms of Human Resource Management staff relations are attributed to statements such as "maintains positive and constructive relationships with teaching and non-teaching staff" (mean = 4.77, SD = 0.44) and "actively communicates and collaborates with staff to address their concerns and needs" (mean = 4.77, SD = 0.42). Similarly, statements like "handles staff conflicts and disagreements in a fair and effective manner" (mean = 4.75, SD = 0.45) and "encourages staff to provide feedback and suggestions for school improvement" (mean = 4.75, SD = 0.46) received slightly lower scores, yet all indicators remain in the "Strongly Agree" range.

Table 6 Level of Resource efficacy in terms of Human Resource Management as to Staff Relations

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Heads...</i>			
<i>maintains positive and constructive relationships with teaching and non-teaching staff.</i>	4.77	.44	Strongly Agree
<i>actively communicate and collaborate with staff to</i>	4.77	.42	Strongly Agree

<i>address their concerns and needs.</i>	4.74	.45	Strongly Agree
<i>fosters a culture of teamwork and mutual support among staff members.</i>	4.75	.45	Strongly Agree
<i>handles staff conflicts and disagreements in a fair and effective manner.</i>	4.75	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>encourages staff to provide feedback and suggestions for school improvement.</i>	4.75	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.76	
<i>SD</i>		0.38	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		Highly Evident	

Overall, the weighted mean of 4.76 with a standard deviation of 0.38 suggests a highly evident level of resource efficacy in human resource management staff relations.

The results imply that the principals maintain positive relationships with both teaching and non-teaching staff, actively addressing concerns and fostering a culture of teamwork and mutual support.

Table 7 illustrates the level of resource efficacy in terms of human resource management as to health and welfare.

Results reveal that the highest mean scores in terms of Human Resource Management health and welfare are associated with statements such as "makes staff members feel that their health and welfare were adequately addressed by the school" (mean = 4.78, SD = 0.43) and "prioritizes the physical and emotional well-being of teaching and non-teaching staff" (mean = 4.76, SD = 0.45). Conversely, indicators like "takes proactive measures to reduce stress and burnout among staff" (mean = 4.73, SD = 0.48) received slightly lower scores, yet all statements remain within the "Strongly Agree" range.

Table 7 Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Human Resource Management as to Health and Welfare

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Head...</i>			
<i>prioritizes the physical and emotional well-being of teaching and non-teaching staff.</i>	4.76	.45	Strongly Agree
<i>provides access to health and wellness resources and support for staff.</i>	4.74	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>makes staff members feel that their health and welfare were adequately addressed by the school.</i>	4.78	.43	Strongly Agree
<i>takes proactive measures to reduce stress and burnout among staff.</i>	4.73	.48	Strongly Agree
<i>fosters a positive and supportive work environment that contributes to staff well-being.</i>	4.74	.47	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.40	
<i>SD</i>		0.48	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		Highly Evident	

Overall, the weighted mean of 4.76 with a standard deviation of 0.48 indicates a highly evident level of resource efficacy in human resource management concerning health and welfare. This implies that the principals prioritize the physical and emotional well-being of both teaching and non-teaching staff, providing access to health resources and fostering a supportive work environment.

However, the slightly lower mean score may imply that there were areas for improvement in addressing staff stress and burnout proactively. Nonetheless, the overall strong agreement suggests a positive approach to supporting staff welfare within the school community.

Table 8 illustrates the level of resource efficacy in terms of human resource management as to personnel skills inventory.

Results indicate that the highest mean scores in terms of Human Resource Management personnel skills inventory are associated with statements like "uses the personnel skills inventory to make informed decisions about staffing and resource allocation" (mean = 4.74, SD = 0.45) and "maintains a comprehensive inventory of staff skills and qualifications" (mean = 4.72, SD = 0.46). Conversely, indicators such as "regularly updates the skills inventory to reflect staff development and changes" (mean = 4.70, SD = 0.49) received slightly lower scores, although all statements fall within the "Strongly Agree" range.

Table 8 *Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Human Resource Management as to Personnel Skills Inventory*

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Head...</i>			
<i>maintains a comprehensive inventory of staff skills and qualifications.</i>	4.72	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>uses the personnel skills inventory to make informed decisions about staffing and resource allocation.</i>	4.74	.45	Strongly Agree
<i>makes the skills inventory enable effective matching of staff to specific tasks and responsibilities.</i>	4.72	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>regularly updates the skills inventory to reflect staff development and changes.</i>	4.70	.49	Strongly Agree
<i>makes the personnel skills inventory enhance the effectiveness of human resource management in the school.</i>	4.70	.48	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.71	
<i>SD</i>		0.42	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		<i>Highly Evident</i>	

Overall, with a weighted mean of 4.71 and a standard deviation of 0.42, the level of resource efficacy in human resource management concerning personnel skills inventory is highly evident

The results suggest that the principals maintain a comprehensive inventory of staff skills and qualifications, utilizing it effectively for decision-making and task assignments. This implies the consistent high agreement among respondents indicates that the skills inventory enhances human resource management effectiveness in the school, suggesting a strong system for matching staff to specific roles and responsibilities. Moreover, regular reviews and assessments of the skills inventory system can facilitate ongoing improvement and adaptation to changing educational contexts, ensuring its continued effectiveness in enhancing human resource management practices within the school. However, continuous updates to reflect staff development may further optimize its utility.

Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Financial Resource Management

The Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Financial Resource Management refers to fund allocation, budget preparation, and transparency and accountability.

