

The Influence of the Decision-Making Skills of the School Heads on the Performance of the Teachers in the Public Elementary Schools of Jose Panganiban District, Division of Camarines Norte

Gallardo O. Caballero¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: School-Head Decision-Making Perceived Influence on Teacher Performance Questionnaire Kendall Concordance Jose Panganiban District	The study examined school-head decision-making and perceived influence on teacher performance in Jose Panganiban District, Division of Camarines Norte during School Year 2025–2026. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design used a researcher-made questionnaire with 54 respondents in the tabulated distribution. Weighted means and ranks described the indicators; Kendall's coefficient of concordance and corresponding chi-square tests assessed agreement at 0.05. The overall ratings of decision-making skills were classified as Very Much Evident (4.57), and those of perceived influence on teacher performance as Very Much Influential overall (4.56). Significant agreement was reported for all six decision-making domains. For perceived influence on teacher performance, significant agreement was reported for all six performance domains. The findings identify local priorities for professional support and implementation review. They concern perceptions and rankings rather than independently verified improvement or causal effects. Incomplete measurement details and unresolved reporting issues constrain interpretation. Participant-role descriptions also require clarification.

1. Introduction

School heads make decisions about instructional priorities, staffing, resource use, communication, and participation in school programs. These decisions can shape the conditions in which teachers work, but their perceived importance must be distinguished from an estimated causal effect. The study examined decision-making skills and ratings of their influence on teacher performance in Jose Panganiban District. Six leadership domains and six perceived-performance domains organized the inquiry.

The decision-making domains concerned clarity and consistency, data use, participation, timeliness, fairness, and empowerment. The performance domains concerned instruction, morale, productivity, participation, teamwork, and teaching and learning outcomes. These functions cover administrative arrangements and professional relationships. Their inclusion allows a distinction between practices that are visible in school operations and claims about the consequences of those practices.

Grissom et al. (2021) synthesized research on how principals affect schools and students, including attention to teaching conditions and organizational processes. Day et al. (2016) examined the ways successful leaders combine transformational and instructional strategies. These contributions provide a basis for considering leadership beyond isolated administrative tasks. Neither establishes that the local ratings in the study demonstrate influence, because the reported analyses concern perceptions and concordance rather than an outcome model.

Burkett and Hayes (2023) investigated teachers' perceptions of ineffective school leadership in Texas and identified communication, ethical conduct, and school climate as relevant concerns. That context differs from Jose Panganiban, but it makes the study's fairness, support, and morale indicators pertinent to professional discussion. The local contribution is a profile of reported practices and perceived influence, with conclusions bounded by unresolved participant descriptions and measurement limitations.

2. Purpose and research questions

The study addressed the extent of decision-making skills across Clarity and Consistency; Data-Driven; Participatory and Collaborative; Timeliness and Responsiveness; Fairness and Objectivity; Supportive and Empowering Decisions; agreement on their indicator rankings; the extent of perceived influence on teacher performance across Improved Instructional Delivery; Increased Motivation and Morale; Higher Productivity and Efficiency; Active Participation in School Programs; Improved Collaboration and Teamwork; Positive Teaching and Learning Outcomes; agreement on those rankings; and policy recommendations based on the findings. The reported null hypotheses concerned the absence of significant rank agreement. The title and substantive focus are retained while the interpretation is limited to the analyses actually reported.

Examining extent and agreement together separates the magnitude of a rating from the ordering of its components. Respondents may rate every statement favorably while differing in which they prioritize. Conversely, concordant rankings can coexist with less favorable ratings. The study therefore treats descriptive profiles and inferential comparisons as complementary evidence, without using one as a substitute for the other.

3. Methods

3.1 Design and participants

The study used descriptive-evaluative-correlational methods in Jose Panganiban District, Division of Camarines Norte for School Year 2025–2026. The reported participant group comprised 54 respondents in the tabulated distribution. The descriptive component assessed the listed practices and outcomes; the evaluative component concerned their rated extent. The reported inferential component assessed agreement on indicator rankings. No separate participant-level correlation or regression between the two sets of domain scores was presented.

