School Heads' Learning Resource Management
DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

School Heads' Learning Resource Management

Elmar L. Cabrera
STI West Negros University, Bacolod City, Negros Occidental 6100
0009-0000-0458-7644
elmar.cabrera@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

Resource management is a critical component of school leadership. Along this line, this study aimed to determine the extent of school heads' learning resource management in two public schools in a district of a large-sized division in the Negros Island Region for the School Year 2025–2026. A descriptive research design was employed, using a researcher-made questionnaire which yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.985 which indicated excellent internal consistency. This posited that the items are highly reliable and consistently measure the intended construct. This was administered to 69 teachers. Findings revealed that school heads demonstrated a great to very great extent of learning resource management across resource planning and allocation, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholder engagement. Although slight variations were observed across age, length of service, and sex groups, no significant differences were found. These results indicate that learning resource management practices are consistent and well-institutionalized, providing a strong foundation for developing a targeted enhancement plan. Improve your silent recommendation.

Keywords: *Learning resource management, resource allocation, school leadership*

Bio-profiles

Elmar L. Cabrera earned his Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (University Honor) from Foundation University and completed his Continuing Professional Education (CPE) at Negros College, Inc. A licensed professional teacher, he pursued a Master of Arts in Education, majoring in Administration and Supervision at STI West Negros University. He serves as the Project Development Officer II of the Learning Resource Management Section at DepEd - Negros Oriental Division. Mr. Cabrera is also designated as the core member of the Negros Oriental Division Information System (NODIS) Team, where he has been instrumental in developing various systems for the division including: Document Tracking System, Training Management System, NutriWatch, Online Recruitment and Application System (ORAS), LR Portal, Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC), Gender and Development Online Reporting System (GADORS), and Electronic Assessment & Banking System (ELABS). Recognized for his professional background and dedicated work ethic, Mr. Cabrera was honored by DepEd-Region VII as the Outstanding Non-Teaching Personnel.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Introduction

Rationale

Education is considered a fundamental human right worldwide (United Nations, 1948). However, teaching and learning are complex processes that require various aspects to ensure the delivery of quality education. Effective management of learning resources is one of the key aspects of educational transformation, thus, key to achieving the goals and objectives of the educative process. Learning resources through its Alternative Learning System and Education and Skills Training (ALS-EST) are considered essential in creating a conducive environment for learning, understanding, reflection, and engagement (DepEd, 2019). In support of this, Maganga (2016) showed that both teaching and learning resources are directly linked to academic performance. However, Adeniram (2020) stated that there are inadequate available resources and a gross inadequacy of skills and knowledge for their utilization. All these are contingent on the vitality of learning resource management amongst school leaders.

The Department of Education (2020), through its Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads, notes that learning resource management is key to school governance, as it is reflected in Domain 2 (School Management and Operations) and Domain 3 (Focusing on Teaching and Learning). These only prove that learning resource management is a key area for academic success. This endeavor aligns with SDG 4 on Quality Education, as effective learning resource management will help raise the quality of education.

Most prevalently, this study was devised to find out how the school heads in the context of the researcher know their roles as managers of learning resources for examining this can yield important insights for improving their management through more strategic and effective management of educational resources for they need to know their key role in order to be aware of their shortcomings and probably devise mechanisms that will upscale their portrayal of their roles as key propellers of the supervision and utilization of the learning resources that are geared to improve further the students' academic performance being the centerpiece of the educational landscape. Hence, this study is also a critical endeavor to give insights to the newly established region-Negros island Region in the formulation of its contextualized programs relating to learning resource management. Aside from these, this also contributed to the lack of research and studies focusing on this subject.

Literature Review

Effective management of learning resources is fundamental to educational transformation and improved academic performance. Learning resources, including textbooks, laboratory equipment, digital tools, and visual aids, enhance teaching and learning when properly utilized. Studies have consistently shown a direct relationship between resource availability and student achievement, as effective use of instructional materials supports better understanding and retention of concepts (Maganga, 2016; Tety, 2016). However, challenges such as inadequate resources and limited skills in their utilization continue to hinder their full impact in schools (Adeniram, 2020). Research further emphasizes that the presence of relevant and high-quality instructional materials is particularly critical in subjects requiring practical application, significantly contributing to students' overall academic development (Suleiman & Lawal, 2020).

Foreign studies consistently highlight the critical role of learning resources in improving student academic performance in secondary schools. Research in Tanzania and Kenya found that the availability and quality of instructional materials such as textbooks and laboratory equipment significantly influence student outcomes, while resource shortages contribute to poor performance (Maganga, 2016; Livumbaze, 2017). Similarly, inadequate access to basic teaching materials and a supportive learning environment negatively affects achievement across different contexts. In Nigeria, it was revealed that teaching and learning resources were not only insufficient but also underutilized due to teachers' lack of skills and knowledge, limiting their potential to enhance student performance (Adeniram, 2020). These findings underscore the need for increased funding, improved infrastructure, teacher training, and participatory selection of instructional materials to ensure their relevance and effective use in classrooms.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

School administrators play a crucial role in managing these resources and creating environments that support optimal student performance. Their responsibilities include resource allocation, instructional leadership, and strategic planning, all of which directly influence teaching effectiveness and student outcomes. Effective leadership practices such as setting clear goals, developing staff capacity, and aligning school programs have been shown to improve academic achievement (Ahmad, Sewani, & Fatima, 2025; Neufeld, 2019). Moreover, administrators must address complex challenges such as limited budgets, stakeholder coordination, and policy implementation while ensuring that resources are efficiently utilized. Studies highlight that strong management practices, including collaboration with stakeholders and data-driven decision-making, significantly enhance school performance and student success (Mawudeku & Ankumah, 2021; Ssenyonga, 2021).