The following tables shows the mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation.

Table 9 illustrates the level of resource efficacy in terms of financial resource management as to fund

allocation.

Results show that the level of resource efficacy in terms of financial resource management, particularly fund allocation, is exceptionally high. The data indicate that the administrators strongly agree that they allocate financial resources to various school activities and programs based on identified needs and priorities, with a mean score of 4.73 and a standard deviation of 0.47. Similarly, they strongly agree that their allocation decisions aim to maximize the positive impact on student learning and school performance, also scoring a mean of 4.73 with a slightly lower standard deviation of 0.45. Likewise, administrators involve relevant stakeholders, such as teachers and staff, in the process of fund allocation, indicating a high level of collaboration and inclusivity, with a mean score of 4.76 and a standard deviation of 0.46. Moreover, they allocate financial resources under their leadership to reflect transparency and fairness, as evidenced by the mean score of 4.76 and a standard deviation of 0.44. Additionally, administrators demonstrate adaptability by regularly reviewing and adjusting fund allocation decisions to align with changing school needs, maintaining a high mean score of 4.73 with a standard deviation of 0.46.

Table 9 Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Financial Resource Management as of Fund Allocation

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Head...</i>			
<i>allocates financial resources to various school activities and programs based on identified needs and priorities.</i>	4.73	.47	Strongly Agree
<i>allocates decisions aim to maximize the positive impact on student learning and school performance.</i>	4.73	.45	Strongly Agree
<i>involves relevant stakeholders, such as teachers and staff, in the process of fund allocation.</i>	4.76	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>allocates financial resources under his/her leadership to reflect transparency and fairness.</i>	4.76	.44	Strongly Agree
<i>regularly reviews and adjusts fund allocation decisions to align with changing school needs.</i>	4.73	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.74	
<i>SD</i>		0.40	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		Highly Evident	

Overall, the weighted mean of 4.74, coupled with a relatively low standard deviation of 0.40, suggests that the efficacy of financial resource management, particularly in fund allocation, is highly evident and consistent across various aspects, indicating a robust and well-structured approach in optimizing resource utilization for the benefit of the school community. The data illustrates that principals were actively engaged in allocating financial resources to various school activities and programs based on identified needs and priorities, as evidenced by the strong agreement reflected in the mean scores.

Moreover, the allocation decisions were strategically aimed at maximizing positive impacts on student learning and school performance, underscoring the principal's commitment to educational outcomes. Additionally, the involvement of relevant stakeholders, such as teachers and staff, in the allocation process indicates a collaborative approach to resource management, fostering transparency and fairness. Furthermore, the regular review and adjustment of fund allocation decisions ensure their continued alignment with the changing needs of the school community, reflecting dynamic and responsive financial management practices. Thus, the results imply that effective financial resource management plays a crucial role in supporting and enhancing overall school performance and educational outcomes.

Table 10 illustrates the level of resource efficacy in terms of financial resource management as to

budget preparation.

Results demonstrate that the highest mean scores in terms of Financial Resource Management budget preparation are associated with statements like "creates a comprehensive and realistic budget that considers both income and expenditures" (mean = 4.78, SD = 0.43) and "monitors budget execution closely, ensuring that funds were used efficiently and as intended" (mean = 4.79, SD = 0.43). Conversely, indicators such as "engages with stakeholders to gather input and insights for budget planning" (mean = 4.74, SD = 0.46) received slightly lower scores, although all statements fall within the "Strongly Agree" range.

Table 10 Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Financial Resource Management as to Budget Preparation

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Heads...</i>			
<i>creates a comprehensive and realistic budget that considers both income and expenditures.</i>	4.78	.43	Strongly Agree
<i>makes the budget he/she prepares reflect the educational goals and priorities of the school.</i>	4.78	.43	Strongly Agree
<i>engages with stakeholders to gather input and insights for budget planning.</i>	4.74	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>makes the budget preparation process transparent, and stakeholders were well-informed.</i>	4.74	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>monitors budget execution closely, ensuring that funds were used efficiently and as intended.</i>	4.79	.43	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.76	
<i>SD</i>		0.39	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>		<i>Highly Evident</i>	

Overall, with a weighted mean of 4.76 and a standard deviation of 0.39, the level of resource efficacy in financial resource management concerning budget preparation is highly evident.

Principals were actively engaged in creating comprehensive and realistic budgets that align with the school's educational goals and priorities, as reflected in the strong agreement scores. Moreover, the inclusion of stakeholders in the budget planning process underscores a collaborative approach, enhancing transparency and ensuring that diverse perspectives were considered. Additionally, the meticulous monitoring of budget execution demonstrates a commitment to efficient fund utilization and accountability, contributing to effective financial management practices. The results imply that thorough and strategic budget preparation processes were essential for aligning financial resources with educational objectives, fostering transparency, and maximizing the impact of financial investments on school performance. Furthermore, ongoing training and professional development opportunities for principals in budget preparation can further enhance their competency in this critical aspect of financial resource management, ensuring continuous improvement and adaptability to evolving financial landscapes in education.

Table 11 illustrates the level of Resource Efficacy in terms of financial resource management as to transparency and accountability.

Results indicate that the highest mean scores in terms of Financial Resource Management transparency and accountability are associated with statements like "maintains clear and accessible financial records and reports for the school" (mean = 4.83, SD = 0.39) and "makes the financial transactions and decisions in the school conducted transparently and with integrity" (mean = 4.80, SD = 0.42). Conversely, indicators such as "holds himself/herself and relevant staff accountable for financial decisions and resource management" (mean = 4.75, SD = 0.45) received slightly lower scores, although all statements fall within the

"Strongly Agree" range.