Purposive sampling was stated for locale selection, and total enumeration was named for respondents. The tabulated distribution reports 8 respondents from big schools, 14 from medium schools, and 32 from small schools, totaling 54. Other passages describe 15 school heads and 18 OICs or identify junior high school teachers. School level and respondent role therefore remain unresolved. The manuscript uses the tabulated total without silently reconciling those conflicting descriptions.

3.2 Instrument and operational definitions

The main instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire covering 12 domains. The reconstructed findings below preserve the listed indicator statements, mean values, and interpretation labels. Numerical rankings, overall means, and group-specific values have not been invented where they were not reported. The categories describe the study's operational measure rather than a standardized diagnostic or performance scale.

The questionnaire specifications list 119 entries, comprising 60 decision-making and 59 influence entries. The fixed findings comprise 54 and 53 indicators, respectively; the questionnaire includes an additional Others entry per domain. The treatment of those additional entries was not reported. The stated decision-making intervals were 4.50–5.00 Very Much Evident, 3.50–4.49 Much Evident, 2.50–3.49 Evident, 1.50–2.49 Fairly Evident, and 1.00–1.49 Not Evident. The influence scale used corresponding Very Much Influential, Much Influential, Influential, Fairly Influential, and Not at All Influential labels.

Validation by the district supervisor, school heads, and adviser was described. Kuder–Richardson Formula 21 and a correlation-significance procedure were named. The account reports $t = 7.36$ but supplies no completed reliability coefficient, pilot sample size, or domain-level results. A significance claim is not a reliability magnitude, and suitability of the procedure for ordinal ratings requires clarification. No reliability coefficient or probability-of-error interpretation is reconstructed.

3.3 Procedures and ethical reporting

The procedure described proposal review, preparation and validation of the instrument, permission through the district supervisor, administration and retrieval, tabulation, analysis, and manuscript review. Acknowledgments refer to administrative permission. The methods retain some future-tense administration language, and exact collection dates were not specified. Administrative access is not represented as independent ethics approval; individual consent and detailed confidentiality procedures were not documented in the available methodological account.

No new fieldwork or reconstruction of individual responses was undertaken. The reporting process preserves aggregate values and distinguishes them from proposed actions. Consequently, the manuscript cannot add standard errors, confidence intervals, missing-data estimates, or participant characteristics that were not provided. The limitations of the available evidence are part of the interpretation of the study, not evidence that an unreported procedure was performed incorrectly.

3.4 Statistical analysis

Weighted means, frequency counts, percentages, ranks, Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W , and corresponding chi-square tests were identified as analytical tools. Significance was set at 0.05. The test tables retain reported W values, chi-square values, probability inequalities, and decisions. Probability inequalities are not exact p values. No unreported probability or corrected calculation has been substituted.

Kendall concordance concerns similarity in the ordering of statements across ranking groups. It does not estimate an association between a practice score and an outcome score, and it does not establish a causal effect. A nonsignificant result means that the reported procedure did not establish significant agreement; it is not proof of no agreement, equivalent groups, or low skill. These distinctions are maintained throughout the results.

The inferential tables report three school-size groups. Decision-making indicator counts were 10, 9, 8, 10, 9, and 8, with degrees of freedom 9, 8, 7, 9, 8, and 7. Performance-domain counts were 10, 9, 8, 9, 9, and 8, with degrees of freedom 9, 8, 7, 8, 8, and 7. Alternative-hypothesis acceptance is retained. Significance thresholds are not converted into percentages of respondents agreeing. The tabulated participant total is 54, but other passages describe 15 school heads and 18 OICs, or junior high school teachers. The summary gives $\chi^2 = 22.21$ for Clarity and Consistency, whereas the findings table, preliminaries, and computation give 22.14. Both entries are acknowledged; 22.14 is used in the reconstructed test table with the discrepancy stated.

