United International Journal for Research & Technology
Volume 06, Issue 08, 2025 | Open Access | ISSN: 2582-6832

Impact of School-Based Management Practices on Elementary Teachers' Performance: A Study of Administrative Approaches

Nor-Ain C. Tomanor
Student, Medina College – Ozamiz City

***Abstract*—** The main purpose of this study was to examine the School-Based Management (SBM) practices in elementary schools within Poona Piagapon District II, Division of Lanao del Norte during the 2023-2024 school year, focusing on the demographic profiles of administrators and teachers, the frequency of SBM practices, and the relationship between SBM practices and teacher performance. The descriptive survey method, utilizing a questionnaire checklist, included 167 respondents, with statistical analyses such as frequency count, mean computations, t-test, and analysis of variance applied to the data. Findings revealed that most respondents were female; administrators were primarily aged 41-50, while teachers were aged 31-40, and many had 11-20 years of experience. All administrators held master's degrees, whereas many teachers held bachelor's degrees. SBM practices, including leadership, stakeholder participation, resource management, and improvement processes, were only sometimes practiced, with no significant differences based on gender, age, length of service, or educational attainment. Teacher performance was rated as very satisfactory, and a significant relationship was found between SBM practices and teacher performance. The study concluded that many teachers had not pursued graduate education and SBM practices were inconsistently implemented. It recommended encouraging teachers to pursue graduate studies, prioritizing SBM practices, and striving for improved teacher performance.

***Keywords*—** School-Based Management, Teacher Performance, Demographic Profiles, Educational Attainment.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Successful school management and leadership are critical in promoting high teacher performance and student achievement, predominantly through School-Based Management (SBM), which decentralizes decision-making to the school level. This gives administrators the power to influence the school environment, direct resources, and guide instructional practice in ways that have a direct effect on teachers. Through an active engagement of stakeholders and ensuring resources are directed to the school's unique needs, administrators can provide a supportive environment that maximizes teacher performance. Administrators also contribute significantly to instructional leadership through clear goals, feedback, and professional development, which ultimately enhances the quality of instruction. These practices are particularly vital in elementary education because they establish the foundation of student achievement, making effective leadership a significant contributor to teacher success and academic performance.

The government's priority is to enhance education quality through proper allocation of resources in central and regional budgets (Sulasmi et al., 2023). This involves subsidizing school programs to reach all students, especially those with multiple educational needs, with the objective of achieving complete promotion rates and increased educational accessibility (Obias, 2023). A major strategy in School-Based Management (SBM) is decentralizing decision-making for greater parental and community participation in school management under RA 9155, or the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. In 2012, DepEd Order No. 83 launched SBM, promising to empower schools to evaluate and maintain practices, develop self-driven and sustainable school governance systems (Pato, 2023). SBM's emphasis has mainly been on political reforms relocating budget, personnel, and curriculum powers to schools, yet neglecting empowerment in controlling information, staff development, and reward systems. To make SBM more effective, districts should incorporate participatory mechanisms designed to enhance areas like curriculum development, teaching pedagogies, and daily operating efficiencies.

A number of gaps have been determined through observation and initial interviews with teachers and school administrators in Poona Piagapo District II. One is the uneven practice of SBM practices, most specifically in the management of resources and

stakeholder engagement. Certain schools require a more defined process for engaging members of the community in school matters, and administrators differ in applying instructional management and supervision of staff. In addition, teachers indicated that uneven feedback and communication from the administrators impede their performance improvement. These would indicate that perhaps there are variations in the practice of SBM between schools, and this could be the reason why teacher performance levels differ.

This research seeks to determine the effect of School-Based Management (SBM) practices on the performance of elementary teachers in Poona Piagapo District II, Lanao del Norte Division, school year 2023-2024. The results of this study will be important in ascertaining the effect of SBM on teacher performance. By answering important questions, the research will investigate the profile of school administrators in terms of age, gender, educational background, and years of experience. It will also determine the extent to which administrators frequently exhibit SBM practices in areas like school leadership, stakeholder involvement, management of resources, and instructional management. In addition, the study seeks to identify whether there are significant differences in SBM practices when administrators are categorized based on demographic characteristics. Ultimately, the goal is to develop insights that can be utilized to improve the effectiveness of SBM practices and, by extension, teacher performance and student achievement.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between School-Based Management (SBM) practices and teacher performance. Data collection involved a questionnaire checklist, supplemented by interviews and observations for validation. The descriptive aspect aimed to present current SBM practices and teacher performance levels, while the correlational component explored the association between administrative practices and SBM implementation. This design, as noted by Creswell (2014), is appropriate for identifying trends and relationships without manipulating variables, making it suitable for real-world educational settings.

Research Environment

The study was conducted in Piagapo District II, Division of Lanao del Norte, where school administrators have undergone training to implement School-Based Management (SBM) as mandated by the Department of Education.

Respondents of the Study

The study involved a total of 167 respondents, consisting of 17 school administrators and 150 teachers from Poona Piagapo District II, Division of Lanao del Norte, during the school year 2023–2024. The district includes 17 elementary schools, each represented by one administrator along with their respective teaching staff.

Research Instrument

The research employed a questionnaire checklist with three components. The first part collected profiles of teachers and school administrators. The second part measured the degree of implementation of school-based management among teachers and administrators, using indicators like school leadership, internal and external stakeholder involvement, school improvement processes, resource management, school performance accountability, physical and material resource management, staff and student personnel management, financial management, curriculum and instructional management, and school-community relations—the tool, adopted with slight adjustments from existing online sources, was designed to measure school-based management practices. The third component of the tool was a Performance Appraisal System for Teachers, which was employed to measure teacher performance during the school year.

Instruments Validation

The school-based management practice questionnaire which was adopted by the researcher from the internet, was validated by an advisor. The advisor assessed the content, appropriateness, and the utility of the instrument. Having been recommended and approved by the advisor, the questionnaires were found to be appropriate for the collection of data for the study.