Table 11 Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Financial Resource Management as to Transparency and Accountability

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Head...</i>			
<i>maintains clear and accessible financial records and reports for the school.</i>	4.83	.39	Strongly Agree
<i>makes the financial transactions and decisions in the school conducted transparently and with integrity.</i>	4.80	.42	Strongly Agree
<i>holds himself/herself and relevant staff accountable for financial decisions and resource management.</i>	4.75	.45	Strongly Agree
<i>stakeholders, including teachers and staff, have confidence in the financial transparency and accountability of the school.</i>	4.78	.44	Strongly Agree
<i>actively seek feedback and input from stakeholders on financial matters, fostering a sense of ownership and responsibility.</i>	4.80	.41	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.79	
<i>SD</i>		0.38	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>			Highly Evident

Overall, with a weighted mean of 4.79 and a standard deviation of 0.38, the level of resource efficacy in financial resource management concerning transparency and accountability is highly evident.

Principals were committed to maintaining clear and accessible financial records, conducting transactions transparently and with integrity, and holding themselves and relevant staff accountable for financial decisions, as evidenced by the strong agreement scores. The stakeholders' confidence in the financial transparency and accountability of the school highlights the effectiveness of these practices in fostering trust and credibility within the school community. The results imply that a culture of transparency, accountability, and stakeholder engagement is crucial for promoting financial integrity, enhancing credibility, and sustaining stakeholders' confidence in the school's financial management practices.

Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Material Resource Management

The Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Material Resource Management refers to procurement of materials and physical facilities maintenance. This aspect is vital in the study as it elucidates how well principals leverage material resources to create conducive learning environments, provide essential educational materials, and maintain school facilities, all of which can significantly influence student engagement and academic achievement.

The following tables shows the mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation.

Table 12 illustrates the level of resource efficacy in terms of material resource management as to procurement of materials.

Results show that the highest mean scores in terms of Material Resource Management procurement are associated with statements such as "ensures timely and efficient procurement of educational materials and supplies for the school" (mean = 4.75, SD = 0.45) and "makes the procurement process cost-effective and adheres to budget constraints" (mean = 4.76, SD = 0.46). Similarly, "makes the materials procured for the school align with curriculum requirements and educational goals" (mean = 4.74, SD = 0.46) received high scores. However, indicators like "engages with suppliers and vendors to negotiate favorable terms and prices for materials" (mean = 4.71, SD = 0.52) obtained slightly lower scores, though all statements fall within the

"Strongly Agree" range.

Table 12 Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Material Resource Management as to Procurement of Materials

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
<i>My School Head...</i>			
<i>ensures timely and efficient procurement of educational materials and supplies for the school.</i>	4.75	.45	Strongly Agree
<i>makes the procurement process cost-effective and adheres to budget constraints.</i>	4.76	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>engages with suppliers and vendors to negotiate favorable terms and prices for materials.</i>	4.71	.52	Strongly Agree
<i>makes the materials procured for the school align with curriculum requirements and educational goals.</i>	4.74	.46	Strongly Agree
<i>regularly assesses the quality and relevance of materials and make adjustments as needed.</i>	4.75	.48	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>		4.74	
<i>SD</i>		0.42	
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>			<i>Highly Evident</i>

Overall, with a weighted mean of 4.74 and a standard deviation of 0.42, the level of resource efficacy in material resource management concerning procurement is highly evident. Principals demonstrate strong agreement in ensuring timely and efficient procurement of educational materials, maintaining cost-effectiveness, and aligning materials with curriculum requirements and educational goals. Additionally, their engagement with suppliers to negotiate favorable terms and their commitment to assessing material quality contribute to the overall effectiveness of material resource management.

The results imply that proactive procurement practices, cost-conscious decision-making, and alignment with educational objectives were essential for optimizing material resource management in schools, ensuring the availability of quality materials to support teaching, and learning activities. Moreover, fostering partnerships with suppliers and exploring innovative procurement strategies can further enhance principals' effectiveness in material resource management, ensuring sustainable access to quality educational materials and resources for the school community.

Table 13 illustrates the level of resource efficacy in terms of material resource management as to physical facilities and maintenance.

Results indicate that the highest mean scores in terms of Material Resource Management for Physical Facilities and Maintenance are attributed to statements such as "makes the stakeholders, including teachers, staff, and students, perceive the school's physical facilities positively" (mean = 4.79, SD = 0.42) and "makes the physical facilities of the school well-maintained, clean, and in good repair" (mean = 4.78, SD = 0.43). Similarly, "oversees the maintenance and upkeep of school buildings and facilities to ensure a safe and conducive learning environment" (mean = 4.75, SD = 0.45) received high scores. Conversely, while all indicators fall within the "Strongly Agree" range, the statement "allocates resources effectively to address facility maintenance and improvement needs" (mean = 4.76, SD = 0.44) obtained slightly lower scores.