4. Results

Table 1. Reported respondent distribution by school size

School-size group	Respondents	Percentage
Big Schools	8	15
Medium Schools	14	26
Small Schools	32	59
GRAND TOTAL	54	100

Note. Counts and percentages reproduce the tabulated distribution. Conflicting role and population descriptions remain unresolved. The small-school category contributed the largest share of the tabulated respondents. These are counts of respondents in school-size groups, not a verified count of schools. The distribution does not resolve whether respondents were heads, OICs, or teachers. Its value is to describe the reported grouping without attributing representativeness or a single professional role to all 54 cases.

4.1 Clarity and Consistency

Table 2. Clarity and Consistency

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Providing clear guidelines in communicating school policies	4.85	Very Much Evident
Regularly reviewing and clarifying policies to avoid misinterpretations	4.72	Very Much Evident
Explaining decisions in a straightforward and understandable manner	4.70	Very Much Evident
Avoiding conflicting instructions and directives	4.58	Very Much Evident
Aligning decisions with established school goals and vision	4.57	Very Much Evident
Maintaining consistency in implementing rules and regulations	4.56	Very Much Evident
Ensuring transparency in decision-making processes	4.52	Very Much Evident
Upholding school policies without favoritism or bias	4.48	Much Evident
Demonstrating fairness in handling similar cases and situations	4.40	Much Evident
consistently applying disciplinary measures across all levels	4.33	Much Evident

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 2 presents clarity and consistency indicators. The displayed means range from 4.33 to 4.85. The entries include both higher and lower interpretation categories, so the overall favorable domain profile should not obscure its components. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items. Clear communication was rated above impartiality and consistent discipline. A well-explained decision can still be perceived differently in its application. The profile supports connecting clarity with procedural fairness. It does not establish discriminatory conduct or the success of a communication intervention; the findings remain perceptions of specified leadership practices.

4.2 Data-Driven

Table 3. Data-Driven

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Analyzing attendance records to identify patterns and concerns	4.74	Very Much Evident
Consulting school financial reports before budget planning	4.68	Very Much Evident
Basing resource allocation on enrollment and utilization data	4.66	Very Much Evident
Using learner performance data to guide academic decisions	4.65	Very Much Evident
Employing assessment results to design intervention programs	4.60	Very Much Evident
Monitoring progress indicators to measure effectiveness of programs	4.60	Very Much Evident
Utilizing survey feedback from stakeholders to improve school policies	4.59	Very Much Evident
Comparing historical school data to forecast future needs	4.56	Very Much Evident
Referring to teachers' performance evaluation in making personnel decisions	4.55	Very Much Evident

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 3 presents data-driven indicators. The displayed means range from 4.55 to 4.74. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Attendance analysis was rated above use of teacher performance evaluations for personnel decisions. Operational data use and sensitive personnel judgment require different safeguards and expertise. The ordering supports considering how evidence is interpreted, not merely whether data are available. No decision audit establishes the accuracy or fairness of the information used.

4.3 Participatory and Collaborative

Table 4. Participatory and Collaborative

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Encouraging open dialogue during staff meetings and consultations	4.68	Very Much Evident
Promoting teamwork in addressing school issues and challenges	4.66	Very Much Evident
Delegating responsibilities based on staff expertise and strengths	4.65	Very Much Evident
Valuing diverse perspectives in planning and problem-solving	4.58	Very Much Evident
Involving teachers in formulating school policies and guidelines	4.57	Very Much Evident
Recognizing contributions of stakeholders in shared decisions	4.54	Very Much Evident
Seeking input from parents and community stakeholders in decision-making	4.50	Very Much Evident
Building consensus before implementing major school initiatives	4.31	Much Evident

Note. Means and interpretations are reconstructed from the summary of findings. The consensus mean 4.31 is supplied by the detailed findings table, where the summary omitted it.

Table 4 presents participatory and collaborative indicators. The displayed means range from 4.31 to 4.68. The entries include both higher and lower interpretation categories, so the overall favorable domain profile should not obscure its components. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items. Open dialogue was rated above building consensus. Consultation and shared agreement are not the same process. The full findings table supplies the consensus mean absent from the concluding summary, with that provenance identified. The profile supports examining how input affects decisions without assuming that all stakeholders had equal influence.