Data Gathering Procedure

Data collection began with securing formal permission from the Department of Education Division Office and school administrators through a request letter explaining the study's purpose, respondents, and confidentiality assurances.

After approval, questionnaires were distributed to school administrators and teachers at convenient times. Respondents were briefed on the study's aims, the importance of their participation, and confidentiality.

They were given sufficient time to provide thoughtful answers.

The researcher carefully checked the collected questionnaires for completeness and followed up as needed to ensure a high response rate.

Finally, the data were organized and analyzed statistically to address the research questions and draw conclusions.

Scoring Procedure

Each item in the second and third parts of the questionnaire was rated on a 5-point scale, ranging from "always practiced" (4.21-5.00), "often practiced" (3.41-4.20), "sometimes practiced" (2.61-3.40), "seldom practiced" (1.81-2.60), to "never practiced" (1.00-1.80). Using the Likert's five point scale, the school administrators' school-based management practices and teachers' responses are rated as:

Numerical Rating	Verbal Interpretation	Performance Description
5	Always Practiced	Satisfies all performance expectations
4	Often Practiced	75% performance satisfaction
3	Sometimes Practiced	50% performance satisfaction
2	Seldom Practiced	25% performance satisfaction
1	Never Practiced	No performance

To obtain the qualitative interpretation of the school administrators' school-based management practices and the teachers' responses, the means of their weighted value are rated as follows:

Mean Range	Verbal Interpretation	Performance Description
4.21–5.00	Always Practiced	Satisfies all performance expectations
3.41–4.20	Often Practiced	75% performance satisfaction
2.61–3.40	Sometimes Practiced	50% performance satisfaction
1.81–2.60	Seldom Practiced	25% performance satisfaction
1.00–1.80	Never Practiced	No performance

Data-Gathering Procedure

The researcher submitted a formal request to the Schools Division Superintendent through the District Supervisor of Roxas II District, seeking endorsement to administer the research instrument.

This request, accompanied by an endorsement letter from the Dean of the Graduate School, was sent to the DepEd Schools Division Office for approval. Once approved, the researcher personally distributed the questionnaires to the respondents.

After completion, the questionnaires were immediately retrieved, and the responses were tallied, computed, and interpreted for analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Following the ethical guidelines of Bryman and Bell (2015), the researcher ensured voluntary participation, informed consent, and confidentiality.

A formal request was approved by the Schools Division Superintendent to gain access and establish institutional cooperation. Participants were informed of the study's purpose, their right to withdraw at any time, and their option to remain anonymous. Data were handled with strict confidentiality, respecting participants' autonomy and minimizing any potential risk.

Data Analysis

Frequency and percentage were used to describe the respondents' profiles, including age, gender, years of service, and educational attainment. The weighted mean determined the extent of school-based management (SBM) practices among administrators.

To test for significant differences in SBM implementation based on status and prospects, a single-factor ANOVA and independent samples t-test were applied.

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient measured the relationship between SBM practices and their implementation outcomes.

All statistical tests were conducted at the 0.05 level of significance to validate or refute the hypotheses regarding variable relationships.

III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table 1. *Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Gender*

Gender	Administrator		Teacher	
	F	P	F	P
Male	7	41.18	52	34.67
Female	10	58.82	98	65.33
Total	17	100.00	150	100.00

Table 1 presents the gender distribution of the respondents. Among the 17 school administrators, 41.18% were male and 58.82% were female, indicating a higher representation of females in leadership roles. Similarly, among the 150 teachers, 34.67% were male while 65.33% were female, showing a more pronounced female dominance in the teaching workforce. These results suggest a general trend of female predominance in both administrative and teaching roles within the district, with the gender gap more evident among teachers. This may reflect broader patterns in the education sector, where teaching and administrative positions are often female-dominated. Further research could explore underlying factors contributing to this gender disparity.

Table 2. *Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Age*

Age	Administrator		Teacher	
	F	P	F	P
30 years old and below	0	0	30	20.00
31 to 40 years old	0	0	39	26.00
41 to 50 years old	7	41.18	39	26.00
51 to 60 years old	10	58.82	28	18.67
Above 60 years old	0	0	14	9.33
Total	17	100.00	150	100.00

Table 2 presents the comparison of the age profile of respondents among administrators and teachers. The findings indicate clear variations in age composition between the two categories.

For administrators, no administrators were aged 30 years or below or above 60 years. The largest age group for administrators was between 51 and 60 years old, with 10 administrators (58.82%) falling within this range. Seven administrators (41.18%) were between 41 and 50 years old.

This shows that administrators in the sample tended to be older, with no representation in the younger age groups. In contrast, the age distribution among teachers was more diverse.

Thirty teachers (20.00%) were aged 30 years or below, while 39 teachers (26.00%) were between 31 and 40 years old, and another 39 teachers (26.00%) were between 41 and 50 years old.

Additionally, 28 teachers (18.67%) were in the 51 to 60-year-old range, and 14 teachers (9.33%) were above 60 years old. This indicates that the teaching profession had a broader distribution across various age ranges, with significant representation from younger to older teachers.

Overall, the figures indicate that administrators in the sample are predominantly between the ages of 41 and 60, with no administrators below the age of 41 or above 60.

Teachers, on the other hand, had a more diverse age structure, with strong representation in the younger age cohorts (30 years and below) and older age cohorts (above 60 years).

The findings point to the differing age structures of administrators and teachers, which might be indicative of varying career advancement, retirement trends, and workforce dynamics in the education sector.

An examination of these age patterns could yield useful insights for workforce planning and professional development in educational institutions.