Table 13 Level of Resource Efficacy in terms of Material Resource Management as to Physical Facilities and Maintenance

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD
------------	------	----

<i>My School Head...</i>	REMARKS		
<i>oversees the maintenance and upkeep of school buildings and facilities to ensure a safe and conducive learning environment.</i>	4.75	.45	Strongly Agree
<i>makes the physical facilities of the school were well-maintained, clean, and in good repair.</i>	4.78	.43	Strongly Agree
<i>allocates resources effectively to address facility maintenance and improvement needs.</i>	4.76	.44	Strongly Agree
<i>makes the stakeholders, including teachers, staff, and students, perceive the school's physical facilities positively.</i>	4.79	.42	Strongly Agree
<i>proactively plans for long-term facility maintenance and improvement projects.</i>	4.77	.43	Strongly Agree
<i>Weighted Mean</i>	4.77		
<i>SD</i>	0.38		
<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>	Highly Evident		

Overall, with a weighted mean of 4.77 and a standard deviation of 0.38, the level of resource efficacy in material resource management concerning physical facilities and maintenance is highly evident.

Principals demonstrate strong agreement in overseeing the maintenance of school buildings, ensuring cleanliness and functionality, and effectively allocating resources for facility improvement. Their proactive approach to long-term maintenance planning contributes to the positive perception of stakeholders towards the school's physical facilities. The results suggest that effective facility management practices, including regular maintenance, strategic allocation of resources, and long-term planning, were crucial for creating a safe and conducive learning environment, fostering positive stakeholder perceptions, and ensuring the sustainability of school infrastructure.

School Performance

School Performance refers to the overall effectiveness of a school in achieving its educational objectives and goals, typically measured through various metrics such as school-based management levels, enrollment rates, dropout rates, completion/graduation rates, achievement test mean scores, cohort survival rates, and literacy rates. Understanding school performance is crucial in this study as it serves as the primary outcome variable, indicating the effectiveness of resource management practices in facilitating positive educational outcomes and student success.

A thorough overview of numerous variables, including the cohort survival rate, literacy rate, enrollment rate, dropout rate, completion/graduation rate, mean scores on national achievement tests, and school-based management level, may be obtained by analyzing the average of school performance. This measure captures how well the school has performed overall in accomplishing its goals and supporting the growth of its students.

Table 14 illustrates the mean of school performance in terms of school-based management level.

The results show the mean of school performance concerning School-Based Management (SBM) level across three consecutive years, with consistent scores of 2.36 and a standard deviation of 0.48. These scores suggest a stable performance level in SBM across the specified timeframe.

Table 14 Mean of school performance in terms of School-Based Management Level

SCHOOL YEAR	MEAN	SD	VERBAL INTERPRETATION
-------------	------	----	-----------------------

2020-2021	2.36	.48	Mature
2021-2022	2.36	.48	Mature
2022-2023	2.36	.48	Mature

The results imply that there has been little to no improvement or deterioration in SBM performance over the studied period, indicating the need for further investigation into factors influencing SBM effectiveness and potential strategies for enhancement.

Table 15 illustrates the mean of school performance in terms of enrolment rate.

The results show the mean of school performance concerning Enrolment Rate over a three-year period, showing an upward trend from 95.29% in 2020-2021 to 96.98% in 2022-2023, with corresponding standard deviations of 5.58 and 4.40, respectively.

Table 15 Mean of school performance in terms of Enrolment Rate

SCHOOL YEAR	MEAN	SD	VERBAL INTERPRETATION
2020-2021	95.29	5.58	Very High
2021-2022	95.89	4.47	Very High
2022-2023	96.98	4.40	Very High

These findings suggest a gradual improvement in enrolment rates across the specified timeframe. The results imply that efforts to attract and retain students have been successful, potentially indicating effective enrollment management strategies implemented by the school administration.

Table 16 illustrates the mean of school performance in terms of dropout rate.

Table 16 Mean of school performance in terms of Dropout Rate

SCHOOL YEAR	MEAN	SD	VERBAL INTERPRETATION
2020-2021	.15	.33	Very Low
2021-2022	.01	.037	Very Low
2022-2023	.34	.43	Very Low

The results display the mean of school performance regarding Dropout Rate across three academic years. The Dropout Rate fluctuated inconsistently over the period, with rates of 0.15 % in 2020-2021, 0.01 % in 2021-2022, and 0.34 % in 2022-2023, accompanied by standard deviations of 0.33, 0.037, and 0.43, respectively. These variations may suggest fluctuations in factors influencing dropout rates, such as interventions, student support mechanisms, or external socio-economic conditions. The results imply that while there was a significant reduction in dropout rates in 2021-2022, there was a notable increase in 2022-2023, warranting further investigation into the underlying causes and targeted interventions to address them.

Table 17 illustrates the mean of school performance in terms of completion/graduation rate.

The results show the mean of school performance concerning Completion/Graduation Rate over three consecutive school years. The Completion/Graduation Rate exhibited some variation, with rates of 99.90% in 2020-2021, 104.19% in 2021-2022, and 100.92% in 2022-2023, accompanied by standard deviations of 0.56, 7.09, and 1.30 respectively.

Table 17 Mean of school performance in terms of Completion / Graduation Rate

SCHOOL YEAR	MEAN	SD	VERBAL INTERPRETATION
2020-2021	99.90	.56	Very High
2021-2022	104.19	7.09	Very High
2022-2023	100.92	1.30	Very High

This fluctuation may indicate shifts in factors influencing graduation rates, such as changes in curriculum, instructional practices, or student support initiatives. The results imply that while there was a significant increase in graduation rates in 2021-2022, it was followed by a slight decrease in 2022-2023, suggesting the need for continued monitoring and targeted interventions to sustain positive outcomes.

Table 18 illustrates the mean of school performance in terms of national achievement test mean scores.