4.4 Timeliness and Responsiveness

Table 5. Timeliness and Responsiveness

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Making decisions within prescribed deadlines and timelines	4.79	Very Much Evident
Providing immediate feedback on teachers' requests and proposals	4.75	Very Much Evident
Ensuring timely communication of decisions to stakeholders	4.74	Very Much Evident
Addressing urgent school concerns without unnecessary delays	4.67	Very Much Evident
Maintaining accessibility during school emergencies and crises	4.66	Very Much Evident
Responding promptly to parents' inquiries and concerns	4.65	Very Much Evident
Demonstrating readiness to adjust plans based on emerging needs	4.63	Very Much Evident
Prioritizing critical matters that require swift action	4.62	Very Much Evident
Acting quickly on issues affecting learner safety and welfare	4.56	Very Much Evident
implementing interventions promptly to resolve recurring issues	4.46	Much Evident

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 5 presents timeliness and responsiveness indicators. The displayed means range from 4.46 to 4.79. The entries include both higher and lower interpretation categories, so the overall favorable domain profile should not obscure its components. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items. Meeting deadlines was rated above resolving recurring issues through prompt intervention. Administrative speed and sustained problem resolution can diverge. The findings support considering follow-through as well as response time. They do not provide case-resolution records or establish that quicker decisions improved classroom outcomes.

4.5 Fairness and Objectivity

Table 6. Fairness and Objectivity

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Basing decisions on facts rather than personal opinions	4.65	Very Much Evident
Providing equal opportunities for teachers and staff in professional development	4.62	Very Much Evident
Applying school rules consistently to all stakeholders	4.59	Very Much Evident
Treating stakeholders with respect regardless of background or status	4.57	Very Much Evident
Recognizing achievements without bias or discrimination	4.56	Very Much Evident
Making personnel decisions grounded on performance and merit	4.53	Very Much Evident
Avoiding favoritism in assigning tasks and responsibilities	4.51	Very Much Evident
Considering all sides of an issue before making a judgment	4.41	Much Evident
Ensuring impartiality in conflict resolution among learners and personnel	4.34	Much Evident

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 6 presents fairness and objectivity indicators. The displayed means range from 4.34 to 4.65. The entries include both higher and lower interpretation categories, so the overall favorable domain profile should not obscure its components. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items. Fact-based decisions were rated above impartial conflict resolution. General commitment to evidence may be easier to endorse than managing contested cases. The profile suggests a role for transparent procedures and review of competing perspectives. No misconduct investigation or independent fairness assessment was undertaken.

4.6 Supportive and Empowering Decisions

Table 7. Supportive and Empowering Decisions

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Recognizing and appreciating teachers' and staff's contributions	4.61	Very Much Evident
Providing teachers with autonomy to innovate in their teaching practices	4.57	Very Much Evident
Encouraging staff to take leadership roles in school projects	4.55	Very Much Evident
Supporting continuous learning through training and development opportunities	4.54	Very Much Evident
Valuing teachers' inputs in shaping instructional strategies	4.50	Very Much Evident
Offering mentoring and guidance to enhance professional growth	4.46	Much Evident
providing resources to help teachers effectively implement initiatives	4.40	Much Evident
promoting a culture of trust that empowers stakeholders to make decisions	4.33	Much Evident

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 7 presents supportive and empowering decisions indicators. The displayed means range from 4.33 to 4.61. The entries include both higher and lower interpretation categories, so the overall favorable domain profile should not obscure its components. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items. Recognition was rated above trust, resources, and mentoring-related statements. Appreciation and practical empowerment are different forms of support. The findings support examining whether teachers have the means and discretion to act on encouragement. They do not establish that any particular resource or mentoring intervention changed performance.