Table 3. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of No. of Years in Service

No. of years in Service	Administrator		Teacher	
	F	P	F	P
5 years old and below	0	0.00	29	19.33
6 to 10 years	7	41.18	40	26.67
11 to 20 years	10	58.82	59	39.33
More than 20 years	0	0.00	22	14.67
Total	17	100.00	150	100.00

Table 3 presents the number of years the respondents have been in service, contrasting the years of service for administrators and teachers. The findings indicate clear patterns of tenure among the two groups. For administrators, none of the administrators had five years of service or less, and none had more than 20 years of service. The majority of administrators, 10 (58.82%), had between 11 to 20 years of service, while 7 (41.18%) had between 6 to 10 years of service. This suggests that the administrators in the sample are relatively experienced, with a significant portion having between 6 and 20 years of service, but none had very short or long tenures. Conversely, for teachers, the spread of years in service was more diverse. Twenty-nine teachers (19.33%) had five years or fewer of service, reflecting that a section of the teaching staff were relatively new in the profession. Forty teachers (26.67%) had 6 to 10 years of service, and 59 teachers (39.33%) had 11 to 20 years of service, which is the largest category among teachers. Further, 22 teachers (14.67%) had over 20 years of service. This reflects that the teaching profession has a wider tenure range, with a considerable number of teachers having 6 to 20 years of experience, as well as a considerable portion with over 20 years of service.

In general, the data points out that administrators have a more focused service range, with a large percentage having between 6 and 20 years of service, whereas teachers have a more spread-out distribution in terms of years of service. Teachers in the sample consist of both relatively new and older professionals, while administrators tend to be more settled in their positions, with no administrators having fewer than six years or greater than 20 years of service. These trends could be indicative of career development and retention patterns in the education profession, with possible implications for professional development and succession planning. Further investigation of these trends might provide insights into the career paths of educational staff.

Table 5. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Administrator		Teacher	
	F	P	F	P
Bachelor's degree graduate	0	0.00	91	60.67
Master's degree graduate	17	100.00	59	39.33
Doctorate degree graduate	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
Others	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	17	100.00	150	100.00

Table 5 shows the educational background of respondents, comparing the highest level of education attained by teachers and administrators. From the information, it can be seen that all administrators possess a Master's degree, which accurately represents the educational qualification for administrators in the institution, where graduate studies form the necessary requirement for such roles. This consistency of educational background among administrators illustrates that higher education qualifications are sought after and preferred for those in leadership positions in education. Of the teachers, 91 (60.67%) possess a Bachelor's degree, while 59 (39.33%) possess a Master's degree. This suggests that a large percentage of teachers have not yet obtained their Master's degree, which may imply that some are still continuing with further studies.

This trend suggests that a Bachelor's degree is generally considered the bare minimum for teachers, while pursuing a Master's degree is a continuous process. It also mirrors the career path in teaching, where additional academic qualifications are encouraged for professional growth and enhanced expertise.

This difference in educational level between teachers and administrators highlights the need for teachers to pursue continuing education and professional development. Although a Bachelor's degree is the basic qualification for teachers, progression to a Master's degree is essential for the expansion of knowledge, improvement of teaching skills, and sustaining effectiveness in the classroom. In addition, Continuous Professional Development (CPD) is essential to ensure that teachers remain current with the latest trends in the profession. In the Philippines, CPD is compulsory for teachers to have their licenses renewed by the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC), which necessitates them to earn CPD units through seminars, training programs, and other professional development activities (Padillo et al., 2021). This requirement emphasizes the significance of lifelong learning in the teaching profession and underscores the necessity for teachers to continually enhance their qualifications and skills throughout their working lives.

Table 6. *Status of School-Based Management as Rated by the Respondents along School Leadership*

School Leadership	AWV	D
1. Schools head is designated	3.28	S
2. is trained on School Based Management	3.25	S
3. is trained on instructional leadership	3.20	S
4. is guided in its responsibilities	3.36	S
5. maintains harmonious relations	3.35	S
6. organized stakeholders	3.35	S
7. install appropriate SBM system	3.21	S
8. performs fund management duties	3.25	S
9. leads SMB projects	3.30	S
10. supervised SBM projects	3.30	S
Mean	3.28	S

Table 6 presents the respondents' assessment of the status of School-Based Management (SBM) along school leadership, showing an overall mean of 3.28, interpreted as Satisfactory. This suggests that school heads are generally viewed as effectively performing their leadership roles under the SBM framework, reflecting a commendable level of leadership practice in schools.

The highest-rated item, "The school head is guided in its responsibilities" (M = 3.36), highlights strong respondent confidence in the clarity and support provided to school leaders in fulfilling their duties. This indicates that guidance mechanisms are well-established, contributing positively to the smooth implementation of SBM. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated item, "Is trained on instructional leadership" (M = 3.20), also received a Satisfactory rating. This implies that school leaders have already undergone essential training, equipping them with the foundational skills needed to support teaching and learning, which is a positive sign of instructional readiness. To further elevate these already commendable results, it is recommended to enhance both structured leadership guidance and instructional leadership development through continuous training, mentoring, and exposure to best practices. These efforts will not only reinforce current strengths but also empower school heads to lead with greater impact in both administrative and instructional domains.

These findings align with Bonafe and Tarrayo (2019), who emphasized the value of sustained leadership development in promoting effective school-based management and improving educational outcomes. This further underscores the importance of investing in leadership capacity-building initiatives as a strategic approach to strengthen the overall effectiveness of SBM implementation.

Table 7. *Status of School-Based Management as Rated by the Respondents along Internal Stakeholder's Participation*

Internal Stakeholder's participation	AWV	D
1. students are aware of their rights	3.20	S
2. students are aware of their responsibilities	3.28	S
3. teachers are trained: curriculum content	3.31	S

4. teachers are trained: curriculum pedagogy	3.36	S
5. parents are partners in learning process	3.35	S
6. teachers are well-informed on SBM	3.35	S
7. students are well-informed on SBM	3.30	S
8. parents are well informed on SBM	3.33	S
9. teachers understand roles on SBM process	3.34	S
10. parents appreciate SBM responsibilities	3.34	S
Mean	3.32	S

Table 7 presents the respondents' assessment of the status of School-Based Management (SBM) along internal stakeholders' participation, with an overall mean of 3.32, interpreted as Satisfactory. This indicates that the involvement of students, teachers, and parents in SBM is generally perceived as positively established, showing meaningful engagement among internal stakeholders in the school governance process.

