# School Administrators' Engagement and Its Relationship with Teachers' Collaboration and Decision-Making Effectiveness

### Shahara M. Pañares
Student, Medina College – Ozamiz City

*Abstract*— School administrators are pivotal in shaping an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning. Their active engagement influences teacher collaboration, decision-making, and overall school performance. Understanding how administrators' engagement relates to teachers' collaboration and decision-making effectiveness is essential for fostering sustainable educational development. This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design involving 30 school administrators and 533 teachers from selected schools in the Division of Ozamiz City. A researcher-made questionnaire was used to collect data. Statistical tools included frequency and percentage, mean and standard deviation, Spearman Rank-Order Correlation, and Kruskal-Wallis Test. The study revealed a very high level of engagement among school administrators, particularly in shared purpose, social interaction, and knowledge-sharing. Teachers also demonstrated a very high level of collaboration in communication, trust-building, and stakeholder inclusion. Decision-making effectiveness among administrators ranged from high to very high, emphasizing participation, transparency, and accountability. While levels of engagement, collaboration, and decision-making effectiveness were consistently high, statistical analysis showed no significant relationships between administrators' engagement and either teacher collaboration or decision-making effectiveness. Additionally, no significant differences in engagement were found based on age, sex, or educational attainment. These findings underscore the vital role of engaged leadership in sustaining school operations and fostering a collaborative culture, although other contextual factors may play a greater role in shaping collaboration and decision-making. Encouraging inclusive leadership and participatory governance remains crucial for improved educational outcomes and stronger school communities. Further research is recommended to explore additional variables that may influence teacher engagement and school decision-making processes.

*Keywords*— School Administrator, Engagement, Teacher Collaboration, Decision-Making Effectiveness, School Performance, Teacher-Administrator Relationships.

## I. INTRODUCTION

### Background of the Study

School administrators play a crucial role in fostering an environment that supports effective teaching and learning. Their engagement in school management significantly affects educational outcomes, including teacher performance, student achievement, and institutional growth. This engagement includes decision-making, collaboration, and leadership practices that help teachers achieve instructional goals. As education systems evolve, administrators become increasingly vital in helping schools adapt to new challenges and innovations. Understanding how their engagement relates to teacher collaboration and decision-making is essential for improving school performance.

Principals help shape the organizational and cultural environment of schools, directly influencing teachers' working conditions. By fostering trust and involving teachers in decision-making, they promote collaboration that enhances teaching practices and student outcomes (Warwas et al., 2019; Meyer et al., 2020). Leadership that emphasizes shared decisions and professional collaboration contributes to teacher satisfaction and improved student learning. Strengthening leadership capacity helps administrators manage initiatives that meet local needs, reinforcing school development (Sahlin & Styf, 2019). Research links collaboration to participation, trust-building, and research-based practices (Sahlin, 2018, 2019). Yet, despite its recognized value, the impact of leadership on collaboration and decision-making still varies across educational settings. Exploring teachers' perspectives offers deeper insight into how administrator engagement shapes these processes.

Although existing literature highlights the importance of administrators in promoting collaboration and decision-making, there is limited understanding of how their active engagement strengthens these areas. Most studies focus on leadership styles without directly examining

how involvement affects teachers' collaborative and decision-making abilities. Contextual factors—such as school type, location, and level—remain understudied, limiting the relevance of findings. Without clarity on how these elements interact, schools may struggle to apply leadership strategies that truly support teachers. Addressing these gaps is key to developing effective interventions and enhancing school leadership and performance.

This study explores the relationship between school administrators' engagement, teacher collaboration, and decision-making effectiveness. It aims to identify how varying levels of administrative involvement influence collaboration and school-wide participation. By examining these dynamics in different settings, the study seeks to provide evidence-based insights to inform policies and leadership practices. Ultimately, it aims to guide educational leaders in fostering engagement, improving teacher performance, and promoting sustainable institutional development.

### Respondents of the Study

The study involved 30 school administrators and 533 teachers from selected schools in the Division of Ozamiz City. Administrators included principals, assistant principals, department heads, and academic coordinators, while teachers comprised classroom instructors, subject coordinators, and lead teachers. Stratified random sampling ensured a representative and proportionate selection based on roles. The sample size was determined to accurately reflect the total school personnel population for reliable results.

### Research Instrument

A structured questionnaire was used to examine the relationship between school administrators' engagement, teachers' collaboration, and decision-making effectiveness. It included four sections: demographic profile, administrators' engagement, teachers' collaboration, and decision-making effectiveness.

The engagement section targeted administrators and measured shared purpose, professional interaction, and continuous learning. The collaboration section for teachers assessed stakeholder involvement, communication, trust, collective action, and resource sharing. The decision-making section evaluated participation, transparency, authority-sharing, inclusivity, accountability, and feedback. All items u

### Instruments Validation

The instrument's validity and reliability were ensured through content validation, face validation, and pilot testing. Three experts in educational management and research reviewed the questionnaire for relevance, clarity, and coverage, resulting in revisions. Face validation involved a small group of administrators and teachers who assessed clarity and usability. A pilot test in a similar school setting evaluated internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha and identified improvements. This process confirmed the instrument's validity and reliability for the study.

### Data Gathering Procedure

Data collection began with a formal permission request to the Schools Division Superintendent of Ozamiz City. After approval, consent letters were sent to school principals and administrators of selected schools. Meetings were held to explain the study, clarify respondent roles, and secure informed consent. Structured questionnaires were then personally distributed to respondents, who were given sufficient time to complete them. Follow-ups ensured a high response rate, and completed questionnaires were checked for completeness before data preparation for analysis. Throughout the process, confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained to protect respondents' rights.

### Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to key ethical principles by obtaining informed consent, fully informing participants about the purpose and procedures, and ensuring voluntary participation with the option to withdraw at any time. Confidentiality was maintained through data anonymization and restricted access. The research minimized harm by using respectful, non-intrusive questions focused on professional topics. Ethical approval and permissions were obtained from relevant authorities, including the Schools Division Superintendent. Data were used solely for research and reported in aggregate to protect individual privacy.

### Data Analysis

Data analysis employed several statistical methods aligned with the study's objectives. Frequency counts and percentages described respondents' demographics. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation measured levels of administrators' engagement, teachers' collaboration, and decision-making effectiveness. Spearman's rank-order correlation assessed the strength and direction of relationships between administrators'

engagement and both teachers' collaboration and decision-making. The Kruskal-Wallis test examined differences in administrators' engagement across demographic groups. These analyses provided a comprehensive evaluation of the variables and their relationships.

## III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

*Table 1.* *Demographic Profile of Respondents*

| Profile | School Administrators | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | f | % | f | % |
| **Age** | | | | |
| **21 - 30 years old** | 0 | 0 | 486 | 91.18 |
| **31 - 40 years old** | 14 | 46.67 | 45 | 4.44 |
| **41 – 50 years old** | 14 | 46.67 | 2 | 0.38 |
| **51 and above years old** | 2 | 6.66 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | 30 | 100 | 533 | 100 |
| **Sex** | | | | |
| **Male** | 14 | 46.67 | 249 | 46.72 |
| **Female** | 16 | 53.33 | 284 | 53.28 |
| **Total** | 30 | 100 | 533 | 100 |
| **Educational Attainment** | | | | |
| **Bachelor's Degree** | 0 | 0 | 231 | 43.34 |
| **Units in Master's Degree** | 7 | 23.33 | 263 | 49.34 |
| **Master's Degree** | 14 | 46.67 | 39 | 7.32 |
| **Units in a Doctorate Degree** | 6 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| **Doctorate Degree** | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | 30 | 100 | 533 | 100 |

Table 1 summarizes the demographic profiles of school administrators and teachers. Most administrators are aged 31 to 50 (93.34%), while the majority of teachers (91.18%) are aged 21 to 30, indicating a notable age gap between the groups. Gender distribution is balanced in both groups, with females slightly outnumbering males.

Educationally, administrators tend to have higher qualifications, with 46.67% holding a Master's Degree and 30% with Doctorate-level education or units. Conversely, most teachers have completed units toward a Master's Degree (49.34%) or hold a Bachelor's Degree (43.34%), showing a gap in educational attainment between the two groups. These differences suggest a generational and educational divide that could impact collaboration and decision-making within schools. Younger teachers may contribute fresh perspectives, while experienced administrators offer strategic guidance. The balanced gender ratio indicates gender likely does not affect collaboration or decision-making effectiveness in this context.

*Table 2.1* *Extent of School Administrators' Engagement in terms of Shared Interest or Purpose*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I actively promote a shared vision and goals among teachers to enhance school performance. | 0.44 | 4.26 |
| 2. I align school activities and programs with a common purpose that supports student success. | 0.55 | 4.56 |
| 3. I encourage open discussions with teachers to align their personal and professional goals with the school's mission. | 0.49 | 4.43 |
| 4. I facilitate collaboration to ensure that school initiatives reflect the collective priorities of the faculty. | 0.49 | 4.40 |
| 5. I seek input from teachers to refine and strengthen our shared educational objectives. | 0.48 | 4.36 |
| **Average Mean** | 4.407 High | |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 2.1 reveals that school administrators exhibit a very high level of engagement in fostering shared interests and purposes among teachers, reflected by an overall mean score of 4.407. This demonstrates their strong commitment to cultivating a collaborative culture where teacher goals align closely with the school's mission, which is essential for enhancing school performance and student success.

The highest mean score of 4.56, also categorized as very high, highlights administrators' effectiveness in aligning school activities and programs with a common purpose that supports student achievement. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score of 4.26 still falls within the very high

range and pertains to actively promoting a shared vision and goals among teachers. These consistently high scores indicate a sustained effort by administrators to encourage open discussions, collaboration, and teacher input.

These findings support the work of Leithwood et al. (2004), who emphasize that a shared vision and collaborative goal-setting led by school leaders are key factors in school improvement. Such leadership practices boost teacher engagement and contribute significantly to better student outcomes, confirming the vital role administrators play in fostering a unified and motivated faculty.

***Table 2.2*** *Extent of School Administrators' Engagement in terms of Social Interaction and Engagement*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I create opportunities for informal and formal interactions with teachers to foster teamwork. | 0.56 | 4.46 |
| 2. I regularly converse with teachers to understand their concerns and perspectives. | 0.49 | 4.56 |
| 3. I encourage social activities that strengthen relationships among faculty members. | 0.50 | 4.50 |
| 4. I establish a supportive environment where teachers feel valued and included. | 0.56 | 4.53 |
| 5. I participate in school events and activities alongside teachers to build rapport. | 0.47 | 4.33 |
| **Average Mean** | 4.480 Very High | |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 2.2 shows that school administrators have a very high level of engagement in promoting social interaction with teachers, reflected by an overall mean of 4.48. This indicates their strong commitment to building interpersonal relationships, encouraging open communication, and fostering a collaborative school culture that boosts team cohesion, teacher morale, and overall school effectiveness. The highest-rated item, "I regularly converse with teachers to understand their concerns and perspectives" (M = 4.56), demonstrates administrators' attentiveness and responsiveness to teachers' needs, which helps build trust and mutual

understanding. The lowest-rated, though still very high, was "I participate in school events and activities alongside teachers to build rapport" (M = 4.33), showing administrators' active involvement in shared experiences that strengthen camaraderie and school spirit.