Table 8. Reported concordance for decision-making skills

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported p	Decision
Clarity and Consistency	0.82	22.14	p<0.01	H ₁ accepted
Data-Driven	0.90	21.60	p<0.01	H ₁ accepted
Participatory and Collaborative	0.72	15.12	p<0.05	H ₁ accepted
Timeliness and Responsiveness	0.73	19.71	p<0.025	H ₁ accepted
Fairness and Objectivity	0.74	17.76	p<0.05	H ₁ accepted
Supportive and Empowering Decisions	0.86	18.06	p<0.025	H ₁ accepted

Note. Three groups are reported. All statistics and probability inequalities are retained as reported. Not rejected expresses a stated exception to rejection; it does not establish equivalence. Clarity and Consistency is 22.14 here; the concluding summary instead reports 22.21. Table 8 reports significant agreement for all six decision-making domains. No domain was reported as nonsignificant. The test concerns indicator ordering. It does not determine which domain was most effective, establish the magnitude of improvement, or demonstrate an association between the two sets of constructs.

Comparisons of chi-square magnitudes require attention to the number of indicators and degrees of freedom; they are not a common scale of educational or organizational value. The practical interpretation is therefore to examine the content of the ratings alongside the reported agreement. Any unresolved calculation or transcription issue limits confidence in the inferential classification until the underlying output is checked.

4.7 Improved Instructional Delivery

Table 9. Improved Instructional Delivery

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Aligned instructional practices with clearly set school goals and priorities	4.73	Very Much Influential
Improved lesson planning guided by well-communicated administrative directions	4.70	Very Much Influential
Enhanced professional competence of teachers through school head-initiated training	4.68	Very Much Influential
Higher quality of teaching resources provided through strategic decision-making	4.63	Very Much Influential
Strengthened classroom management through consistent policy implementation	4.61	Very Much Influential
Enhanced teacher motivation through participatory decision-making processes	4.52	Very Much Influential
Increased use of innovative teaching strategies as encouraged by school head decisions	4.51	Very Much Influential
Timely adaptation of teaching methods based on data-driven administrative decisions	4.49	Much Influential
Improved learner engagement resulting from responsive instructional guidelines	4.48	Much Influential
Greater collaboration among teachers fostered by supportive leadership decisions	4.41	Much Influential

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 9 presents improved instructional delivery indicators. The displayed means range from 4.41 to 4.73. The entries include both higher and lower interpretation categories, so the overall favorable domain profile should not obscure its components. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items. Alignment with goals was rated above collaboration and some adaptive-instruction statements. Clear direction and the capacity to implement it are distinct concerns. The influence labels record perceptions, not causal effects. There were no independent observation scores or before-and-after instructional assessments establishing improvement.

4.8 Increased Motivation and Morale

Table 10. Increased Motivation and Morale

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Recognition of teacher achievements through transparent decision-making processes	4.60	Very Much Influential
Higher teacher enthusiasm encouraged by motivational school head directives	4.57	Very Much Influential
Positive work environment established by morale-boosting administrative choices	4.56	Very Much Influential
Reduced teacher stress through timely and considerate problem-resolution decisions	4.53	Very Much Influential
Boosted teacher confidence through consistent and empowering leadership decisions	4.46	Much Influential
Increased job satisfaction from fair and supportive administrative decisions	4.45	Much Influential
Increased willingness to innovate encouraged by supportive leadership actions	4.42	Much Influential
Stronger sense of belonging fostered by inclusive decision-making practices	4.34	Much Influential
Enhanced professional commitment resulting from participatory decision-making	4.34	Much Influential

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 10 presents increased motivation and morale indicators. The displayed means range from 4.34 to 4.60. The entries include both higher and lower interpretation categories, so the overall favorable domain profile should not obscure its components. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items. Recognition was rated above belonging and professional commitment. Morale therefore should not be treated as a single uniform response to leadership. Its summary was lower than the other performance domains. The study did not use independent retention, absence, or well-being outcomes to validate the perceived influence ratings.