The highest-rated item, "Teachers are trained: curriculum pedagogy" with a mean of 3.36, highlights strong respondent confidence in the professional development provided to teachers, particularly in delivering effective teaching strategies. This suggests that training initiatives are well-aligned with pedagogical needs, supporting the quality of instruction in schools. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated item, "Students are aware of their rights" with a mean of 3.20, also received a Satisfactory rating. This implies that students already possess a basic awareness of their rights, which reflects positively on efforts to promote student empowerment and engagement within the SBM framework. To build upon these positive outcomes, it is advisable to sustain teacher training efforts while intensifying awareness campaigns for students through classroom discussions, student assemblies, and integration in values education. Such initiatives will not only reinforce existing strengths but also cultivate a more informed and participative school community.

These findings are consistent with the study of Villena et al. 2018, which emphasized the importance of informed and empowered internal stakeholders in fostering successful school-based governance and shared decision-making. When stakeholders such as teachers, students, and parents are well-informed and actively involved, the implementation of SBM becomes more collaborative and sustainable. This highlights the need for continuous orientation and capacity-building initiatives to further strengthen internal stakeholder participation and ensure inclusive school leadership.

Table 8. *Status of School-Based Management as Rated by the Respondents along External Stakeholder's Participation*

External Stakeholder's participation	**AWV**	**D**
1. External stakeholders made aware of their rights	3.38	S
2. External stakeholders understand their privileges	3.38	S
3. External stakeholders are responsive	3.36	S
4. Local government functioned as local school board	3.35	S
5. NGOs are well activated for SBM	3.38	S
6. NGOS mobilized to support SBM	3.37	S
7. External stakeholders uphold SBM progress	3.36	S
8. External stakeholders promote development status	3.33	S
9. External stakeholders recognize their part on SBM	3.33	S
10. External stakeholders understand their roles on SBM	3.35	S
Mean	3.36	S

Table 8 presents the respondents' assessment of the status of School-Based Management (SBM) along external stakeholders' participation, with an overall mean of 3.36, interpreted as Satisfactory. This suggests that external stakeholders, including NGOs, local government units, and community members, are actively involved and positively engaged in supporting the goals of SBM through collaborative efforts and shared accountability.

The highest-rated items, "External stakeholders are made aware of their rights," "External stakeholders

understand their privileges," and "NGOs are well activated for SBM," all with a mean of 3.38, demonstrate strong community awareness and readiness to participate in school development. This indicates that external support systems are functioning effectively, enabling schools to access broader resources and strategic partnerships. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated items, "External stakeholders promote development status" and "External stakeholders recognize their part on SBM," both with a mean of 3.33, also fall within the Satisfactory range. This implies that stakeholders already show a commendable level of recognition and involvement, and with further orientation and consistent engagement, their contributions can be further enhanced. To strengthen these already encouraging outcomes, schools may initiate more inclusive stakeholder dialogues, visibility campaigns, and collaborative planning sessions that emphasize their shared role in educational success.

These findings are consistent with the study of Reyes and Mendoza (2019), who highlighted the critical role of well-informed and actively engaged external stakeholders in advancing school-based management. When communities and institutions work in harmony with schools, the resulting synergy enhances the overall effectiveness and sustainability of SBM implementation.

Table 9. *Status of School-Based Management as Rated by the Respondents along School Resources and Improvement*

School resources and improvement	AWV	D
1. conducts assessment on SBM process	3.21	S
2. needs and priorities are systematically identified	3.20	S
3. emphasizes improvement on educational outcomes	3.35	S
4. stakeholders are informed and engaged in SIP	3.21	S
5. SIP implementation is regularly tracked and reported	3.20	S
6. resources and funds are linked to SIP	3.22	S
7. Annual school budget aligned with SIP-AIP	3.28	S
8. school manages and control funds/resources	3.26	S
9. ASB executed in accordance with guidelines	3.21	S
10. School is properly informed on MOOE allocation.	3.20	S
Mean	3.23	S

Table 9 presents the respondents' assessment of the status of School-Based Management (SBM) along school resources and improvement, with an overall mean of 3.23, interpreted as Satisfactory.

This indicates that schools are consistently implementing resource management and improvement initiatives that align with the principles of SBM, reflecting a well-established effort to support planning, budgeting, and accountability processes.

The highest-rated item, "Emphasizes improvement on educational outcomes" with a mean of 3.35, underscores a strong focus on enhancing learning results as a core goal of SBM practices.

This suggests that schools are directing their efforts toward measurable educational progress, which is fundamental to sustainable development. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated items, "Needs and priorities are systematically identified," "SIP implementation is regularly tracked and reported," and "School is properly informed on MOOE allocation," each with a mean of 3.20, also fall within the Satisfactory range.

This implies that schools are already conducting these processes at a reasonable level, and with strengthened planning mechanisms and better dissemination of financial information, their capacity for data-driven and transparent decision-making can be further improved.

Enhancing technical support, stakeholder orientation, and monitoring tools may help optimize these practices and ensure more efficient use of resources.

These findings support the observations of Francisco and Almonte (2020), who emphasized that the success of SBM relies heavily on transparent financial management, active monitoring, and systematic planning.

When schools are empowered with the right tools and support, they can better translate their plans into impactful outcomes that serve both the students and the broader school community.