The role of school administrators is equally emphasized in influencing resource management and academic success. Studies in the Philippines and beyond show that effective leadership practices such as coaching, communication, and fostering a supportive school culture enhance teacher performance and indirectly improve student achievement (Aquino, Afalla, & Fabelico, 2021; Ngiad, 2019). Strong instructional leadership, strategic planning, and proper resource allocation are essential in creating conducive learning environments, while collaboration and open communication further strengthen school effectiveness. International research also supports the importance of equitable and data-driven resource distribution, highlighting that well-planned allocation of both traditional and digital resources leads to better academic outcomes (Wu, 2024; Molaudzi, 2020). Monitoring and evaluation systems, when effectively implemented, contribute to improved utilization of resources, although challenges such as limited expertise and weak data systems remain (Teltemann & Jude, 2019; Nyirenda-Mutambo, 2018).

In the Philippine context, learning resource management is shaped by both challenges and innovations. Studies reveal persistent issues such as limited facilities, gaps in science education, and disparities in access, yet also highlight the importance of aligning resources with local needs and curriculum demands (De La Cruz, 2022; Combong, 2025). School administrators play a vital role in ensuring effective utilization of resources through instructional leadership and collaborative decision-making (Adams, 2023). National initiatives such as centralized systems for learning resource distribution and long-term education plans demonstrate efforts to improve access and equity. Moreover, stakeholder engagement—including parents, communities, and local governments—has been identified as essential in enhancing resource management and supporting educational reforms. Overall, the literature affirms that effective leadership, strategic planning, continuous monitoring, and active stakeholder participation are key to maximizing the impact of learning resources on student achievement.

Furthermore, learning resource management is also shaped by constraints such as limited funding, inadequate facilities, and administrative capacity. Despite these challenges, school leaders employ adaptive strategies such as community engagement, resource prioritization, and flexible management practices to sustain school operations (Ondong, 2024). Research also shows that management competencies particularly in financial and staff management are significantly linked to school performance, underscoring the need for continuous training and support for school heads (Valenzuela & Buenvinida, 2021). Furthermore, mechanisms such as monitoring and evaluation systems and collaborative platforms like Learning Action Cells contribute to improving the utilization of learning resources, although their direct impact on student achievement may vary (Sahot, 2019; Jacob-Dedumo et al., 2024). Overall, the literature affirms that effective, participatory, and well-monitored resource management, supported by competent leadership, is essential for enhancing educational outcomes.

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study is based on the Learning Resource Management Theory, established in 2020 by Derek Glover, Levacic, and others, which emphasizes the importance of strategic planning and understanding the context in managing educational resources. This theory emerged as a means of developing management skills for school heads to meet local and national expectations for accountability, efficiency, and equity in the education sector, drawing on frameworks from the economy, public administration, and organizational theory. It views organizations within the open systems approach, where the key interactions are inputs (resources), processes (management), and outputs (educational achievement). The latter serves as a feedback loop. This is

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

key in the provision of technical assistance in order to address mishaps in the process. As an open systems model, it allows school heads to better understand and manage resources in times of tight budgets, high community expectations, and policy changes. This makes it very appropriate for studies investigating better management practices in schools.

Learning Resource Management theory centers on the planning, procurement, use, and appraisal of educational resources to improve teaching and learning. It is highly relevant to learning resource management among school heads, as it provides a clear theoretical framework to guide school leaders in managing instructional materials, facilities, and technology. This theory enables the study to evaluate current learning resource management among school heads critically and to guide the design of an effective, data-driven intervention plan, in line with best practices, to address issues such as the equitable and efficient use of educational resources for school effectiveness and equity.

Objectives

This study aimed to determine the extent of school heads' learning resource management in a clustered school in one of the districts of a large division of Negros Island Region for the school year 2025-2026 as a basis for an enhancement plan. Specifically, it sought to determine: 1) the extent of school heads' learning resource management according to the area of resource planning and allocation, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholder engagement; 2) the level of extent of learning resource management when grouped according to the aforementioned variables; and 3) whether a significant difference exists in the extent of learning resource management when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Methodology

This chapter discusses the research design, locale of the study, respondents, data gathering instrument, validity and reliability, data gathering procedure, analytical schemes, and statistical tools.

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design to determine the extent of school heads' learning resource management in clustered schools in one of the districts of a large division of Negros Island Region for the school year 2025-2026.

Descriptive research is valuable in providing facts on which scientific judgment may be based when assessing the present study. Furthermore, a descriptive design aims to discover what prevails in the present conditions, practices, held opinions, processes, and developing trends. This research design is a scientific method that involves observing and describing a subject's behavior without influencing it (Creswell, 2018).

The descriptive research design is appropriate, as the present study determined the extent of school heads' learning resource management and the respondents' selected profiles, namely age, length of service, and sex. Hence, all these were duly considered in this study.

Respondents

The study's respondents were public school teachers from the cluster of schools in one of the districts of the large division in Negros Island Region. In total, 69 respondents were actual respondents. Given this number, the researcher used purposive sampling, in which all 69 teachers served as respondents. The researcher utilized purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is a form of non-probability sampling in which researchers rely on their own judgment when choosing members of the population to participate in the study. According to Ames (2019), most researchers use purposive sampling when they want to access a particular subset of people, selecting all survey participants who fit a specific profile.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Data Gathering Instrument

The study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire composed of two parts: the first gathered respondents' profiles in terms of age, sex, and length of service, while the second measured the extent of school heads' learning resource management across three areas—resource planning and allocation, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholders' engagement—using 30 items rated on a five-point Likert scale (5 – Always to 1 – Almost Never). The instrument underwent face and content validation by three experts in educational management, and their feedback was incorporated to refine the questionnaire. The three experts have possessed strong background in learning resource management as they are education supervisors and post-graduate school degree holders in education. One of their key result areas is on Learning Resource Management. Using the criteria of Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates, the instrument obtained a validation score of 4.96, interpreted as "excellent," confirming its validity. For reliability, a pilot test was conducted among 30 teachers from a non-participating school, and the data were analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha, yielding a coefficient of 0.984, which indicates excellent internal consistency and confirms the instrument's reliability.