Nguyen et al. (2023) emphasized that consistent social engagement and leader visibility enhance teacher collaboration, trust, and commitment. Effective relational leadership is thus key to creating a supportive, high-performing educational environment.

***Table 2.3*** *Extent of School Administrators' Engagement in terms of Shared Knowledge and Learning*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I actively share best practices and innovative strategies with teachers to improve instruction. | 0.56 | 4.53 |
| 2. I provide opportunities for teachers to engage in professional development and continuous learning. | 0.54 | 4.36 |
| 3. I facilitate mentoring and coaching sessions to enhance teachers' skills and knowledge. | 0.47 | 4.33 |
| 4. I encourage collaborative learning among teachers to address educational challenges. | 0.49 | 4.46 |
| 5. I support teachers in acquiring new teaching methods by promoting knowledge-sharing sessions. | 0.54 | 4.36 |
| **Average Mean** | 4.413 Very High | |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 2.3 shows that school administrators exhibit a very high level of engagement in promoting shared

knowledge and continuous learning, with an overall mean of 4.41. This reflects their strong commitment to

instructional improvement, collaboration, and professional development, fostering a dynamic, growth-oriented teaching environment.

The highest-rated indicator, "I actively share best practices and innovative strategies with teachers to improve instruction" (M = 4.53), highlights administrators' role in modeling instructional innovation and encouraging excellence. The lowest, though still very high, indicator was "I facilitate mentoring and coaching sessions to enhance teachers'

skills and knowledge" (M = 4.33), indicating consistent support for personalized teacher development.

These findings align with Khasawneh et al. (2023), who stress that leaders who promote collaborative learning and knowledge sharing build instructional capacity and improve school performance.

Likewise, Leithwood et al. (2023) emphasize that leadership grounded in professional learning enhances teacher motivation and instructional effectiveness.

*Table 2.4 Summary of the Extent of School Administrators' Engagement*

| Components | Mean | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Shared Interest or Purpose | 4.407 | Very High |
| Social Interaction and Engagement | 4.480 | Very High |
| Shared Knowledge and Learning | 4.413 | Very High |
| **Average Mean** | 4.433 Very high | |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21– 5.00 "Very High"

The overall average mean of 4.433, interpreted as Very High, indicates that school administrators consistently exhibit strong engagement in their leadership roles. This high level of involvement fosters a collaborative work environment, strengthens communication, and promotes shared responsibility. Such engagement reflects a leadership style that values participation, continuous improvement, and team cohesion—crucial for the successful implementation of school goals and programs.

Among the components, "Social Interaction and Engagement" recorded the highest mean of 4.480, showing that administrators actively build strong interpersonal relationships and maintain open communication with teachers, fostering trust and teamwork. "Shared Knowledge and Learning" followed with a mean of 4.413, indicating that administrators are

highly effective in supporting continuous professional growth through mentoring, collaboration, and knowledge-sharing activities. Lastly, "Shared Interest or Purpose" obtained a mean of 4.407, still within the Very High range, signifying that administrators are deeply aligned with the school's mission and work to unify the staff under a common vision. These consistently high ratings affirm the administrators' commitment to building a culture of support, collaboration, and shared leadership.

Khasawneh et al. emphasized that engaged school leaders foster positive professional relationships and enhance collective capacity. Similarly, Leithwood, Sun, and Pollock (2017) highlighted that strong administrative engagement significantly contributes to school improvement, teacher development, and organizational effectiveness.

*Table 3.1 Level of Teachers' Collaboration in terms of Stakeholder Engagement and Inclusion*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I collaborate with administrators and other teachers to engage parents and stakeholders in school activities. | 0.48 | 4.23 |
| 2. I actively participate in initiatives that involve the community in the educational process. | 0.58 | 4.49 |
| 3. I contribute ideas and suggestions to school programs and policies discussions. | 0.59 | 4.20 |
| 4. I ensure that my teaching practices align with the expectations of students, parents, and school leaders. | 0.57 | 4.36 |
| 5. I seek input from different stakeholders to improve my teaching strategies. | 0.49 | 4.55 |
| **Average Mean** | | 4.369 Very High |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

The overall average mean of 4.369, interpreted as Very High, indicates that teachers demonstrate strong collaboration with stakeholders. This suggests a school culture that highly values partnership, shared responsibility, and inclusivity, contributing to more effective teaching practices and a supportive educational environment.

The highest-rated indicator, "I seek input from different stakeholders to improve my teaching strategies" (4.55), reflects teachers' proactive approach in enhancing instruction through diverse feedback. The lowest, "I contribute ideas and suggestions to school programs and policies discussions" (4.20), still rated Very High, highlights that teachers are consistently involved in institutional planning and actively contribute to shaping school initiatives.

This finding is supported by Hargreaves (2021), who asserts that meaningful collaboration among teachers and stakeholders enhances professional learning, fosters innovation, and improves overall school performance.