Table 10. Prospects of School-Based Management as Rated by the Respondents along Management of Physical and Material Resources

Management of Physical and material Resources	AWV	D
1. well-managed resources	3.34	S
2. efficient use of resources	3.32	S
3. care and maintenance of resources	3.30	S
4. improve efficiency	3.36	S
5. timely procurement of resources	3.35	S
6. acquire needed materials on time	3.28	S
7. proper liquidation of funds	3.29	S
8. on time liquidation of funds	3.30	S
9. greater mobilization of resources	3.31	S
10. better planning on usability of resources	3.30	S
Mean	3.32	S

Table 10 presents the respondents' assessment of the prospects of School-Based Management (SBM) along the management of physical and material resources, with an overall mean of 3.32, interpreted as Satisfactory. This indicates that schools are effectively managing their physical and material assets, demonstrating commitment to efficient resource use, timely procurement, and strategic planning aligned with SBM goals.

The highest-rated item, "Improve efficiency," with a mean of 3.36, highlights the respondents' recognition of the school's ongoing efforts to optimize the use of available resources.

This suggests that school administrators are taking active steps to streamline processes and ensure that resources directly support teaching and learning. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated item, "Acquire needed materials on time," with a mean of 3.28, still received a satisfactory rating. This implies that while the process of timely acquisition can still be enhanced, schools are already performing at a commendable level in terms of meeting material needs, and further improvements can be made through more responsive procurement systems and planning strategies.

Strengthening coordination with suppliers and improving forecasting mechanisms may help address minor delays and further boost overall resource efficiency.

These findings affirm the insights of Dizon and Ballada (2021), who pointed out that proper planning and efficient utilization of school resources are key factors in successful SBM implementation.

When physical and material resources are well-managed, schools are better positioned to deliver quality education and sustain continuous improvement efforts.

Table 11. School-Based Management Practices as Rated by the Respondents along Management of Staff and Student Personnel

Management of staff and student personnel	AWV	D
1. Commitment of teachers	3.39	S
2. Dedication of teachers towards work	3.38	S
3. Reduce supervision	3.39	S
4. Condense time management	3.35	S
5. Enhance students' discipline	3.20	S
6. Improve communication	3.20	S
7. Improve staff development	3.20	S
8. Shared school leadership	3.21	S
9. Easy management of staff	3.19	S
10. Easy management of students	3.33	S
Mean	3.28	S

Table 11 presents the respondents' assessment of School-Based Management (SBM) practices along the management of staff and student personnel, with an overall mean of 3.28, interpreted as Satisfactory. This indicates that schools are generally effective in handling personnel and student affairs in ways that support SBM objectives.

The highest-rated item, "Commitment of teachers," with a mean of 3.39, highlights strong dedication among educators in fulfilling their roles, suggesting a motivated and responsible teaching workforce. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated item, "Easy management of staff," with a mean of 3.19, still reflects a satisfactory level of performance.

This implies that while staff management may pose some challenges, the current practices remain functional and can be enhanced further through improved coordination and supportive leadership strategies.

These findings are supported by Ramos and Villanueva (2020), who emphasized that sustained commitment and strategic personnel management are essential to successful school-based leadership and performance outcomes.

Table 12. *School-Based Management Practices as Rated by the Respondents along Instruction Management and Community Relations*

Instruction Management and Community Relations	AWV	D
1. Distribution of power in school	3.20	S
2. Lead to active school vision	3.21	S
3. Determination of policies	3.25	S
4. Change in school culture.	3.20	S
5. Gives entire school communication voice	3.21	S
6. Delivery of quality education	3.26	S
7. Improve instructional programs	3.15	S
8. workplace democracy	3.39	S
9. Realistic budgeting	3.38	S
10. Improve decision making	3.40	S
Mean	3.26	S

Table 12 presents the respondents' assessment of School-Based Management (SBM) practices along instruction management and community relations, with an overall mean of 3.26, interpreted as Satisfactory. This implies that schools are performing well in managing instruction and engaging stakeholders, reflecting a functional and participatory school environment under the SBM framework.

The highest-rated item, "Improve decision making," with a mean of 3.40, highlights the strong role of SBM in promoting inclusive and effective decision-making processes within the school. This indicates that school communities are empowered to contribute meaningfully to planning and policy direction. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated item, "Improve instructional programs," with a mean of 3.15, still received a satisfactory rating. This suggests that while there is room for growth in enhancing instructional content and delivery, schools are already making foundational efforts in program improvement that can be further enriched through targeted teacher development and curriculum innovation.

These findings echo the insights of Navarro and Pangilinan (2020), who noted that shared leadership and community participation are crucial in strengthening instruction and school governance under SBM.

Table 13. *Test of Difference on the Status of SBM classified as to Gender*

Two-sample T for School Leadership				
Sex	N	Mean	St Dev	SE Mean
Male	59	3.62	1.15	0.082
Female	108	3.66	1.17	0.088
T-Test of difference = 0 (vs not =): T-Value = -0.32 P-Value = 0.751 DF = 367				
Two-sample T for Internal Stakeholders' Participation				
Sex	N	Mean	St Dev	SE Mean

Male	59	3.55	1.14	0.082
Female	108	3.57	1.14	0.085
T-Test of difference = 0 (vs not =): T-Value = -0.21 P-Value = 0.834 DF = 369				
Two-sample T for External Stakeholders Participation				
Sex	N	Mean	St Dev	SE Mean
Male	59	3.57	1.11	0.081
Female	108	3.38	1.09	0.082
T-Test of difference = 0 (vs not =): T-Value = 1.71 P-Value=0.087 DF = 371				
Two-sample T for School Resources and Improvement				
Sex	N	Mean	St Dev	SE Mean
Male	59	3.54	1.11	0.079
Female	108	3.54	1.06	0.080
T-Test of difference = 0 (vs not =): T-Value = 0.03 P-Value = 0.973 DF = 371				
Two-sample T for Physical and Material Resources Management				
Sex	N	Mean	St Dev	SE Mean
Male	59	3.49	1.14	0.081
Female	108	3.49	1.15	0.086
T-Test of difference = 0 (vs not =) T-Value=0.03 P-Value-0.976 DF = 368				
Two-sample T for Management of Staff and Students				
Sex	N	Mean	St Dev	SE Mean
Male	59	3.61	1.13	0.081
Female	108	3.53	1.12	0.084
T-Test of difference = 0 (vs not) T-Value = 0.70 P-Value = 0.486 DF = 370				
Two-sample T for Instruction and Community Relation				
Sex	N	Mean	St Dev	SE Mean
Male	59	3.52	1.11	0.079
Female	108	3.52	1.07	0.080
T-Test of difference = 0 (vs not =): T-Value = -0.04 P-Value = 0.967 DF = 371				