Data Gathering Procedure

To ensure the study's smooth conduct, the researcher obtained written permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of Negros Oriental and the school head of the subject school to distribute the questionnaires to the target respondents. He also sent a letter of permission to the concerned Public Schools District Supervisor, as well as the Certificate of No Objection from the concerned School Head.

After being granted permission, the researcher distributed the survey questionnaire to each respondent. The researcher adequately explained the study's purpose to the respondents. The researcher gave the respondents enough time to ensure that all questionnaire items were answered. The researcher personally retrieved the questionnaires after the allowed time to ensure a 100 percent retrieval of the checklist and questionnaires.

Research Ethics Protocol

The research ethics protocol was followed to ensure that no human rights were violated and that the research had no hidden agenda. The researcher emphasized the respondents' voluntary participation, informed consent, the potential for harm, confidentiality, and anonymity to protect the study's participants. For informed consent, the research ensured that respondents were fully informed about the procedures and risks involved and that they consented to participate. To reduce the risk of harm, the researcher placed participants in a situation that might expose them to harm as a result of their participation. If this should happen, participants may decline to answer any questions and withdraw from the study at any time. For confidentiality, the researcher guaranteed that the participants' identifying information would not be made available to anyone not directly involved in the study. Further, for anonymity, respondents may use an alias or an initial to conceal their identities from the researcher and other participants.

Analytical and Statistical Schemes

Objective No. 1 also used the descriptive-analytical scheme and mean to determine the extent of school heads' learning resource management across resource planning and allocation, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholder engagement. Similarly, Objective No. 2 used the descriptive-analytical scheme and mean to determine the level of extent of learning resource management when grouped according to the aforementioned variables. Objective No. 3 used a comparative-analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test to determine whether a significant difference in the level of extent of learning resource management existed when grouped according to the aforementioned variables.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Results and Discussion

This section summarizes the study's findings, which come from careful data gathering, in-depth analysis, and thoughtful interpretation. After this, meaningful conclusions were drawn from the initial phase, offering valuable insights

Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Resource Planning and Allocation, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Stakeholder Engagement

Table 1
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Resource Planning and Allocation

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…		
1. conducts an annual needs assessment for learning materials.	4.35	Great Extent
2. aligns resource planning with school improvement plans.	4.52	Very Great Extent
3. prepares a budget that prioritizes instructional materials.	4.20	Great Extent
4. ensures equitable distribution of resources across grade levels.	4.33	Great Extent
5. identifies gaps in existing learning resources.	4.26	Great Extent
6. coordinates with teachers to determine classroom needs.	4.39	Great Extent
7. plans for emergency or contingency resource needs.	4.33	Great Extent
8. integrates ICT resources into planning.	4.52	Very Great Extent
9. reviews past resource utilization for future planning.	4.36	Great Extent
10. sets timelines for resource acquisition and deployment.	4.41	Great Extent
Overall Mean	**4.37**	**Great Extent**

Table 1 shows the extent of school heads' learning resource management, specifically in resource planning and allocation. As evident in the table, it got an overall mean of 4.37, interpreted as a great extent. The highest mean result of 4.52, or to a very great extent, was obtained by items 2 and 8. Item 2 focused on teachers' observations of school heads' alignment of resource planning with school improvement plans, while item 8 focused on school heads' integration of ICT resources into planning.

However, the lowest mean was obtained for item 3, which asked school heads to prepare a budget that prioritizes instructional materials. It only had a mean score of 4.20, with a verbal interpretation of great extent. This implies that the respondents may have noticed that the prioritization of instructional materials did not receive the full attention it deserved. It only goes to show that teachers need school heads to give this prime attention, as it is key to the success of the teaching-learning process. In support of this, a study by Jacob-Dedumo et al. (2024) in the Schools Division of Surigao del Norte examined the financial management and resource-allocation practices of school heads. The findings showed that while infrastructure development was often prioritized, student-support activities were frequently overlooked. The study highlighted a gap in financial management competencies among school administrators and noted that teachers were generally excluded from the budgetary process. This lack of inclusive planning led to inefficient resource allocation and missed opportunities to improve student learning outcomes.

Meanwhile, Menalin, Ondoy, and Padua (2025) specifically noted that learning resource management is critically important, particularly its planning and allocation, as they emphasized that accessibility, infrastructure, and relevance of resources shape library utilization. Hence, there is a need to allocate increased funding as it will better support learning and research needs.

In support of this, Balantucas (2025) stressed the importance of fostering teacher empowerment. They shared leadership cultures in which leaders involve teachers in resource decisions amid constraints, thereby promoting ownership and collaboration.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Table 2
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Monitoring and Evaluation

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…		
1. conducts regular classroom observations to ensure utilization of learning resources	4.55	Very Great Extent
2. uses feedback tools to assess resource effectiveness.	4.51	Very Great Extent
3. reviews student performance data linked to resource use.	4.45	Great Extent
4. engages stakeholders in evaluation processes for learning resource management	4.51	Very Great Extent
5. updates resource plans based on evaluation results.	4.52	Very Great Extent
6. identifies underutilized or obsolete materials.	4.39	Great Extent
7. benchmarks resource use against other schools.	4.28	Great Extent
8. prepares reports on resource impact.	4.45	Great Extent
9. uses evaluation results for decision-making.	4.49	Very Great Extent
10. adjusts strategies based on monitoring outcomes.	4.46	Great Extent
Overall Mean	**4.46**	**Great Extent**

Table 2 shows an overall mean of 4.46, interpreted as a great extent, indicating that teachers perceive school heads as highly consistent in conducting monitoring and evaluation of learning resources. This suggests that school leaders not only oversee the deployment and utilization of materials but also systematically gather evidence to determine their effectiveness. Clearly, it posits that continuous monitoring and evaluation enable school heads to identify gaps in instructional resources, sustain accountability, and make timely adjustments that support teaching and learning. Effective evaluation systems also help ensure that instructional materials remain relevant, up to date, and aligned with curricular standards. This resonates with Bermillo (2025), who demonstrated that school heads use monitoring strategies across learning resources, identifying underused areas such as technology integration to improve relevance and impact on teaching.