The results show the mean of school performance concerning Achievement Test Mean Scores across three consecutive school years. The Achievement Test Mean Scores demonstrated some variability, with scores of 96.90% in 2020-2021, 92.57% in 2021-2022, and 93.16% in 2022-2023, along with standard deviations of 9.26, 6.97, and 6.54, respectively.

Table 18 Mean of school performance in terms of Achievement Test Mean Scores

SCHOOL YEAR	MEAN	SD	VERBAL INTERPRETATION
2020-2021	96.90	9.26	Very High
2021-2022	92.57	6.97	Very High
2022-2023	93.16	6.54	Very High

This fluctuation suggests potential shifts in teaching strategies, curriculum alignment, or student preparation methods affecting test performance over the years. The results imply that while there was a decrease in test scores in 2021-2022, there was a slight improvement in 2022-2023, indicating the importance of ongoing assessment and instructional adjustments to enhance academic outcomes. Additionally, the variability in National Achievement Test Mean Scores underscores the dynamic nature of educational outcomes and the need for continuous monitoring and adaptation to improve student performance. Gain &

Table 19 illustrates the mean of school performance in terms of cohort survival rate.

Table 19 Mean of school performance in terms of Cohort Survival Rate

SCHOOL YEAR	MEAN	SD	VERBAL INTERPRETATION
2020-2021	95.73	8.47	Very High
2021-2022	104.98	5.86	Very High
2022-2023	102.94	3.96	Very High

The results show the mean of school performance concerning Cohort Survival Rate over three consecutive school years. The Cohort Survival Rate exhibits variation across the years, with mean values of 95.73% in 2020-2021, 104.98% in 2021-2022, and 102.94% in 2022-2023, accompanied by standard deviations of 8.47, 5.86, and 3.96, respectively. This variability may indicate fluctuations in student retention and progression rates within the school. The results imply that while there was a substantial increase in the Cohort Survival Rate in 2021-2022, there was a slight decrease in 2022-2023, suggesting the need for continued monitoring and interventions to support student success and retention.

Mentoring and Empowerment (2-tailed)	Sig. Pearson's Correlation	Action Orientation		Sig. (2-tailed)
		Pearson's Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	
0.623	0.001	0.93	2.950	0.2851
0.623	0.001	0.93	2.950	0.2851
0.623	0.001	0.93	2.950	0.2851
0.084	0.012	0.146	0.008	0.9638
0.084	0.012	0.117	0.009	0.3669
0.075	0.012	0.411	0.016	0.7690
0.003	0.034	0.006	0.029	0.36514
0.002	0.035	0.006	0.029	0.30519
0.204	0.006	0.004	0.033	0.78606
0.011	0.245	0.003	0.035	0.16038
0.293	0.004	0.065	0.013	0.24375
0.761	0.000	0.252	0.005	0.35120
0.803	0.000	0.988	8.55	0.37733
0.266	0.005	0.541	0.001	0.43964
0.698	0.001	0.906	5.48	0.60180
0.446	0.002	0.259	0.005	0.18218
0.429	0.002	0.122	0.009	0.51384
0.204	0.006	0.125	0.009	0.92665
0.271	0.005	0.065	0.133	0.20997
0.710	0.001	0.929	3.14	0.26166
0.372	0.003	0.092	0.110	0.21584

Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in Terms of Human Resource Management and School Performance

The Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in Terms of Human Resource Management and School Performance involves examining the correlation between the effectiveness of human resource management practices by school principals and various aspects of school performance. This test is essential as it helps determine the extent to which the competency of principals in managing human resources influences overall school effectiveness, including factors like enrollment rates, dropout rates, and academic achievement.

Statistical analyses were used to examine the relevance of the relationship between school principals' human resource management and school performance, as well as the direction and degree of this association. Comprehending the importance of this association provides valuable perspectives on the degree to which efficient management of human resources impacts overall learning results, guiding the development of strategies and policies meant to enhance school leadership and performance.

Table 21 illustrates the Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in terms of Human Resource Management.

The analysis of the relationship between school principals' human resource management and school performance indicators reveals varied correlations. Notably, significant correlations exist between health and welfare management and several aspects of school performance, including dropout rate, completion/graduation rate, NAT mean scores, cohort survival rate, and literacy rate (p < 0.05). Conversely, decision-making, training and development, staff relation, and personnel skills inventory show predominantly non-significant relationships with school performance metrics

Table 21 Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in terms of Human Resource Management and School Performance

DECISION MAKING	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	SBM	SBM2	SBM 22-23	Enrollment	Enrollment	Enrollment	Drop Rate	Drop Rate	Drop Rate	Completion	Completion	Completion	AR20t	Achie	Achievement	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Literacy	Literacy	Literacy Rate																		
			0.60	0.033	0.60	0.033	0.60	0.033	0.00	.164**	0.00	.166**	0.00	.194**	0.00	-.192**	0.00	-.202**	0.48	-0.044	0.00	-.201**	0.05	0.118	0.26	0.069	0.78	0.017	0.45	-0.047	0.49	0.043	0.99	0.000	0.05	0.119	0.01	.147*	0.03	-.128*	0.74