4.9 Higher Productivity and Efficiency

Table 11. Higher Productivity and Efficiency

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Streamlined workflow achieved through well-structured decision-making policies	4.70	Very Much Influential
Maximized use of teaching resources guided by practical and goal-oriented decisions	4.69	Very Much Influential
Efficient use of instructional time guided by school head's strategic planning	4.67	Very Much Influential
Reduced duplication of work through organized and systematic leadership decisions	4.66	Very Much Influential
Enhanced teacher performance supported by effective delegation of responsibilities	4.64	Very Much Influential
Improved task prioritization influenced by data-driven administrative choices	4.59	Very Much Influential
Faster resolution of instructional challenges due to responsive leadership actions	4.56	Very Much Influential
Increased teacher output supported by resource allocation decisions	4.55	Very Much Influential

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 11 presents higher productivity and efficiency indicators. The displayed means range from 4.55 to 4.70. The reported classification is Very Much Influential. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Workflow organization was rated above output attributed to resource allocation. Efficient arrangements and greater production are related but distinct claims. The favorable ratings describe perceived support, not audited time savings or teacher output. No causal productivity estimate can be derived from concordance in these perceptions.

4.10 Active Participation in School Programs

Table 12. Active Participation in School Programs

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Greater attendance and participation in school activities encouraged by motivational decisions	4.76	Very Much Influential
Enhanced willingness to volunteer in school events due to morale-boosting directives	4.73	Very Much Influential
Consistent participation in professional development programs supported by leadership directives	4.73	Very Much Influential
Strengthened commitment to extracurricular programs fostered by supportive leadership	4.70	Very Much Influential
Improved teacher engagement in community outreach through responsive leadership actions	4.67	Very Much Influential
Increased teacher involvement in school initiatives through inclusive decision-making	4.63	Very Much Influential
Increased enthusiasm in organizing and leading school events influenced by strategic decisions	4.61	Very Much Influential
Stronger collaboration in school programs driven by participatory decision-making practices	4.57	Very Much Influential
Greater teacher ownership of school projects resulting from transparent administrative choices	4.54	Very Much Influential

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 12 presents active participation in school programs indicators. The displayed means range from 4.54 to 4.76. The reported classification is Very Much Influential. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Attendance was rated above ownership of projects. Being present at an activity does not necessarily mean that teachers shaped its direction. The ordering supports attention to meaningful involvement alongside participation counts. The study did not examine attendance logs or trace changes in responsibility over time.

4.11 Improved Collaboration and Teamwork

Table 13. Improved Collaboration and Teamwork

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Enhanced sharing of best practices encouraged by supportive administrative choices	4.60	Very Much Influential
Improved peer mentoring and coaching resulting from strategic leadership initiatives	4.58	Very Much Influential
Increased teacher cooperation in joint tasks through inclusive decision-making	4.57	Very Much Influential
Greater alignment of teaching practices through harmonized decision-making processes	4.51	Very Much Influential
Stronger problem-solving collaboration encouraged by school head-facilitated dialogue	4.50	Very Much Influential
Strengthened collegial relationships fostered by participatory leadership decisions	4.49	Much Influential
Greater unity in achieving school goals guided by collective decision-making approaches	4.44	Much Influential
Increased trust among teachers built through transparent administrative decisions	4.43	Much Influential
Enhanced sense of collective responsibility nurtured by empowering leadership decisions	4.38	Much Influential

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 13 presents improved collaboration and teamwork indicators. The displayed means range from 4.38 to 4.60. The entries include both higher and lower interpretation categories, so the overall favorable domain profile should not obscure its components. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Sharing practices was rated above collective responsibility and trust-related outcomes. Exchange of information can occur without equally strong ownership of joint work. The profile supports considering the relational conditions of teamwork. It does not establish that a particular decision-making practice caused better collaboration.

4.12 Positive Teaching and Learning Outcomes

Table 14. Positive Teaching and Learning Outcomes

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Greater alignment of teaching practices with curriculum standards through effective decision-making	4.62	Very Much Influential
Improved assessment practices influenced by well-informed administrative choices	4.61	Very Much Influential
Increased learner engagement fostered by supportive leadership decisions	4.59	Very Much Influential
Higher learner participation encouraged by innovative school head directives	4.59	Very Much Influential
Enhanced quality of lesson delivery guided by strategic instructional policies	4.54	Very Much Influential
Reduced learning gaps addressed through responsive school head interventions	4.49	Much Influential
Enhanced critical thinking and problem-solving skills of learners through teacher-focused leadership support	4.47	Much Influential
Improved learner achievement resulting from data-driven administrative decisions	4.45	Much Influential

Note. Means and interpretations are retained from the reported average findings. These are perceptions, not independently measured effects. Table 14 presents positive teaching and learning outcomes indicators. The displayed means range from 4.45 to 4.62. The entries include both higher and lower interpretation categories, so the overall favorable domain profile should not obscure its components. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Curriculum alignment was rated above learner achievement. Organizational coherence and measured student results are different outcomes. The ratings cannot substitute for learner assessment data, nor can significant concordance validate causal claims. The findings identify perceived priorities that require direct outcome evaluation.