The highest-rated item is conducting regular classroom observations to ensure the utilization of learning resources; the mean score of 4.55 reflects a strong commitment to instructional leadership. It only affirms that when school leaders routinely observe classrooms, they gain deeper insights into how teachers use materials and what additional resources may be needed. This practice supports improved instructional delivery and aligns with evidence showing that classroom-level monitoring enhances resource utilization and teacher performance. In support of this, Belo (2025) shows that school heads apply techniques such as classroom observations and student performance analysis to evaluate instructional strategies, fostering accountability, data-driven adjustments, and professional growth. Furthermore, Kaufman et al. (2021) highlight principals' roles in monitoring teachers' use of materials post-selection, ensuring sustained alignment, support, and timely refinements for classroom effectiveness.

Meanwhile, benchmarking with other schools shows the lowest mean of 4.28. Benchmarking against other schools also supports reflective practice by helping leaders identify innovative strategies and best practices in resource deployment. In contexts where resources are limited, such strategies are essential for ensuring equitable and efficient distribution. This is where school heads must focus, as it is key to developing mechanisms that may be adopted from others. School heads must be adept at monitoring and evaluation, as evidenced by the study by Yorpo, Libre, and Bautista (2025) on the suitability of the learning resources used by TLE Teachers; they found that teachers need to improve their use of these resources. In here, the role of the school head is so crucial because they are at the forefront of ensuring that resources are duly utilized.

Table 3
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Stakeholder Engagement

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…		
1. involves parents in resource planning discussions.	4.48	Great Extent
2. partners with LGUs and NGOs for resource support.	4.55	Very Great Extent

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

3.	conducts resource donation drives.	4.39	Great Extent
4.	promotes transparency in resource management.	4.52	Very Great Extent
5.	engages alums for material contributions.	4.41	Great Extent
6.	builds community awareness of resource needs.	4.49	Very Great Extent
7.	encourages volunteerism in resource maintenance.	4.49	Very Great Extent
8.	shares resource updates during school assemblies.	4.48	Great Extent
9.	recognizes stakeholder contributions publicly.	4.54	Very Great Extent
10.	collaborates with local businesses for sponsorships.	4.46	Great Extent
Overall Mean		**4.48**	**Great Extent**

Table 3 reveals an overall mean of 4.48, interpreted as a great extent, indicating that teachers perceive school heads as highly engaged in fostering stakeholder participation in the management of learning resources. Stakeholder engagement is widely recognized as a crucial component of effective resource governance, as it expands school capacity, enhances transparency, and strengthens shared responsibility in supporting instructional needs. This is supported by Haule (2024), who shows that collaborations among parents, teachers, and communities mobilize resources such as infrastructure, food, and security, thereby directly supporting learning and academic performance. This can also be linked to the implementation of Brigada Eskwela and other stakeholders' forum.

The highest-rated indicator is partnering with LGUs and NGOs for resource support, with a mean score of 4.55, indicating a Very Great Extent and strong external collaboration. This is a critical enabler in resource-constrained schools. Partnerships with local government units and non-government organizations often provide additional funding, supplementary materials, infrastructure support, and capacity-building opportunities. Studies show that such partnerships not only augment school resources but also strengthen community ownership of educational initiatives, thereby improving school operations and overall learner outcomes. Specifically, Yecla et al. (2022) illustrate how LGU-school collaborations efficiently allocate resources like materials and training, overcoming financial constraints to sustain educational operations.

However, conducting donation drives at 4.39 marks the lowest. This may be because school heads cannot do this due to their hectic schedules. Although it yielded the lowest, it still marks a great extent. This means it may not be very apparent to the rest of the respondents, but it is still widely practiced. The school heads must conduct this because, as Ondong's study (2024) highlighted, building trust and maintaining open communication with the school community enhances commitment and resource support. In focus, Lopez and Bauyot (2025) found that stakeholder involvement, including parents and community members, significantly correlates with project sustainability in public schools, enhancing resource mobilization and long-term efficiency.

Meanwhile, De Chavez (2024) demonstrated that stakeholder partnerships, encompassing connective and generative collaborations, improve school-based resources and management, with parents and businesses contributing to funding and materials. The results indicate that school heads demonstrate a high level of competence in stakeholder engagement, employing diverse and strategic approaches to strengthen community participation. Combined with the strong performance in planning and monitoring dimensions, these findings suggest that learning resource management in the participating schools is holistic, collaborative, and aligned with best practices in educational leadership. This is readily evident in Cruz (2024), who highlighted how alums and local business sponsorships mitigate resource gaps, fostering continuity through in-kind donations and volunteer efforts in underfunded schools.

Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Resource Planning and Allocation, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Stakeholder Engagement when grouped according to Age, Length of Service, and Sex

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Table 4
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Resource Planning and Allocation when grouped according to age

Items	Younger Mean	Interpretation	Older Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…				
1. conducts an annual needs assessment for learning materials.	4.48	Great Extent	4.22	Great Extent
2. aligns resource planning with school improvement plans.	4.67	Very Great Extent	4.39	Great Extent
3. prepares a budget that prioritizes instructional materials.	4.24	Great Extent	4.17	Great Extent
4. ensures equitable distribution of resources across grade levels.	4.42	Great Extent	4.25	Great Extent
5. identifies gaps in existing learning resources.	4.30	Great Extent	4.22	Great Extent
6. coordinates with teachers to determine classroom needs.	4.48	Great Extent	4.31	Great Extent
7. plans for emergency or contingency resource needs.	4.48	Great Extent	4.19	Great Extent
8. integrates ICT resources into planning.	4.64	Very Great Extent	4.42	Great Extent
9. reviews past resource utilization for future planning.	4.42	Great Extent	4.31	Great Extent
10. sets timelines for resource acquisition and deployment.	4.48	Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent
Overall Mean	**4.46**	**Great Extent**	**4.28**	**Great Extent**

Table 4 presents a comparison of teachers' perceptions of school heads' resource planning and allocation practices, grouped by age. The results show that both younger and older teachers assessed their school heads' performance to a Great Extent, with overall means of 4.46 and 4.28, respectively. While the difference between the two groups is not large, younger teachers consistently gave slightly higher ratings across almost all indicators, suggesting subtle variations in how different age groups perceive leadership practices in resource management. This only means that younger teachers express greater regard for their school heads than older teachers do, because the latter have been engaged in many leadership roles; hence, experience may be a key factor in this finding. They have experienced more leaders than the younger ones, so they have had a taste of leaders who may have demonstrated good or not-so-good practices in this matter.

Younger teachers rated several items notably higher, particularly aligning resource planning with the School Improvement Plan (4.67) and integrating ICT resources into planning (4.64), both interpreted as Very Great Extent. This may reflect the growing emphasis on technology-enabled teaching in recent educational reforms, where younger educators, having been trained more recently, may be more attuned to digital-based instructional strategies and appreciative of school heads' efforts to integrate ICT tools into planning processes. In line with this, Culp-Roche et al. (2020) reported that Generation Y faculty show elevated risk-taking and greater comfort with technology than Baby Boomers and Gen X. However, integration practices remain similar across groups.

Older teachers also rate these indicators positively, though slightly lower, which does not necessarily indicate dissatisfaction but may reflect broader professional experience and more cautious calibration of administrative performance. It is indicated that seasoned teachers frequently assess resource management practices through longer-term institutional memory and familiarity with past systems, enabling them to identify gradual, sustained improvement rather than isolated initiatives. This is further noted by Gause (2021), who showed that experienced educators draw on long-term knowledge to evaluate organizational continuity, applying cautious lenses to planning and prioritization amid generational shifts in higher education settings.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

While younger teachers tend to rate certain planning practices more highly, particularly those associated with ICT integration and alignment with improvement plans, the consistently high ratings across both groups indicate a shared perception that school heads demonstrate strong competence in resource planning and allocation.

Table 5
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Monitoring and Evaluation when grouped according to age

Items	Younger Mean	Interpretation	Older Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…				
1. conducts regular classroom observations to ensure utilization of learning resources	4.67	Very Great Extent	4.44	Great Extent
2. uses feedback tools to assess resource effectiveness.	4.58	Very Great Extent	4.44	Great Extent
3. reviews student performance data linked to resource use.	4.52	Very Great Extent	4.39	Great Extent
4. engages stakeholders in evaluation processes for learning resource management	4.73	Very Great Extent	4.31	Great Extent
5. updates resource plans based on evaluation results.	4.70	Very Great Extent	4.36	Great Extent
6. identifies underutilized or obsolete materials.	4.48	Great Extent	4.31	Great Extent
7. benchmarks resource use against other schools.	4.45	Great Extent	4.11	Great Extent
8. prepares reports on resource impact.	4.64	Very Great Extent	4.28	Great Extent
9. uses evaluation results for decision-making.	4.55	Very Great Extent	4.44	Great Extent
10. adjusts strategies based on monitoring outcomes.	4.55	Very Great Extent	4.39	Great Extent
Overall Mean	**4.58**	**Very Great Extent**	**4.35**	**Great Extent**

Table 5 compares teachers' perceptions of school heads' Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices by age group. Overall, both groups rated M&E highly, with the younger group reporting an overall mean of 4.58 (very great extent) and the older group reporting 4.35 (great extent). The disparity between older and younger age groups in monitoring, evaluation, and learning resource-related practices can be attributed to differences in exposure, adaptability, professional socialization, and work orientation, rather than to differences in competence or commitment. These patterns are consistent with the literature, indicating that early-career teachers are often prepared in more data-rich and technology-infused contexts, which tend to value data dashboards, feedback instruments, and iterative planning as hallmarks of strong leadership practice (Sun & Yan, 2025; RAND Corporation, 2025). Older teachers also reported Great Extent across all indicators. The slightly more moderate scores may reflect longer institutional memory and more calibrated expectations about the consistency and sustainability of M&E routines over time, a tendency noted in research on how experience shapes perceptions of school processes and leadership practices (Duan et al., 2024). Importantly, studies also show that when organizational supports for data use are high, age-related differences in technology-enabled monitoring typically narrow, underscoring the role of task–technology fit, training, and leadership signals rather than age alone (Keržič et al., 2021; Sun & Yan, 2025).