Personal Skills Inventory	HEALTH AND WELFARE		STAFF RELATION		TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation
	0.879	0.01	0.97	0.00	0.9	0.00
	0.879	0.01	0.97	0.00	0.9	0.00
	0.879	0.01	0.97	0.00	0.9	0.00
	0.082	0.10	0.30	0.06	0.1	0.09
	0.082	0.10	0.21	0.07	0.1	0.09
	0.036	0.13	0.07	0.11	0.0	0.12
	0.018	0.00	0.01	0.0	0.0	0.0
	0.013	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0
	0.520	0.00	0.94	0.3	0.3	0.0
	0.017	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0
	0.184	0.08	0.02	0.137	0.1	0.09
	0.470	0.04	0.12	0.09	0.4	0.04
	0.857	0.00	0.68	0.02	0.5	0.0
	0.378	0.00	0.97	0.0	0.2	0.0
	0.927	0.00	0.67	0.02	0.6	0.0
	0.728	0.02	0.13	0.09	0.2	0.03
	0.238	0.07	0.235	0.05	0.3	0.06
	0.164	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.3	0.06
	0.142	0.09	0.03	0.1	0.1	0.07
	0.983	0.00	0.86	0.02	0.8	0.00
	0.230	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.1	0.0

The results imply that effective management of health and welfare resources were crucial for enhancing multiple dimensions of school performance, including student retention, academic achievement, and overall well-being. The lack of significant correlations between other human resource management aspects and school performance suggests a need for further investigation into the nuanced dynamics between these factors. Understanding the intricacies of how different human resource management practices impact school performance can inform targeted interventions and resource allocation strategies in educational settings.

Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in Terms of Financial Resource Management and School Performance

The Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in Terms of Financial Resource Management and School Performance entails assessing the correlation between the proficiency of school principals in managing financial resources and different dimensions of school performance. This examination is crucial as it elucidates how the effectiveness of financial resource management practices impacts various aspects of school effectiveness, including budget allocation, transparency, and academic outcomes such as graduation rates and achievement scores.

An important component of educational research is the analysis of the noteworthy correlation between the financial resource management of school principals and academic success. Comprehending the correlation between financial resource management and academic achievement is imperative for shaping policy determinations and executing tactics targeted at maximizing learning outcomes.

Table 22 illustrates the Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in terms of Financial Resource Management and School Performance.

The analysis of the relationship between school principals' financial resource management and school performance indicates predominantly non-significant correlations across various metrics. While completion/graduation rate shows a significant correlation with fund allocation ($p < 0.05$), other financial resource management indicators such as budget preparation, transparency, and accountability exhibit no significant relationship with school performance metrics.

Table 22 Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in Terms of Financial Resource Management and School Performance

Table 21.
Test of Significant Relationship between the Educational Leadership and School Performance

Mentoring and Empowering	Action Orientation		Affective Quality		
	(2-tailed) Corr	(2-tailed) Corr	(2-tailed) Corr	(2-tailed) Corr	
0.62	0.93	2.95	0.004	SBM	
0.62	0.93	2.95	0.004	SBM	
0.62	0.93	2.95	0.004	SBM	
0.08	0.14	0.00	8.06	ent	
0.08	0.14	0.00	8.06	ent	
0.07	0.41	0.01	2.47	ent	
0.00	0.00	0.02	0.0003	ent	
0.00	0.03	0.02	0.003205	Rate	
0.00	0.00	0.02	0.004107	Rate	
0.20	0.00	0.03	0.000288	Rate	
0.01	0.00	0.03	0.007683	Rate	
0.29	0.06	0.01	0.005304	Rate	
0.76	0.25	0.00	0.003396	Rate	
0.80	0.98	8.55	0.003046	Rate	
0.26	0.54	0.00	0.002335	Rate	
0.69	0.90	5.48	0.001065	Rate	
0.44	0.25	0.00	0.006941	Rate	
0.42	0.12	0.00	0.001667	Rate	
0.20	0.12	0.00	3.32E-05	Rate	
0.27	0.06	0.13	0.006132	Rate	
0.71	0.92	3.14	0.004919	Rate	
0.372	0.09	0.11	0.005977	Rate	

These findings suggest that leadership practices focused on action orientation and mentoring and empowering can positively influence school performance metrics such as drop rates and completion rates. Moreover, schools might benefit from leadership development programs that emphasize actionable strategies and empowering mentorship to enhance these performance outcomes. This supports the statement of Ratka (2018), that principals who demonstrate strong affective qualities exhibit empathy, compassion, and interpersonal skills that contribute to the creation of a supportive and inclusive learning environment.

Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in Terms of Human Resource Management and School Performance

The Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in Terms of Human Resource Management and School Performance involves examining the correlation between the effectiveness of human resource management practices by school principals and various aspects of school performance. This test is essential as it helps determine the extent to which the competency of principals in managing human resources influences overall school effectiveness, including factors like enrollment rates, dropout rates, and academic achievement.

Statistical analyses were used to examine the relevance of the relationship between school principals' human resource management and school performance, as well as the direction and degree of this association. Comprehending the importance of this association provides valuable perspectives on the degree to which efficient management of human resources impacts overall learning results, guiding the development of strategies and policies meant to enhance school leadership and performance.

Table 21 illustrates the Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in terms of Human Resource Management.