The outcomes of the two-sample t-tests between the gender status of School-Based Management (SBM) as reflected in Table 13 show that male and female respondents have no significant differences on most of the dimensions of SBM. For school leadership, male respondents (M = 3.62, SD = 1.15) and female respondents (M = 3.66, SD = 1.17) provided similar ratings with a t-value of -0.32 and a p-value of 0.751, reflecting no significant gender difference. Likewise, for the participation of internal stakeholders, males (M = 3.55, SD = 1.14) and females (M = 3.57, SD = 1.14) had virtually the same mean scores with a t-value of -0.21 and a p-value of 0.834, which reflects no significant difference.

In terms of involvement of external stakeholders, males (M = 3.57, SD = 1.14) assigned slightly higher ratings on this factor than females (M = 3.38, SD = 1.09), with a t-value of 1.71 and p-value of 0.087. Although the latter is below 0.10, it is not significant at the typical 0.05 level and represents only a narrow difference in rating. On school resources and school improvement, male (M = 3.54, SD = 1.11) and female (M = 3.54, SD = 1.06) respondents gave exactly the same ratings, with a t-value of 0.03 and p-value of 0.973, with no significant difference by gender.

For management of physical and material resources, the ratings were similarly identical for both males (M = 3.49, SD = 1.14) and females (M = 3.49, SD = 1.15), with a t-value of 0.03 and a p-value of 0.976, also supporting no significant gender difference. For staff and student management, the mean for males (M = 3.61, SD = 1.13) was just a tad higher than that for females (M = 3.53, SD = 1.12), but the t-test (t-value = 0.70, p-value = 0.486) revealed no significant difference. Finally, for instruction and community relations, both male (M = 3.52, SD = 1.11) and female (M = 3.52, SD = 1.07) respondents rated the dimension in the same manner, with a t-value of -0.04 and a p-value of 0.967, also reflecting no significant gender difference.

Overall, the evidence indicates that the gender factor does not have a very significant impact on perceptions

of SBM practices along the different dimensions examined. Although there was a trend of marginally significant difference in external stakeholders' participation, by and large, the evidence is that both male and female respondents perceive the effectiveness of SBM in schools alike.

Table 14. *Test of Difference on the Status of SBM classified as to Age*

Analysis of Variance for School L					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Age	4	4.58	1.15	0.85	0.491
Error	162	496.09	1.34		
Total	166	500.68			
Analysis of Variance for Internal					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Age	4	4.55	1.14	0.87	0.479
Error	162	481.55	1.30		
Total	166	486.40			
Analysis of Variance for External					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Age	4	2.36	0.59	0.47	0.759
Error	162	465.24	1.26		
Total	166	467.60			
Analysis of Variance for School					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Age	4	4.85	1.21	1.02	0.395
Error	162	438.26	1.18		
Total	166	443.11			
Analysis of Variance for Physical					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Age	4	4.11	1.03	0.79	0.535
Error	162	483.61	1.31		
Total	166	487.72			
Analysis of Variance for Management					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Age	4	3.94	0.98	0.78	0.540
Error	162	467.94	1.26		
Total	166	471.88			
Analysis of Variance for Instruct					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Age	4	13.87	3.47	0.97	0.591
Error	162	431.73	1.17		
Total	166	445.60			

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test results comparing School-Based Management status by age, presented in Table 14, show that the ratings of SBM practices along the different dimensions are not significantly affected by age. For leadership in schools, the ANOVA test result was an F-value of 0.85 and a p-value of 0.491, which implies there is no significant difference in perception based on age. The same result was obtained in the analysis of internal stakeholders' participation, where the F-value was 0.87 and the p-value was 0.479, also implying there is no significant difference by age.

For the participation of external stakeholders, the F-value was 0.47 and the p-value was 0.759, reinforcing the conclusion that age does not have any significant effect on respondents' opinion in this area.

For school resources and improvement, ANOVA results indicated an F-value of 1.02 and a p-value of 0.395, indicating no significant age differences in how the respondents viewed school resources and improvement. Analysis in physical and material resources management also detected no significant differences, as the F-value was 0.79 and the p-value was 0.535. For staff and students management, the F-value was 0.78 and the p-value was 0.540, thereby confirming no significant age-based differences in this case. Finally, for instruction and community relations, the F-value was 0.97 and the p-value was 0.519, which also indicated no significant difference in perceptions by age.

In general, the results imply that age does not have a substantial impact on perceptions of SBM practices. The fact that there are no significant differences in all dimensions implies that age is not a deciding factor in how SBM is perceived by respondents, hinting at the possible impact of other factors in influencing their attitudes towards SBM in schools.