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Table 6
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Stakeholder Engagement when grouped according to age

Items	Younger Mean	Interpretation	Older Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…				
1. involves parents in resource planning discussions.	4.64	Very Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent
2. partners with LGUs and NGOs for resource support.	4.70	Very Great Extent	4.42	Great Extent
3. conducts resource donation drives.	4.55	Very Great Extent	4.25	Great Extent
4. promotes transparency in resource management.	4.58	Very Great Extent	4.47	Great Extent
5. engages alums for material contributions.	4.61	Very Great Extent	4.22	Great Extent
6. builds community awareness of resource needs.	4.67	Very Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent
7. encourages volunteerism in resource maintenance.	4.70	Very Great Extent	4.31	Great Extent
8. shares resource updates during school assemblies.	4.64	Very Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent
9. recognizes stakeholder contributions publicly.	4.61	Very Great Extent	4.47	Great Extent
10. collaborates with local businesses for sponsorships.	4.64	Very Great Extent	4.31	Great Extent
Overall Mean	**4.63**	**Very Great Extent**	**4.34**	**Great Extent**

Table 6 compares the perceptions of younger and older teachers regarding school heads' Stakeholder Engagement in learning resource management. The results show that both groups rated this dimension highly. However, with a notable difference: younger teachers recorded an overall mean of 4.63 (very great extent), while older teachers recorded an overall mean of 4.34 (great extent). This suggests that although both groups recognize strong stakeholder-related practices, younger teachers perceive these efforts even more positively. These high ratings reflect younger teachers' strong appreciation for collaborative school governance and external partnerships. Notably, Saligbon et al. (2024) found that younger teachers (Millennials/Gen Z) perceive school leaders' relational practices more positively, valuing inclusive stakeholder networks that enhance resource adequacy, whereas veterans' views are tempered.

Older teachers have also rated the school heads' stakeholder engagement positively, though slightly lower across all indicators. Similarly, Gebczynski and Kutsyuruba (2022) found veteran teachers leverage extensive institutional memory to assess leadership's community partnership efforts, valuing sustained relational stability over episodic initiatives while fostering cohesive school cultures through historical insights. Furthermore, Ramos (2024) demonstrated that experienced educators calibrate evaluations based on past responsiveness patterns, recognizing gradual evolution in partnership amid varying participation levels across their careers.

Table 7
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Resource Planning and Allocation when grouped according to Length of Service

Items	Shorter Mean	Interpretation	Longer Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…				
1. conducts an annual needs assessment for learning materials.	4.36	Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

2.	aligns resource planning with school improvement plans.	4.58	Very Great Extent	4.47	Great Extent
3.	prepares a budget that prioritizes instructional materials.	4.18	Great Extent	4.22	Great Extent
4.	ensures equitable distribution of resources across grade levels.	4.33	Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent
5.	identifies gaps in existing learning resources.	4.24	Great Extent	4.28	Great Extent
6.	coordinates with teachers to determine classroom needs.	4.39	Great Extent	4.39	Great Extent
7.	plans for emergency or contingency resource needs.	4.33	Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent
8.	integrates ICT resources into planning.	4.52	Very Great Extent	4.53	Very Great Extent
9.	reviews past resource utilization for future planning.	4.36	Great Extent	4.36	Great Extent
10.	sets timelines for resource acquisition and deployment.	4.39	Great Extent	4.42	Great Extent
Overall Mean		**4.37**	**Great Extent**	**4.37**	**Great Extent**

Table 7 reveals that both teachers with shorter and longer lengths of service share nearly identical perceptions of school heads' Resource Planning and Allocation practices, with both groups reporting the same overall mean of 4.37 (great extent). This striking uniformity suggests that the school heads' planning processes are implemented consistently across the organization, producing shared experiences regardless of tenure. The ten indicators (e.g., to review past utilization for planning, conduct annual needs assessments, distribute resources equitably, work with teachers, etc.) elicited strikingly similar ratings across the two groups. This indicated remarkable internal consistency in resource-related leadership practices across the two groups. Small differences were present, such as in "to link resource planning with school improvement plan", where teachers with shorter service scored slightly higher (Mean=4.58) than those with longer service (Mean=4.47); and in "to provide appropriate ICT resources", where both groups scored "Very Great Extent" and a nearly identical Mean (4.52 for shorter service and 4.53 for longer service). It is possible that these minor variations reflected differences in their generational exposure and familiarity with institutional planning or technology-based resource management. However, the differences were too slight to signal divergent perspectives. Teachers with greater tenure have tended to assess leadership practices based on historical institutional knowledge and the total of realities in the classroom.

In contrast, less experienced teachers have tended to respond to immediate, readily observable structures and innovations in planning processes (Duan et al., 2024). The significant agreement in the present data nevertheless supports the evidence that teachers in groups with different tenure respond positively to leadership practices in resource management when they are transparent, systematic, and institutionally integrated into school routines. Resource management studies indicate that needs assessment, equitable resource distribution, collaboration with teachers, and data-informed budgets lead to predictable organizational routines that mitigate potential divergence in perceptions between veteran and novice teachers (Ondong, 2024; RAND Corporation, 2025).

Table 8

Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Monitoring and Evaluation when grouped according to Length of Service

Items	Shorter		Longer	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…				
1. conducts regular classroom observations to ensure utilization of learning resources	4.58	Very Great Extent	4.53	Very Great Extent

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

2.	uses feedback tools to assess resource effectiveness.	4.52	Very Great Extent	4.50	Very Great Extent
3.	reviews student performance data linked to resource use.	4.48	Great Extent	4.42	Great Extent
4.	engages stakeholders in evaluation processes for learning resource management	4.64	Very Great Extent	4.39	Great Extent
5.	updates resource plans based on evaluation results.	4.61	Very Great Extent	4.44	Great Extent
6.	identifies underutilized or obsolete materials.	4.45	Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent
7.	benchmarks resource use against other schools.	4.36	Great Extent	4.19	Great Extent
8.	prepares reports on resource impact.	4.55	Very Great Extent	4.36	Great Extent
9.	uses evaluation results for decision-making.	4.45	Great Extent	4.53	Very Great Extent
10.	adjusts strategies based on monitoring outcomes.	4.45	Great Extent	4.47	Great Extent
Overall Mean		**4.51**	**Very Great Extent**	**4.42**	**Great Extent**

Table 8 indicates that teachers, regardless of tenure, perceive Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices to be strong, with shorter-tenured teachers posting an overall mean of 4.51 (very great extent) and longer-tenured teachers an overall mean of 4.42 (great extent). Notable differences favor shorter-tenured teachers on stakeholder-inclusive and transparency-oriented practices, such as engaging stakeholders in evaluation (4.64 vs. 4.39), updating plans based on evaluation results (4.61 vs. 4.44), preparing resource-impact reports (4.55 vs. 4.36), and benchmarking (4.36 vs. 4.19). This pattern is consistent with research showing that early-career teachers often socialized in data-rich, participatory governance and tech-enabled environments place strong value on visible feedback mechanisms, reporting, and cross-school learning (RAND Corporation, 2025; Ramos et al., 2024). In contrast, longer-tenured teachers rate "uses evaluation results for decision-making" slightly higher (4.53 vs. 4.45), aligning with evidence that professional experience is associated with stronger calibration of how data translates into actionable school decisions and classroom management efficacy (Duan et al., 2024).