Table 15. Reported concordance for perceived influence on teacher performance

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported p	Decision
Improved Instructional Delivery	0.79	21.33	p<0.025	H ₁ accepted
Increased Motivation and Morale	0.90	21.60	p<0.01	H ₁ accepted
Higher Productivity and Efficiency	0.76	15.96	p<0.05	H ₁ accepted
Active Participation in School Programs	0.88	21.12	p<0.01	H ₁ accepted
Improved Collaboration and Teamwork	0.82	19.68	p<0.025	H ₁ accepted
Positive Teaching and Learning Outcomes	0.84	17.64	p<0.025	H ₁ accepted

Note. Three groups are reported. All statistics and probability inequalities are retained as reported. Not rejected expresses a stated exception to rejection; it does not establish equivalence.

Table 15 reports significant agreement for all six performance domains. No domain was reported as nonsignificant. The test concerns indicator ordering. It does not determine which domain was most effective, establish the magnitude of improvement, or demonstrate an association between the two sets of constructs.

Comparisons of chi-square magnitudes require attention to the number of indicators and degrees of freedom; they are not a common scale of educational or organizational value. The practical interpretation is therefore to examine the content of the ratings alongside the reported agreement. Any unresolved calculation or transcription issue limits confidence in the inferential classification until the underlying output is checked.

Table 16. Summary of decision-making ratings by school-size group

Domain	Big Mean / rank	Medium Mean / rank	Small Mean / rank	Average Mean / rank
Clarity and Consistency	4.54 / 4.5	4.57 / 3	4.61 / 3	4.57 / 3
Data-Driven	4.61 / 2	4.61 / 2	4.66 / 1.5	4.63 / 2
Participatory and Collaborative	4.58 / 3	4.56 / 4	4.55 / 4	4.56 / 4
Timeliness and Responsiveness	4.65 / 1	4.65 / 1	4.66 / 1.5	4.65 / 1
Fairness and Objectivity	4.54 / 4.5	4.52 / 5	4.53 / 5	4.53 / 5
Supportive and Empowering Decisions	4.51 / 6	4.49 / 6	4.50 / 6	4.50 / 6
Average	4.57	4.57	4.59	4.57

Note. All entries are Very Much Evident except the medium-school Supportive and Empowering Decisions mean, 4.49, which is Much Evident. Values and ranks match the reported summary.

Timeliness and Responsiveness ranked first overall, whereas Supportive and Empowering Decisions ranked sixth. The latter domain also included the sole Much Evident entry in the school-group summary. The difference is useful for distinguishing prompt administrative decisions from the resources, trust, and guidance needed for teachers to act. The aggregate means do not test differences between individual respondents or establish a causal pathway.

Table 17. Summary of perceived influence on teacher performance

Domain	Big Mean / rank	Medium Mean / rank	Small Mean / rank	Average Mean / rank
Improved Instructional Delivery	4.60 / 3	4.58 / 3	4.56 / 3	4.58 / 3
Increased Motivation and Morale	4.48 / 6	4.46 / 6	4.47 / 6	4.47 / 6
Higher Productivity and Efficiency	4.65 / 2	4.63 / 2	4.62 / 2	4.63 / 2
Active Participation in School Programs	4.68 / 1	4.66 / 1	4.64 / 1	4.66 / 1
Improved Collaboration and Teamwork	4.52 / 5	4.50 / 5	4.48 / 5	4.50 / 5

Positive Teaching and Learning Outcomes	4.57 / 4	4.53 / 4	4.53 / 4	4.54 / 4
Average	4.58	4.56	4.55	4.56

Note. Increased Motivation and Morale is Much Influential in every group. Small-school Improved Collaboration and Teamwork is also Much Influential. All other summary entries are Very Much Influential. The preliminaries use Effective wording instead; the findings-table labels are retained here.