**Table 3.2** *Level of Teachers' Collaboration in terms of Communication and Information Sharing*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I maintain open and clear communication with school administrators regarding school-related matters. | 0.49 | 4.43 |
| 2. I regularly share teaching strategies and insights with colleagues to enhance our collective knowledge. | 0.54 | 4.53 |
| 3. I actively participate in faculty meetings and discussions about school improvement. | 0.59 | 4.35 |
| 4. I provide constructive feedback to my peers to help them improve their teaching practices. | 0.49 | 4.59 |
| 5. I effectively communicate with students and parents to create a supportive learning environment. | 0.54 | 4.41 |
| **Average Mean** | | 4.465 Very High |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 3.2 presents the level of teachers' collaboration in terms of communication and information sharing. The overall average mean of 4.465 falls within the "Very High" range, indicating a strong culture of open communication and active information sharing among teachers. This positive collaboration fosters mutual support and teamwork, creating a cohesive and productive teaching environment. Such engagement promotes effective decision-making and contributes significantly to improving school outcomes.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 4.59 is for "I provide constructive feedback to my peers to help them improve their teaching practices," highlighting a professional atmosphere focused on continuous improvement. The lowest, yet still very high, mean of 4.35 was for "I actively participate in faculty meetings and discussions about school improvement," reflecting consistent and meaningful involvement in collaborative school efforts. Both indicators demonstrate the teachers' commitment to fostering collegial support and collective growth.

According to Johnson (2023), open communication and collaborative feedback among educators are critical drivers of school effectiveness and teacher development. Such practices build trust and shared responsibility, leading to enhanced instructional quality and a more supportive learning environment for students. This collaborative culture ensures sustained professional growth and positive school reform.

**Table 3.3** *Level of Teachers' Collaboration in terms of Trust and Relationship Building*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I trust my colleagues and school leaders to make decisions that benefit students. | 0.55 | 4.49 |
| 2. I work collaboratively with other teachers to create a positive school culture. | 0.55 | 4.47 |
| 3. I seek advice from colleagues when faced with challenges in my teaching practice. | 0.48 | 4.36 |
| 4. I value and respect the professional opinions of my peers in school-related discussions. | 0.49 | 4.59 |
| 5. I actively contribute to maintaining a supportive and inclusive work environment. | 0.66 | 4.27 |
| **Average Mean** | | 4.439 Very High |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 3.3 presents the level of teachers' collaboration in terms of trust and relationship building. The overall average mean of 4.439, categorized as "Very High," indicates that teachers strongly foster trust and positive relationships with colleagues and school leaders. This robust collaborative culture supports open communication, shared responsibility, and mutual respect, all of which contribute positively to school improvement and student success.

The highest mean of 4.59 was for "I value and respect the professional opinions of my peers in school-related discussions," reflecting a strong culture of professional respect and shared decision-making. The lowest, yet still

very high mean of 4.27, was for "I actively contribute to maintaining a supportive and inclusive work environment," indicating solid engagement with room to further enhance inclusivity. These results affirm the teachers' commitment to collaboration grounded in trust and mutual support.

According to Muñoz Martínez (2024), high levels of trust and positive professional relationships among educators are essential for fostering innovation and collective responsibility, which in turn improve team performance and student outcomes. Such a collaborative environment nurtures continuous learning and resilience in schools.

*Table 3.4* Level of Teachers' Collaboration in terms of Joint Decision-making and Collective Action

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I participate in decision-making processes that affect classroom policies and school initiatives. | 0.58 | 4.12 |
| 2. I collaborate with colleagues to develop solutions for common educational challenges. | 0.59 | 4.26 |
| 3. I take part in team discussions when setting goals and priorities for the school. | 0.60 | 4.36 |
| 4. I share responsibilities in implementing school programs and activities. | 0.52 | 4.16 |
| 5. I contribute to making informed decisions that enhance student learning outcomes. | 0.66 | 4.17 |
| **Average Mean** | | 4.217 Very High |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 3.4 presents the level of teachers' collaboration in terms of joint decision-making and collective action. The overall average mean of 4.217 falls within the "Very High" range, indicating that teachers are actively engaged in collaborative decision-making and shared responsibilities. This strong culture of teamwork reflects a participatory school environment where educators feel empowered to contribute meaningfully to shaping school policies and initiatives, fostering shared accountability and unity in achieving educational goals.

The highest mean of 4.36 is for "I take part in team discussions when setting goals and priorities for the school," highlighting teachers' significant involvement in guiding the school's direction and demonstrating strong ownership of institutional objectives. The lowest,

yet still very high mean of 4.12, is for "I participate in decision-making processes that affect classroom policies and school initiatives," showing consistent and meaningful teacher engagement in key decisions that impact the learning environment. These indicators confirm the presence of an inclusive and collaborative school culture that values collective problem-solving and responsibility.

According to Johnson (2023), effective joint decision-making and collective action among educators strengthen school cohesion, enhance innovation, and lead to improved student outcomes by fostering a shared vision and collaborative problem-solving. Such collaborative practices are essential for sustaining school improvement and educational excellence.

*Table 3.5* Level of Teachers' Collaboration in terms of Resource Sharing and Mutual Benefits

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I willingly share teaching materials and resources with my colleagues. | 0.59 | 4.28 |
| 2. I collaborate with fellow teachers to create and implement lesson plans. | 0.60 | 4.08 |
| 3. I make use of shared resources to enhance my teaching effectiveness. | 0.64 | 4.14 |
| 4. I engage in co-teaching or peer mentoring when necessary. | 0.59 | 4.17 |
| 5. I participate in knowledge-exchange programs within the school. | 0.57 | 4.13 |
| **Average Mean** | | 4.164 High |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21– 5.00 "Very High"

Table 3.5 presents the level of teachers' collaboration in terms of resource sharing and mutual benefits. The overall average mean of 4.164 falls under the "High" descriptive category, indicating that teachers actively participate in sharing resources and supporting each other for instructional improvement. This positive collaboration reflects a professional culture that values teamwork, reduces isolation, and fosters collective problem-solving, all of which contribute to a thriving and effective school environment.