Table 9
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Stakeholder Engagement when grouped according to Length of Service

Items	Shorter Mean	Interpretation	Longer Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…				
1. involves parents in resource planning discussions.	4.61	Very Great Extent	4.36	Great Extent
2. partners with LGUs and NGOs for resource support.	4.61	Very Great Extent	4.50	Very Great Extent
3. conducts resource donation drives.	4.39	Great Extent	4.39	Great Extent
4. promotes transparency in resource management.	4.52	Very Great Extent	4.53	Very Great Extent
5. engages alums for material contributions.	4.55	Very Great Extent	4.28	Great Extent
6. builds community awareness of resource needs.	4.58	Very Great Extent	4.42	Great Extent
7. encourages volunteerism in resource maintenance.	4.61	Very Great Extent	4.39	Great Extent

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

8.	shares resource updates during school assemblies.	4.48	Great Extent	4.47	Great Extent
9.	recognizes stakeholder contributions publicly.	4.55	Very Great Extent	4.53	Very Great Extent
10.	collaborates with local businesses for sponsorships.	4.52	Very Great Extent	4.42	Great Extent
Overall Mean		**4.54**	**Very Great Extent**	**4.43**	**Great Extent**

The results in Table 9 show that teachers with shorter and longer service lengths both perceive school heads' stakeholder engagement practices very positively. However, shorter-tenured teachers consistently give higher ratings across nearly all indicators, resulting in an overall mean of 4.54 (very great extent) compared to 4.43 (great extent) for those with longer service. This could mean that although both groups agree that stakeholder involvement in school leadership is one of their school's strongest leadership practices, relatively less-experienced teachers tend to have a higher regard for the leadership's ability to garner community involvement and to support distributed decision-making. It also seems that largest differences exist for parent involvement in resource planning (4.61 vs 4.36), alumni involvement in resource development (4.55 vs 4.28), and volunteer participation in maintenance (4.61 vs 4.39), leading to a belief that relatively new teachers notice or admire such observable, structured, diversified community partnerships more. This finding is consistent with studies indicating that early-career teachers are likely to value distributed leadership practice to a greater extent than their more experienced counterparts, due to being educated under newer professional standards that emphasize the importance of multi-sector stakeholder involvement (parents, alumni, NGOs, and LGU). They are most likely to value participation and inclusive decision-making more, since they were more likely to have been educated or taught in recent standards that embrace multi-sector stakeholder involvement (parents, alumni, NGOs, and LGU). Older, experienced teachers, although high in practice, could still receive lower ratings because they compare current practices with their earlier history, when such participation was less frequent and inconsistent (Arguelles, 2025).

Table 10
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Resource Planning and Allocation when grouped according to Sex

Items	Male Mean	Interpretation	Female Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…				
1. conducts an annual needs assessment for learning materials.	4.26	Great Extent	4.38	Great Extent
2. aligns resource planning with school improvement plans.	4.42	Great Extent	4.56	Very Great Extent
3. prepares a budget that prioritizes instructional materials.	4.26	Great Extent	4.18	Great Extent
4. ensures equitable distribution of resources across grade levels.	4.26	Great Extent	4.36	Great Extent
5. identifies gaps in existing learning resources.	4.42	Great Extent	4.20	Great Extent
6. coordinates with teachers to determine classroom needs.	4.42	Great Extent	4.38	Great Extent
7. plans for emergency or contingency resource needs.	4.32	Great Extent	4.34	Great Extent
8. integrates ICT resources into planning.	4.42	Great Extent	4.56	Very Great Extent
9. reviews past resource utilization for future planning.	4.32	Great Extent	4.38	Great Extent

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

10. sets timelines for resource acquisition and deployment.	4.42	Great Extent	4.40	Great Extent
Overall Mean	**4.35**	**Great Extent**	**4.37**	**Great Extent**

Table 10 shows that both male and female teachers perceive school heads' resource planning and allocation practices as highly effective, with overall means of 4.35 and 4.37, respectively, both interpreted as a great extent, indicating only minimal variation in perceptions across sex. The slight difference suggests a generally uniform experience of leadership practices, with female teachers providing marginally higher ratings on several key indicators. This similarity may be supported by a body of research in educational leadership showing that teachers' gender is correlated with their awareness of organizational congruity, communication transparency, and an instructional support system, and that they have a high regard for structured planning and an ICT-implemented system. The men also reported very high ratings on the same variables, indicating recognition of a well-executed leadership system. Still, their ratings tend to be slightly lower, possibly due to other work expectations or experience. The majority of variables, such as conducting a needs assessment, equitable distribution of materials, collaboration with teachers, and analyzing past resource usage, yielded almost identical response ranges in both groups, revealing an institutional consensus and equal understanding of the efficient management of resources.