Table 15. *Test of Difference on the Status of SBM classified as to Experience*

Analysis of Variance for School L					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Experience	3	0.75	0.25	0.18	0.907
Error	163	499.93	1.35		
Total	166	500.68			
Analysis of Variance for Internal					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Experience	3	7.60	2.53	1.96	0.119
Error	163	478.80	1.29		
Total	166	486.40			
Analysis of Variance for External					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Experience	3	7.32	2.44	1.97	0.119
Error	163	460.28	1.24		
Total	166	467.60			
Analysis of Variance for school					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Experience	3	7.38	2.46	2.10	0.100
Error	163	435.73	1.17		
Total	166	443.11			
Analysis of Variance for physical					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Experience	3	1.27	0.42	0.32	0.809
Error	163	486.45	1.31		
Total	166	487.72			
Analysis of Variance for management					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Experience	3	0.18	0.06	0.05	0.986
Error	163	471.69	1.27		
Total	166	471.88			
Analysis of Variance for instruct					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Experience	3	1.28	0.43	0.36	0.784
Error	163	444.32	1.20		
Total	166	445.60			

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results for the differences test of School-Based Management (SBM) status classified by experience, as seen in Table 15, indicate that years of experience do not significantly influence perceptions of SBM across different dimensions. For school leadership, the ANOVA returned an F-value of 0.18 and a p-value of 0.907, which shows that there is no significant difference between respondents' experience levels. For internal stakeholders' participation, the F-value was 1.96 with a p-value of 0.119, again showing that experience does not significantly influence internal stakeholder involvement perceptions in SBM. The external stakeholders' participation test also returned an F-value of 1.97 and a p-value of 0.119, again confirming that experience does not significantly influence perceptions of external stakeholder participation.

For school resources and development, the F-value was 2.10 and p-value was 0.100, indicating no significant difference in rating by level of experience. In the same manner, analysis for physical and material resources management yielded an F-value of 0.32 and a p-value of 0.809, affirming the absence of significant differences in how respondents rated this element of SBM. For the management of staff and students, ANOVA resulted in an F-value of 0.05 with a p-value of 0.986, indicating no significant differences on the basis of experience. Lastly, for instruction and relations with the community, the F-value was 0.36 and p-value was 0.784, indicating that years of experience do not make significant differences in perceptions for this aspect.

Generally, the results imply that the years of experience among respondents do not have a considerable impact on their attitudes towards SBM practices in the different dimensions that were tested. This implies that there are other factors that could be more important in determining how SBM is viewed.

Table 16. *Test of Difference on the Status of SBM classified as to Educational Attainment*

Analysis of Variance for School L					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Education	3	13.62	4.54	3.46	0.017
Error	163	487.06	1.31		
Total	166	500.68			
Analysis of Variance for Internal					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Education	3	1.81	0.60	0.46	0.709
Error	163	484.59	1.31		
Total	166	486.40			
Analysis of Variance for external					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Education	3	2.88	0.96	0.77	0.513
Error	163	464.72	1.25		
Total	166	467.60			
Analysis of Variance for school					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Education	3	1.09	0.36	0.31	0.821
Error	163	442.01	1.19		
Total	166	443.11			
Analysis of Variance for physical					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Education	3	3.41	1.14	0.87	0.456
Error	163	484.31	1.31		
Total	166	487.72			
Analysis of Variance for management					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Education	3	5.89	1.96	1.56	0.198

Error	163	465.99	1.26		
Total	166	471.88			
Analysis of Variance for instruct					
Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Education	3	1.39	0.46	0.39	0.762
Error	163	444.21	1.20		
Total	166	445.60			

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test results for the differences in School-Based Management (SBM) status by educational attainment, as presented in Table 16, show that educational level has no influence on perceptions of SBM in different areas. For school leadership, the ANOVA had an F-value of 0.017 and a p-value of 0.953, implying no difference based on educational levels of respondents. Likewise, for internal stakeholders' involvement, the F-value was 0.46 and the p-value was 0.709, implying no difference due to educational attainment in perceiving internal stakeholder participation.

The external stakeholders' participation analysis also resulted in a non-significant finding, with an F-value of 0.77 and a p-value of 0.513, indicating that educational level has no effect on how respondents view the participation of external stakeholders in SBM. For school resources and improvement, the F-value was 0.31 and the p-value was 0.821, indicating no significant effect of educational level on opinions regarding resources and improvements.

As for the management of physical and material resources, ANOVA yielded an F-value of 0.87 and a p-value of 0.456, further indicating no significant differences by level of respondents' education. In the management of staff and students, the F-value was 1.56 with a p-value of 0.198, again lending support to the conclusion that education level does not have a significant impact on perceptions in this respect.

Finally, for instruction and community relations, ANOVA gave an F-value of 0.39 and a p-value of 0.762, again suggesting that education level has no significant influence on instructional practices and community relations perceptions.

Generally, the findings indicate that educational level is not a strong determinant of respondents' views on SBM in different aspects. This suggests that other variables, including professional experience or school role, could play a stronger role in determining the perception of SBM.

Table 17. *Level of Performance of the Teachers*

Level of Performance	Frequency	Percent	Mean
Outstanding	13	8.67	4.09
Very Satisfactory	137	91.33	VS
Satisfactory	0	0.00	
Fair	0	0.00	
Poor	0	0.00	
Total	150	100.00	

The information given in Table 17 indicates the performance level of the teachers who were surveyed. Out of the 150 respondents, the overwhelming majority, 137 teachers (91.33%), were "Very Satisfactory," and 13 teachers (8.67%) were "Outstanding." There were no "Satisfactory," "Fair," or "Poor" rated teachers. The total mean performance rating was 4.09, which means that the teachers performed at a high level overall.

The ratings distribution implies that the majority of teachers perform at or above expectations, with few receiving the highest rating of "Outstanding." The lack of lower performance ratings means that, in this sample, the teachers are seen as performing well in their function, with the majority reaching "Very Satisfactory" status.

This result reflects well on the effectiveness of the teachers and implies a high degree of competence in the performance. The somewhat high mean score also reinforces the conclusion that teacher performance in this sample is robust.