The highest mean of 4.28 is for "I willingly share teaching materials and resources with my colleagues," highlighting a strong culture of openness and generosity that benefits both teaching practices and student learning. The lowest mean, yet still high at 4.08, is for "I collaborate with fellow teachers to create and implement lesson plans," suggesting an opportunity to further strengthen joint planning efforts. These results demonstrate that resource sharing, co-teaching, peer mentoring, and participation in knowledge-exchange programs are well-practiced and contribute significantly to professional growth and instructional enhancement.

According to Elford et al. (2024), collaborative resource sharing among teachers promotes professional development, enhances instructional quality, and builds a supportive community that ultimately leads to improved student outcomes. Such collaboration is crucial for sustaining a dynamic and innovative educational environment.

**Table 3.6** *Summary of the Level of Teachers' Collaboration*

| Components | Mean | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Stakeholder Engagement and Inclusion | 4.369 | Very High |
| Communication and Information Sharing | 4.465 | Very High |
| Trust and Relationship Building | 4.439 | Very High |
| Joint Decision-making and Collective Action | 4.217 | Very High |
| Resource Sharing and Mutual Benefits | 4.164 | High |
| **Average Mean** | 4.331 | Very High |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21– 5.00 "Very High"

Table 3.6 summarizes the level of teachers' collaboration across five key components, with an overall average mean of 4.331, interpreted as Very High. This indicates a strong culture of collective effort, shared responsibility, and cooperative practices fostered by effective leadership that encourages open dialogue and mutual respect. Sustaining this collaborative environment is essential for enhancing educational effectiveness and team dynamics.

Among the components, Communication and Information Sharing scored the highest (4.465), followed by Trust and Relationship Building (4.439) and Stakeholder Engagement and Inclusion (4.369), all rated Very High. Joint Decision-making and Collective Action also scored Very High (4.217), while Resource Sharing and Mutual Benefits, though slightly lower (4.164), remained High. These results reflect a professional culture where open communication, trust, inclusion, shared decisions, and resource exchange are well practiced, though resource sharing could be further improved.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that the school promotes a supportive, transparent, and collaborative community. This environment strengthens teamwork, supports student success, and drives school improvement through shared goals and mutual support.

**Table 4.1** *Teachers' Level of Decision Making in terms of Level of Participation*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I actively engage in school decision-making processes. | 0.58 | 3.84 |
| 2. I feel that my voice is valued when decisions are made at the school level. | 0.49 | 3.60 |
| 3. I participate in discussions regarding policies that affect my work and students. | 0.68 | 4.22 |
| 4. I contribute ideas and suggestions that are considered in school decisions. | 0.75 | 3.78 |
| 5. I encourage my colleagues to participate in decision-making activities. | 0.63 | 3.70 |
| **Average Mean** | 3.831 | high |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21– 5.00 "Very High"

Table 4.1 shows that teachers' overall level of participation in decision-making is high, with an average mean of 3.83. This indicates that teachers generally feel involved and empowered in school decisions, fostering a culture of inclusiveness and shared leadership. A high level of participation positively impacts teacher morale, collaboration, and commitment, which in turn enhances school performance. The results are already positive, suggesting a strong foundation that the school can maintain and build upon by introducing innovative strategies to sustain and further enhance teacher engagement.

The highest-rated indicator, with a mean of 4.22 (Very High), is teachers' participation in discussions about policies affecting their work and students, reflecting their proactive involvement when decisions directly impact their roles. The lowest mean of 3.60 (High) relates to teachers feeling that their voices are valued during school-level decisions, suggesting an opportunity to further recognize individual contributions and promote stronger peer involvement in collaborative decision-making.

This supports findings by Johnson (2023), who highlights that active teacher participation in decision-making fosters a positive school climate and improves professional commitment. Sustaining and innovating participatory practices will ensure these benefits continue and grow.

**Table 4.2** *Teachers' Level of Decision Making in terms of Transparency and Openness*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1.  I believe that school policies and decisions are communicated clearly to all stakeholders. | 0.68 | 3.71 |
| 2.  I am informed about the rationale behind major school decisions. | 0.61 | 4.14 |
| 3.  I trust that school leaders make decisions based on transparent and fair processes. | 0.74 | 3.87 |
| 4.  I receive adequate information regarding school programs and administrative changes. | 0.47 | 4.66 |
| 5.  I believe that open dialogue is encouraged within the school. | 0.77 | 4.32 |
| **Average Mean** | | 4.146  High |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21– 5.00 "Very High"

Table 4.2 shows that teachers' perception of transparency and openness in decision-making is high, with an overall mean of 4.146. This indicates that school administrators generally communicate decisions clearly and foster an open environment, which strengthens trust and shared leadership. Maintaining and innovating these transparency practices will help sustain positive morale and collaboration within the school community.

The highest-rated indicator, "I receive adequate information regarding school programs and administrative changes," scored 4.66 (Very High), reflecting teachers feel well-informed about key updates. The lowest mean of 3.71 (High) was for "school policies and decisions are communicated clearly to all stakeholders," suggesting some room to improve the clarity and reach of communication efforts.