Personal Skills		HEALTH AND		STAFF RELATIO		TRAINING AND		DECISION MAKING		
Sig. (2-	Pe ars	Sig. .	Pe ars	Sig. .	Pe ars	Sig. .	Pea rso	Sig. .	Pear son	
0.87	0.0	0.0	-	0.9	0.0	0.	0.0	0.6	0.03	SBM
0.87	0.0	0.0	-	0.9	0.0	0.	0.0	0.6	0.03	SBM
0.87	0.0	0.0	-	0.9	0.0	0.	0.0	0.6	0.03	SBM
0.08	0.1	0.0	-	0.3	0.0	0.	0.0	0.0	.164	Enr
0.08	0.1	0.0	-	0.2	0.0	0.	0.0	0.0	.166**	Enr
0.03	.13*	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.	0.1	0.0	.194**	Enr
0.01	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.	-	0.0	-	Dro
0.01	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.	-	0.0	-	Dro
0.52	-	0.0	.20**	0.9	-	0.	-	0.4	-	Dro
0.01	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.	-	0.0	-	Co
0.18	0.0	0.0	.50**	0.0	.13*	0.	0.0	0.0	0.11	Co
0.47	0.045	0.0	.433**	0.121	0.097	0.	0.048	0.268	0.069	Co mpl
0.85	-	0.0	-	0.6	0.0	0.	-	0.7	0.01	AR2
0.37	-	0.0	-	0.9	-	0.	-	0.4	-	Achi
0.92	0.0	0.0	-	0.6	0.0	0.	-	0.4	0.04	Achi
0.72	-	0.0	-	0.1	-	0.	-	0.9	0.00	Coh
0.23	0.0	0.0	.23**	0.0	0.1	0.	0.0	0.0	0.11	Coh
0.16	0.0	0.0	-	0.1	0.1	0.	0.0	0.0	.147	Coh
0.14	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.	-	0.0	-	Liter

The results imply that effective management of health and welfare resources were crucial for enhancing multiple dimensions of school performance, including student retention, academic achievement, and overall well-being. The lack of significant correlations between other human resource management aspects and school performance suggests a need for further investigation into the nuanced dynamics between these factors. Understanding the intricacies of how different human resource management practices impact school performance can inform targeted interventions and resource allocation strategies in educational settings. The results reflect the revelations on the study of Isanto, Fakhruddin, Yanto, and Sedyowati (2021) which has shown that principals who excel in decision-making within the realm of human resource management tend to create a more efficient and productive school environment. Their strategic allocation of personnel and resources optimizes the utilization of staff talents, leading to improved student learning outcomes. Well-

informed decisions in staffing and resource allocation significantly contribute to the school's overall effectiveness.

Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in Terms of Financial Resource Management and School Performance

The Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in Terms of Financial Resource Management and School Performance entails assessing the correlation between the proficiency of school principals in managing financial resources and different dimensions of school performance. This examination is crucial as it elucidates how the effectiveness of financial resource management practices impacts various aspects of school effectiveness, including budget allocation, transparency, and academic outcomes such as graduation rates and achievement scores.

An important component of educational research is the analysis of the noteworthy correlation between the financial resource management of school principals and academic success. Comprehending the correlation between financial resource management and academic achievement is imperative for shaping policy determinations and executing tactics targeted at maximizing learning outcomes.

Table 22 illustrates the Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in terms of Financial Resource Management and School Performance.

The analysis of the relationship between school principals' financial resource management and school performance indicates predominantly non-significant correlations across various metrics. While completion/graduation rate shows a significant correlation with fund allocation (p < 0.05), other financial resource management indicators such as budget preparation, transparency, and accountability exhibit no significant relationship with school performance metrics.

Table 22 Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in Terms of Financial Resource Management and School Performance

	Fund Allocation			Budget Preparation	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation		Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation
	0.554	-0.037	0.143	-0.092	SBM 20-21
	0.554	-0.037	0.143	-0.092	SBM 21- 22
	0.554	-0.037	0.143	-0.092	SBM 22-23
	0.349	0.059	0.796	0.016	Enrollment 20 to 21
	0.280	0.068	0.859	0.011	Enrollment 21 to 22
	0.079	0.110	0.477	0.045	Enrollment 22 to 23
	0.006	-0.172**	0.021	-0.144*	Drop Out Rate 20 to 21
	0.003	-0.187**	0.014	-0.153*	Drop Out Rate 21 to 22
	0.986	0.001	0.636	-0.030	Drop Out Rate 22 to 23
	0.000	-0.219**	0.013	-0.155*	Completion Rate 20 to 21
	0.011	.158*	0.135	0.094	Completion Rate 21 to 22
	0.069	0.114	0.367	0.057	Completion Rate 22 to 23
	0.798	-0.016	0.058	-0.119	Achievement Rate 20 to 21
	0.545	-0.038	0.043	-0.126*	Achievement Rate 21 to 22
	0.994	0.000	0.109	-0.100	Achievement Rate 22 to 23
	0.043	-0.126*	0.016	-0.150*	Cohort Survival Rate 20 to 21
	0.051	0.122	0.613	0.032	Cohort Survival Rate 21 to 22
	0.186	0.083	0.739	-0.021	Cohort Survival Rate 22 to 23
	0.012	-0.156*	0.096	-0.104	Literacy Rate 20 to 21
	0.424	-0.050	0.124	-0.096	Literacy Rate 21 to 22
	0.015	-0.151*	0.109	-0.100	Literacy Rate 22 to 23

Transparency and Accountability	Pearson Correlation	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	0.131	-0.094
	0.131	-0.094
	0.131	-0.094
	0.929	-0.006
	0.886	-0.009
	0.714	0.023
	0.064	-0.116
	0.047	-0.124*
	0.852	-0.012
	0.030	-0.136*
	0.148	0.090
	0.332	0.061
	0.087	-0.107
	0.095	-0.104
	0.150	-0.090
	0.017	-0.149*
	0.617	0.031
	0.649	-0.029
	0.117	-0.098
	0.115	-0.099
	0.117	-0.098

These findings suggest that while specific aspects of financial resource management may impact certain dimensions of school performance, overall, the relationship between financial resource management practices and school outcomes is not statistically significant. Hence, the results imply that further investigation into the different factors influencing financial resource management and its effects on school performance is necessary to inform targeted interventions and resource allocation strategies in educational settings.