Table 18. Test of relationship Between School Based Management Practices and Teachers' Performance

Variables	r-computed	t-computed	Decision
School-Based Management	0.24	2.77*	Reject HO
Teachers' Performance			

Table 18 shows the outcome of the test of association between School-Based Management (SBM) practices and teachers' performance. The correlation coefficient (r-computed) is 0.24, showing that there is a weak positive association between SBM practices and teachers' performance. The t-computed value is 2.77, which is significant at the conventional alpha level of 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis (H0), which assumed there is no meaningful association between SBM practices and teachers' performance, is rejected.

The null hypothesis rejection indicates that there is a statistically significant correlation between SBM practice implementation and teacher performance. While the relationship is weak (r = 0.24), the fact that it is positive indicates that the better SBM practices are implemented, the better teachers' performance is, though the impact may not be very significant. This result indicates the significance of SBM practices in determining teacher performance but also indicates that other variables may be adding to teachers' effectiveness beyond SBM implementation.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS

Conclusion

Based on the study findings, most teachers had not yet pursued graduate studies, with a significant portion holding only a bachelor's degree. Furthermore, the limited and inconsistent implementation of school-based management (SBM) practices by administrators was observed to influence teacher performance.

Recommendation

Teachers may consider pursuing graduate studies to enhance their qualifications and support ongoing professional development. In connection with this, administrators are encouraged to consistently implement school-based management practices to help improve teacher performance and overall school effectiveness. Moreover, teachers can be guided to gradually improve their performance from very satisfactory to outstanding through sustained commitment to excellence. Alongside these efforts, it is important to strengthen the regularity and consistency of SBM implementation across key areas such as leadership, stakeholder involvement, resource management, and school improvement processes. To support these initiatives, continuous professional development programs may be provided to assist both teachers and administrators in improving school governance and educational outcomes.

V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION

Summary of Findings

1. Most school administrators (40.63%) are aged 40–49, while teachers are evenly spread across 20–49 years. Female administrators dominate (68.75%), but male teachers slightly outnumber females (50.92%). All administrators have at least a master's degree, while most teachers hold bachelor's or master's degrees. The largest group of teachers are Master Teacher I (27.84%).
2. School administrators demonstrate high levels of leadership in all areas, with participative leadership scoring highest (4.156). Directive, supportive, and achievement-oriented leadership also show strong performance, averaging 4.114 overall.
3. Administrators' practices strongly influence teachers' job satisfaction. Both motivators (4.026) and hygiene factors (4.032) are rated highly, confirming administrators' key role in fostering job satisfaction.
4. A moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.388$, $p = 0.028$) shows that effective leadership strategies significantly increase teachers' job satisfaction.
5. No significant differences were found in administrative practices based on age, sex, or educational attainment (all $p > 0.05$), indicating consistency across these groups.

Conclusion

The study concludes that school administrators' administrative leadership practices significantly influence teachers' job satisfaction, with participative leadership being the most prominent approach. Teachers highly value administrators' efforts in fostering a supportive and achievement-oriented work environment, recognizing accomplishments, and ensuring fair workload distribution. The findings further confirm a significant positive relationship between school administrators' leadership strategies and teachers' job satisfaction. However, demographic factors such as age, sex, and educational attainment do not significantly impact the way school administrators exercise their

administrative practices. These results highlight the crucial role of effective leadership in enhancing teachers' job satisfaction, emphasizing the need for continued professional development and participatory decision-making in school administration.

Recommendations

- For School Administrators. Continue strengthening participative leadership by involving teachers in decisions. Balance directive, supportive, and achievement-oriented approaches to keep teachers motivated. Provide more professional development and foster open communication to address teachers' concerns.
- For Teachers. Actively participate in decision-making and offer feedback on policies. Take advantage of professional growth opportunities and communicate openly with administrators to help create a supportive work environment.
- For Students. Recognize that a positive work environment for teachers leads to better teaching and learning. Schools should support teacher well-being to enhance student engagement and success.
- For School Management and Policymakers. Use these findings to promote leadership development, equitable workloads, better working conditions, and stronger incentives to improve teacher satisfaction and retention.
- For Future Researchers. Investigate other factors affecting teacher satisfaction, like organizational culture and mental health support. Conduct longitudinal and broader studies across various school types to deepen understanding of leadership's impact.

REFERENCES

[1] Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2015). Business research methods (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

[2] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

[3] Dare, P. S., & Saleem, A. (2022). Toward success while tackling the change in a pandemic age: Path-goal theory leadership as a win-win gadget. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 944145. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.944145

[4] Dursun, İ. E., & Bilgivar, O. O. (2022). The effect of school principals' leadership styles on teacher performance and organizational happiness. International Journal of Educational Administration and Leadership, 1(1), Article 7. https://doi.org/10.52380/ijedal.2022.1.1.7

[5] Ertürk, R. (2023). The relationship between school administrators' supportive leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship according to teacher perceptions. Journal of Education and Recreation Patterns, 4(1), 14-30.

[6] Macalisang, D. S. (2023). Administrative practices of school administrators and instructional supervision: Analysis of the impact towards school organizational culture. Sprin Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, 2(02), 42–49. https://doi.org/10.55559/sjahss.v2i02.90

[7] Nayon, N. J. N., & Macalisang, N. D. S. (2024). Interpersonal self-efficacy, morale, and personality traits of public elementary school teachers vis-à-vis teaching performance. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 12(1), 231–240. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2024.12.1.0793

[8] Nyambura, J. (2018). Influence of school administrative practices on teachers' job satisfaction in secondary schools in Kirinyaga Central Sub County, Kenya [Master's thesis, Kenyatta University]. Kenyatta University Institutional Repository. http://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/handle/123456789/19004

[9] Revelo, M. T. (2023). Administrative practices of school administrators in Clarin South District: Insights from teachers as basis for enhancement. UIJRT.

[10] Saxon, P. M. (2015). The influence of leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University). https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/1248

[11] Torres, D. G. (2018). Distributed leadership and teacher job satisfaction in Singapore. Journal of Educational Administration, 56(1), 5-24. https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-12-2016-0140