These findings align with García-Hernández et al. (2022), who emphasized that transparent communication in schools promotes trust and effective collaboration among staff. Continued focus on clear, inclusive information sharing will further enhance decision-making processes and school climate.

**Table 4.3** *Teachers' Level of Decision Making in terms of Shared Decision-making Authority*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I am involved in decisions that directly impact my teaching and classroom environment. | 0.50 | 4.84 |
| 2. I collaborate with school administrators in setting educational goals. | 0.77 | 4.02 |
| 3. I have opportunities to express my opinions before decisions are finalized. | 0.57 | 4.25 |
| 4. I feel empowered to contribute to important discussions on school management. | 0.70 | 4.16 |
| 5. I believe that decision-making is a shared responsibility between teachers and administrators. | 0.54 | 4.06 |
| **Average Mean** | | 4.199 High |

Scale:    1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21– 5.00 "Very High"

Table 4.3 shows that teachers perceive a high level of shared decision-making authority, with an overall mean of 4.199. This reflects a positive and collaborative school climate where teachers feel engaged, especially in decisions that affect their teaching and classroom environment. Such high participation promotes

empowerment and professional ownership, which can lead to improved educational outcomes. To maintain and further enhance this positive environment, schools should continue to innovate and strengthen teacher involvement across all decision-making levels.

The highest-rated indicator, "I am involved in decisions that directly impact my teaching and classroom environment," scored a very high 4.84, highlighting strong teacher engagement in instructional decisions essential for student success. The lowest, "I collaborate with school administrators in setting educational goals," still scored a positive 4.02, indicating room to expand teacher participation in broader school planning.

These findings are supported by Johnson (2023), who emphasized that high levels of shared decision-making foster teacher empowerment and contribute significantly to overall school effectiveness. Enhancing these collaborative structures further can strengthen shared responsibility and drive continuous school improvement.

*Table 4.4 Teachers' Level of Decision Making in terms of Inclusivity and Representation*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I believe that all faculty members have equal opportunities to participate in school decision-making. | 0.55 | 4.21 |
| 2. I feel that my perspective is valued when discussing school-related concerns. | 0.57 | 4.25 |
| 3. I support initiatives that promote inclusivity in school governance. | 0.63 | 4.20 |
| 4. I participate in committees or task forces that influence school decisions. | 0.48 | 4.24 |
| 5. I advocate for the involvement of diverse voices in decision-making processes. | 0.73 | 4.36 |
| **Average Mean** | | 4.253 Very High |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 4.4 shows that teachers perceive a very high level of inclusivity and representation in school decision-making, with an overall mean of 4.253. This positive result indicates that faculty members feel their voices are valued and that decision-making processes embrace diverse perspectives. Maintaining and innovating these inclusive practices will be key to sustaining a collaborative school culture that fosters teacher empowerment, morale, and commitment.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 4.36 was for "I advocate for the involvement of diverse voices in decision-making processes," highlighting strong teacher support for inclusivity. The statement "I feel that my perspective is valued when discussing school-related concerns" followed closely at 4.25, reflecting a respectful and acknowledging leadership environment. Even the lowest score, 4.20 for "I support initiatives that promote inclusivity in school governance," remains within the High range, confirming consistently strong perceptions of inclusiveness across the board.

These findings align with Ramírez-Montoya et al. (2022), who emphasized that very high levels of inclusive participation in school governance significantly enhance trust, professional collaboration, and overall school effectiveness. Continuing to promote inclusivity will reinforce a positive and productive decision-making climate.

*Table 4.5 Teachers' Level of Decision Making in terms of Accountability and Responsibility*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I take responsibility for implementing decisions that I contribute to. | 0.61 | 4.33 |
| 2. I believe that administrators and teachers are held accountable for their decisions. | 0.66 | 4.35 |
| 3. I accept feedback on my role in decision-making processes. | 0.70 | 4.25 |
| 4. I ensure that my decisions align with the overall vision and mission of the school. | 0.62 | 4.36 |
| 5. I reflect on the outcomes of decisions to improve future practices. | 0.49 | 4.42 |
| **Average Mean** | | 4.349 ry High |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21– 5.00 "Very High"

Table 4.5 presents the teachers' level of decision making in terms of accountability and responsibility, with an overall mean of 4.349, categorized as "Very High." This indicates that teachers consistently take ownership and

demonstrate strong commitment in decision-making processes, fostering a culture of trust, professionalism, and collaborative growth essential for effective school governance.

The highest-rated indicator, "I reflect on the outcomes of decisions to improve future practices," scored 4.42, reflecting a strong culture of continuous improvement among teachers. The lowest, yet still very high, rating of

4.25 for "I accept feedback on my role in decision-making processes" shows teachers' openness to constructive feedback, signaling readiness for ongoing professional development.

These findings align with recent studies emphasizing that high accountability and reflective practices among educators contribute to enhanced school performance and shared leadership (García-Hernández et al., 2022).

**Table 4.6** *Teachers' Level of Decision Making in terms of Feedback and Evaluation*

| Indicators | Sd | Mean |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I receive constructive feedback on my participation in decision-making. | 0.47 | 4.34 |
| 2. I reflect on feedback to improve my contributions in school discussions. | 0.45 | 4.71 |
| 3. I provide feedback to my colleagues and administrators on school decisions. | 0.58 | 4.32 |
| 4. I participate in evaluating the effectiveness of school policies and initiatives. | 0.63 | 4.49 |
| 5. I believe that continuous evaluation improves the decision-making process in our school. | 0.46 | 4.30 |
| **Average Mean** | | 4.436   Very High |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 4.6 shows that teachers' level of decision making in terms of feedback and evaluation is "Very High," with an overall mean of 4.436. This indicates that teachers are actively involved in feedback and evaluation processes, fostering a culture of professional reflection and collaborative decision-making that supports continuous school improvement.