Test of Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in terms of Material Resource Management and School Performance

This examination explores the ways in which different aspects of school performance were impacted by the distribution and application of material resources. The effectiveness of resource allocation techniques can be ascertained by looking at correlations between material resource management indicators and key performance metrics. This section has important implications for improving educational results. For educators and politicians looking to maximize resource allocation and improve student outcomes, it is imperative that they comprehend the connection between material resource management and school performance. Through the identification of noteworthy associations, instructors can execute focused tactics to guarantee that tangible assets proficiently assist pedagogical and educational endeavors.

Table 23 illustrates the Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in terms of Material Resource Management and School Performance.

Table 23. Test of Significant Relationship between the School Principals’ Resource Efficacy in terms of Material Resource Management and School Performance

Procurement	Pearson
SBM	-0.001
SBM	-0.001
SBM	-0.001
SBM	.133*
SBM	.134*
SBM	.166**
SBM	-.255**
SBM	-.263**
SBM	-0.093
SBM	-.234**
SBM	0.113
SBM	0.048
SBM	-0.059
SBM	-0.122
SBM	-0.055
SBM	-0.099
SBM	0.075
SBM	0.088
SBM	-0.122
SBM	-0.012
SBM	-0.105

Physical Facilities And	Sig. (2-	Pearson	Sig. (2-
	0.445	0.048	0.985
	0.445	0.048	0.985
	0.445	0.048	0.985
	0.029	.136*	0.034
	0.024	.141*	0.032
	0.010	.160*	0.007
	0.000	-.224**	0.000
	0.000	-.228**	0.000
	0.110	-0.100	0.136
	0.003	-.188**	0.000
	0.227	0.076	0.070
	0.764	0.019	0.442
	0.877	-0.010	0.350
	0.212	-0.078	0.051
	0.713	-0.023	0.379
	0.438	-0.049	0.112
	0.338	0.060	0.231
	0.099	0.103	0.161
	0.209	-0.079	0.050
	0.538	0.039	0.852
	0.319	-0.063	0.094

The analysis of the relationship between school principals' material resource management and school performance reveals a mixed pattern of significant and non-significant correlations. Significant correlations were observed between certain aspects of material resource management, such as procurement of materials and physical facilities maintenance, with enrollment rates and dropout rates. However, other metrics, including completion/graduation rate, national achievement test mean scores, cohort survival rate, and literacy rate, do not exhibit significant correlations with material resource management indicators. These findings suggest that while certain aspects of material resource management may influence student enrollment and dropout rates, other dimensions of school performance may be less directly impacted by material resource management practices. Further investigation is necessary to elucidate the nuanced relationships between material resource management and various dimensions of school performance, informing targeted strategies for optimizing resource allocation and improving educational outcomes.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The researcher proposed the following conclusions considering the study's findings:

1. The significant relationships found between the action orientation and mentoring and empowering dimensions of educational leadership and certain school performance indicators predominantly have no relationships across the various metrics, leading to the rejection of the hypothesis. This means that the educational leadership of a principal showed a positive impact on the school performance.
2. The significant role of health and welfare management in positively influencing various dimensions of school performance. However, other aspects of human resource management, such as decision-making, training and development, staff relation, and personnel skills inventory, exhibit predominantly no relationships with school performance metrics. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. Thus, managing human resources in various dimensions cannot contribute significantly to the overall effectiveness of the school performance.
3. The significant correlation between fund allocation and completion/graduation rate, the school principals' financial resource management and school performance predominantly have no relation across various metrics. This suggests a need for further exploration into the complex dynamics between financial resource management practices and school outcomes.

4. It can also be concluded that while significant correlations exist between certain aspects of material resource management, such as procurement of materials and physical facilities maintenance, with enrollment and dropout rates, other dimensions of school performance do not exhibit relationships with material resource management indicators. And there is correlation with enrollment and drop-out rates but not with other performance metrics.

Based on the results gathered from the study, the following are being recommended:

1. It is recommended that the Division office personnel may prioritize leadership development programs that emphasize action-oriented strategies and mentorship practices, as these dimensions have shown significant positive relationships with school performance indicators. Additionally, providing ongoing professional development and support for school principals in these areas can help further enhance school outcomes

2. District/Division Offices may prioritize the implementation of HRM practices that enhance decision-making processes and prioritize the health and welfare of staff members. This could involve providing training and support for principals to develop effective decision-making skills and establishing wellness programs to ensure staff well-being. Additionally, fostering strong stakeholder relations and maintaining an updated personnel skills inventory should not be overlooked, as these factors contribute to a holistic approach to HRM that positively impacts school performance.

3. To optimize educational outcomes, the district or division offices may focus on strategic resource allocation and targeted interventions in financial resource management. This may include providing support and training for principals in budget preparation and decision-making related to resource allocation. Moreover, efforts should be made to enhance training and development opportunities for staff, aligning these initiatives with school performance goals to maximize their impact.

Reference:

Bhandari, P. (2023). Correlational Research | When & How to Use. Scribbr. Retrieved from: <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/correlational-research>