Active Participation in School Programs ranked highest and Increased Motivation and Morale lowest in every school-size group. This consistent order does not mean that participation produced morale or that the two outcomes were measured independently of respondents' perceptions. It suggests that visible involvement and internal professional experience were rated differently. Morale deserves substantive attention despite significant concordance, because agreement is not the same as a high level.

5. Discussion

5.1 Meaning of the descriptive profile

The study reported favorable ratings across decision-making skills and perceived influence on teacher performance. The detailed tables nevertheless distinguish specific practices and behaviors rather than establishing a uniformly successful process. The most useful application is to examine what the relatively lower statements require in everyday practice. A high category rating does not establish that every participant had the same experience or that all implementation conditions were equally supportive.

The within-domain patterns are exploratory and descriptive. The displayed precision allows exact transcription but should not be confused with evidence that small mean differences are practically important. Without response distributions and variability estimates, it is not possible to determine whether a narrow range reflects genuinely similar experience, restricted response options, or a tendency to endorse favorable statements. The interpretation therefore remains tied to the content and type of measurement.

Grissom et al. (2021) and Day et al. (2016) provide broader evidence concerning leadership and educational outcomes, while Burkett and Hayes (2023) emphasize teacher perceptions of communication and ethical practice. The local profile is pertinent to these concerns, but its concordance analyses do not reproduce those studies' designs or estimate the effect of leadership on measured teacher performance.

5.2 Agreement and the research questions

The reported agreement results address a narrower question than the title's practical purpose. For decision-making skills, significant agreement was reported for all six decision-making domains. For perceived influence on teacher performance, it was reported for all six performance domains. These findings describe the ordering of indicators under the reported procedure. They do not establish which practice explains individual differences in outcomes, nor do they demonstrate that changing one domain would improve another.

Nonsignificant domains should not automatically become deficit labels. They may reflect differences in relative emphasis even when ratings are uniformly high. Similarly, significant domains are not necessarily the strongest priorities for intervention. Priority setting should consider the importance of the behavior, actual implementation conditions, and the evidence needed to understand a problem. The test classification alone does not supply those judgments.

5.3 Implications for practice and policy

The study proposed evidence-based leadership development, data-literacy support, decision-support dashboards, risk and contextual analysis, and reflective documentation of decisions and results. These are proposed actions; their implementation and effects were not evaluated.

A defensible next step is to review the findings with relevant stakeholders and compare the questionnaire statements with actual examples of practice. Such review can clarify what respondents understood, identify usable resources, and distinguish shared priorities from context-specific needs. This would extend the study rather than represent data already collected. Proposed actions should have explicit objectives and indicators before their effectiveness is evaluated.

Implementation should also include attention to access, workload, and the quality of support. Standardizing a form or activity does not by itself establish that participants can use it meaningfully. The findings provide a basis for discussing those conditions, but not for prescribing an identical response to every school or stakeholder group. The study did not compare alternative policy packages or estimate their costs and benefits.

6. Conclusion

The study reported favorable extent ratings for decision-making skills and perceived influence on teacher performance among 54 respondents in the tabulated distribution in Jose Panganiban District, Division of Camarines Norte. Significant agreement was reported for all six decision-making domains in the first set and all six performance domains in the second. These conclusions concern reported extent and rank concordance.

The findings support consideration of the proposed professional and implementation priorities. They do not establish causal effectiveness, individual mastery, or verified improvement. Completing the missing methodological details and resolving the identified reporting issues are necessary before stronger explanatory claims. The title and study purpose are retained without expanding the evidence beyond the reported design.

References

- [1] Burkett, J., & Hayes, S. D. (2023). Ineffective school leadership: Teachers weigh-in. *School Leadership Review*, 18(1), Article 7.
- [2] Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258.
- [3] Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research. The Wallace Foundation. <https://doi.org/10.59656/EL-SB1065.001>