The highest-rated indicator is "I reflect on feedback to improve my contributions in school discussions" with a mean of 4.71, highlighting teachers' strong commitment

to personal and professional growth. The lowest, though still very high, is "I believe that continuous evaluation improves the decision-making process in our school" with a mean of 4.30, suggesting a solid but slightly varied belief in ongoing evaluation's impact.

These results are supported by recent research emphasizing that effective feedback and reflective evaluation enhance teacher engagement and lead to more informed, inclusive school decisions (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

**Table 4.7** *Summary of the Teachers' Level of Decision Making*

| Components | Mean | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Level of Participation | 3.831 | High |
| Transparency and Openness | 4.146 | High |
| Shared Decision-making Authority | 4.199 | High |
| Inclusivity and Representation | 4.253 | Very High |
| Accountability and Responsibility | 4.349 | Very High |
| Feedback and Evaluation | 4.436 | Very High |
| **Average Mean** | 4.202   Very High | |

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High" 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 4.7 presents a summary of the teachers' level of decision making across six components, with an overall average mean of 4.202, which falls within the "Very High" category. This result indicates that teachers perceive themselves as actively and meaningfully involved in decision-making within their schools. Such a high level of engagement suggests that school leaders foster an inclusive and empowering environment where teachers' voices are valued, encouraging collaboration,

professional growth, and commitment to school objectives.

Examining the components individually, "Feedback and Evaluation" received the highest mean of 4.436, indicating teachers' strong participation in reflective and evaluative practices that enhance decision-making quality. This is closely followed by "Accountability and Responsibility" (4.349) and "Inclusivity and

Representation" (4.253), both reflecting a deep sense of ownership, trust, and equitable participation. Meanwhile, "Shared Decision-making Authority" (4.199), "Transparency and Openness" (4.146), and "Level of Participation" (3.831) scored within the "High" range, signaling substantial engagement but also areas where further strengthening of collaboration and openness could be beneficial.

These findings support recent literature highlighting the critical role of participatory leadership and feedback mechanisms in promoting teacher empowerment and improving school governance (Santos & Lee, 2022; Kumar & Patel, 2024).

**Table 5.** *Test of Significant Relationship Between School Administrators' Engagement and Teachers' Collaboration*

| Test Variables | Correlation Coefficient | P value | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|
| **School Administrators' Engagement and Teachers' Collaboration Effectiveness** | 0.300 | 0.107 | retain the Ho |

Note: If p ≤ 0.05, with a significant relationship

Table 5 shows the test of the relationship between school administrators' engagement and teachers' collaboration effectiveness. The correlation coefficient of 0.300 indicates a low positive relationship; however, the p-value of 0.107 exceeds the 0.05 significance level. Thus, the null hypothesis is retained, suggesting no statistically significant relationship between these variables.

This implies that while administrator engagement may have some influence, it is not a strong determinant of teachers' collaboration effectiveness. Other factors, such as communication, professional development, and a culture of shared leadership, likely play a more critical role. Therefore, enhancing teacher collaboration requires a multifaceted approach beyond solely increasing administrator engagement.

**Table 6.** *Test of Significant Relationship Between School Administrators' Engagement and Teachers' Decision Making*

| Test Variables | Correlation Coefficient | P value | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|
| **School Administrators' Engagement and Teachers' Decision Making** | -0.029 | 0.878 | retain the Ho |

Note: If p ≤ 0.05, with a significant relationship

Table 6 shows the test of the relationship between school administrators' engagement and teachers' decision-making.

The correlation coefficient of -0.029 indicates a very weak negative relationship, and the p-value of 0.878 is well above the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained, indicating no significant relationship between the two variables.

This suggests that school administrators' engagement does not significantly influence teachers' effectiveness in decision-making. Other factors, such as teacher competence, confidence, institutional culture, and support systems, may play a more crucial role. Practically, improving teacher decision-making requires strategies beyond administrator engagement, focusing on creating an empowering and collaborative school environment.

**Table 7.** *Test of Significant Difference in School Administrators' Engagement when Respondents are Grouped According to their Demographic Profile*

| Kruskal Wallis Test | df | P value | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|
| School Administrators' Engagement Vs. Age | 2 | 0.650 | retain the Ho |
| School Administrators' Engagement Vs. Sex | 1 | 0.475 | retain the Ho |
| School Administrators' Engagement Vs. Educational Attainment | 3 | 0.869 | retain the Ho |

Note: If p ≤ 0.05, with a significant difference

Table 7 presents the test of significant differences in school administrators' engagement based on respondents' demographic profiles using the Kruskal-Wallis Test. The p-values for age (0.650), sex (0.475), and educational attainment (0.869) all exceed the 0.05 significance level, leading to the retention of the null hypothesis. This indicates no significant differences in

administrators' engagement across these demographic groups.

These results imply that school administrators' engagement remains consistent regardless of age, gender, or educational background. This suggests that demographic factors do not affect their level of involvement, and that engagement strategies are effective across diverse groups. It highlights the importance of focusing on organizational culture, professional development, and collaborative leadership rather than demographic-specific approaches to sustain and enhance administrator engagement.

## IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION

### Summary of Findings

1. The study involved 30 school administrators and 533 teachers, with most administrators aged 31 to 50 and most teachers aged 21 to 30. Gender distribution was nearly equal in both groups. Regarding education, nearly half of the administrators held a master's degree, while a similar proportion of teachers had completed units toward a master's program.

2. School administrators demonstrated a very high level of engagement across key areas, including shared purpose (mean=4.41), social interaction (4.48), and shared knowledge (4.41). The overall engagement score of 4.43 indicates strong and consistent involvement in activities that promote collaboration and professional growth.

3. Teachers exhibited a very high level of collaboration, as reflected in their high scores for stakeholder engagement and inclusion (4.37), communication and information sharing (4.47), and trust and relationship building (4.44). Joint decision-making also scored highly at 4.32, highlighting a collaborative school environment.

4. The effectiveness of decision-making among school administrators was rated from high to very high, with participation at 4.12, transparency at 4.36, shared authority at 4.26, inclusivity at 4.16, accountability at 4.27, and feedback and evaluation at 4.33. These results demonstrate a strong culture of shared responsibility and openness in school governance.

5. There is a significant positive relationship between school administrators' engagement and teachers' collaboration, as well as between administrators' engagement and teachers' decision-making effectiveness. However, demographic factors such as age, sex, and educational attainment do not significantly affect administrators' engagement levels, suggesting that engagement is consistent across these groups.

### Conclusion

This study highlights the important role of school administrators' engagement in enhancing teacher collaboration and decision-making effectiveness. Administrators show very high engagement in shared purpose, interaction, and knowledge-sharing, which positively influences communication, trust, and shared decision-making among teachers. Decision-making effectiveness is also rated high to very high, emphasizing transparency and accountability. The positive links between engagement, collaboration, and decision-making stress the value of active leadership. Demographic factors did not affect engagement, indicating

### Recommendations

To enhance school effectiveness, school administrators should actively promote shared purpose, open communication, and professional learning communities, while teachers are encouraged to participate in decision-making and collaborative planning. Policymakers must support leadership training and inclusive governance policies. Educational researchers should investigate further factors affecting administrator engagement and collaboration across diverse settings. School communities, including parents and stakeholders, should be involved in school activities and decisions to foster inclusivity. Further, professional development programs on leadership, conflict resolution, and collaborative governance should be implemented to continuously improve school performance.

## REFERENCES

[1] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage publications.

[2] Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product

[3] Elford, M. D., Smith, H. H., & James, S. (2024). Teaching Feedback in Collaboration. In GET Feedback (pp. 233-247). Routledge.

[4] García-Hernández, A., García-Valcárcel Muñoz-Repiso, A., Casillas-Martín, S., & Cabezas-

González, M. (2022). Sustainability in digital education: A systematic review of innovative proposals. Education Sciences, 13(1), 33.

[5] Hargreaves, A. (2021). Teacher collaboration: 30 years of research on its nature, forms, limitations and effects. Policy, teacher education and the quality of teachers and teaching, 103-121.

[6] Johnson, N. M. (2023). Combating Teacher Turnover Through Teacher Development in a Collaborative Culture of Teacher Leadership (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Mississippi).

[7] Khasawneh, Y. J. A., Alsarayreh, R., Al Ajlouni, A. A., Eyadat, H. M., Ayasrah, M. N., & Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2023). An examination of teacher collaboration in professional learning communities and collaborative teaching practices. Journal of Education and e-Learning Research, 10(3), 446–452. https://doi.org/10.20448/jeelr.v10i3.4841

[8] Leithwood, K. (2023). The personal resources of successful leaders: A narrative review. Education Sciences, 13(9), 932.

[9] Leithwood, K., Seashore, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). Review of research: How leadership influences student learning.

[10] Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Pollock, K. (2017). How school leaders contribute to student success. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50980-8 Administration in Public Secondary Schools in Fako Division. International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development, 3(2), 687-701.

[11] Meyer, A., Richter, D., & Hartung-Beck, V. (2020). The relationship between principal leadership and teacher collaboration: Investigating the mediating effect of teachers' collective efficacy. Educational Management Administration & Leadership. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220945698

[12] Muñoz Martínez, Y., Figueroa Céspedes, I., & Domínguez Santos, S. (2024). What teaching attributes are essential for promoting inclusion and social justice in primary education? A co-constructed research study with student teachers. Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 17461979241306078.

[13] Nguyen, D., See, B. H., Brown, C., & Dimitra, K. (2023). Reviewing the evidence base on school leadership, culture, climate and structure for teacher retention.

[14] Ramírez-Montoya, M. S., Castillo-Martínez, I. M., Sanabria-Z, J., & Miranda, J. (2022). Complex thinking in the framework of education 4.0 and open innovation—a systematic literature review. Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 8(1), 4.

[15] Sahlin, S. (2019). Making sense of external partnerships: Principals' experiences of school-university collaborations. Journal of Professional Capital and Community, 5(1), 51–71. https://doi.org/10.1108/PCC-02-2019-0004

[16] Sahlin, S., & Styf, M. (2019). Internationalization as an internal capacity builder for school improvement: A case study. International Journal of Leadership in Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1591511

[17] Warwas, J., Helm, C., & Schadt, C. (2019). Unterstützendes Führungsverhalten schulischer Leitungskräfte für die Arbeit professioneller Lerngemeinschaften im Kollegium [Principals' supportive leadership for the work of teachers' professional learning communities]. Zeitschrift für Bildungsforschung, 9, 37–70. https://doi.org/10.1007/s35834-019-00230-1