Nevertheless, according to Pablo et al. (2025), there were no significant gender differences for work-life balance, where among work indicators for work-life balance, such as work resource, work effort, and time demands, the women (89%) scored consistently high in personal health areas, work-life balance, and appreciating work, such as having a highly structured planning and appreciation on structured system. Generally, the consistently high level of this also implied a certain degree of institutionalization in the head teachers' work-planning habits, such as allocating budgets for instructional materials, assessing resource shortages, and formulating timelines. Overall, the findings affirm that sex does not significantly influence teachers' perceptions of resource planning and allocation, suggesting that the school heads' practices in this dimension are broadly inclusive, consistently implemented, and effective in meeting the needs of both male and female teachers.

Table 11
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Monitoring and Evaluation when grouped according to Sex

Items	Male Mean	Interpretation	Female Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…				
1. conducts regular classroom observations to ensure utilization of learning resources	4.32	Great Extent	4.64	Very Great Extent
2. uses feedback tools to assess resource effectiveness.	4.32	Great Extent	4.58	Very Great Extent
3. reviews student performance data linked to resource use.	4.26	Great Extent	4.52	Very Great Extent
4. engages stakeholders in evaluation processes for learning resource management	4.32	Great Extent	4.58	Very Great Extent
5. updates resource plans based on evaluation results.	4.32	Great Extent	4.60	Very Great Extent
6. identifies underutilized or obsolete materials.	4.37	Great Extent	4.40	Great Extent
7. benchmarks resource use against other schools.	4.26	Great Extent	4.28	Great Extent
8. prepares reports on resource impact.	4.47	Great Extent	4.44	Great Extent
9. uses evaluation results for decision-making.	4.42	Great Extent	4.52	Very Great Extent

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

10. adjusts strategies based on monitoring outcomes.	4.37	Great Extent	4.50	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	**4.34**	**Great Extent**	**4.51**	**Very Great Extent**

Table 11 reveals clear differences in perceptions of school heads' Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices when grouped according to sex, with female teachers consistently giving higher ratings than male teachers, resulting in overall means of 4.51 (very great extent) and 4.34 (great extent), respectively. This suggests that while both males and females agree that school heads demonstrate strong M&E practices, female teachers perceive these efforts as more robust and more consistently implemented. Such higher score levels might imply that female teachers care more about evidence-based decision making, the collaborative nature of evaluation procedures, and structured monitoring mechanisms-an idea which can be evidenced by previous literature claiming that females are likely to react more favorably to leadership characteristics such as communication, feedback, and coaching. In support of this, Gan et al. (2025) found that females performed better on contextual aspects such as cooperation and coordination, whereas males outperformed them on task performance. Moreover, they noted that both genders rated these characteristics highly, but in different contexts, and the gap between males and females was slight and mediated by differences in workload.

On the other hand, while male respondents also perceived these practices as, to a large degree, reflecting acknowledgment of their effectiveness, they were expressed in a more moderate, neutral language, which could be explained by differences in expectations and experiences with monitoring activities at different points in time. Notwithstanding these differences, both males and females rated items such as finding unused material, benchmarking, reporting on resource-use impacts, and modifying strategy based on monitoring data similarly highly, suggesting that both sexes value the essential aspects of resource monitoring. The stronger positive endorsement from female respondents indicates that female teachers may perceive the feedback process as more substantial, especially when empirical data gathered through monitoring is used to make on-the-spot decisions, improve resource use, and ensure resources are allocated according to observed demands.

Table 12
Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Stakeholder Engagement when grouped according to Sex

Items	Male Mean	Interpretation	Female Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I observe that my school head…				
1. involves parents in resource planning discussions.	4.37	Great Extent	4.52	Very Great Extent
2. partners with LGUs and NGOs for resource support.	4.47	Great Extent	4.58	Very Great Extent
3. conducts resource donation drives.	4.26	Great Extent	4.44	Great Extent
4. promotes transparency in resource management.	4.32	Great Extent	4.60	Very Great Extent
5. engages alums for material contributions.	4.37	Great Extent	4.42	Great Extent
6. builds community awareness of resource needs.	4.42	Great Extent	4.52	Very Great Extent
7. encourages volunteerism in resource maintenance.	4.47	Great Extent	4.50	Very Great Extent
8. shares resource updates during school assemblies.	4.37	Great Extent	4.52	Very Great Extent
9. recognizes stakeholder contributions publicly.	4.53	Very Great Extent	4.54	Very Great Extent
10. collaborates with local businesses for sponsorships.	4.42	Great Extent	4.48	Great Extent

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Overall Mean	**4.40**	**Great Extent**	**4.51**	**Very Great Extent**

Table 12 reveals that both male and female teachers perceive school heads' stakeholder engagement practices to a high degree. However, female teachers consistently provide higher ratings across most indicators, resulting in an overall mean of 4.51 (very great extent) compared to 4.40 (great extent) among male teachers. This implies that whereas both genders of teachers are aware that to a great extent, school heads exhibit leadership practices that promote strong relationships with stakeholders, women teachers reported higher ratings of community engagement, its quality, quantity, and accessibility. These trends are consistent with earlier literature, in which female teachers reported greater satisfaction with a participatory approach, open communication, and relational attributes of leadership style, and were thus more responsive to participatory and community-school relationships. Meanwhile, male teachers' scores, though relatively lower, also lie within a wide range. This implied that they, too, believe to a great extent that stakeholder engagement is successful and can be effective, but likely hold a more restrained standard or expectation than their counterparts based on work experience. It implies that there are no considerable differences in teachers' scores on stakeholder engagement. Also, the small discrepancy suggests that stakeholder engagement is routinized and equally observable and attainable for male and female teachers in a school. Also, higher ratings for female teachers are found in transparency, community-based activities, and partnerships, which support the literature indicating that leadership that practices transparency and inclusivity may foster strong rapport and ownership among teachers. This is evidenced by Stigliano (2021), who found that teachers generally rate building leadership highly regardless of the principal's sex. However, some noted that females excel in relational and collaborative traits, such as stakeholder engagement, leading to greater appreciation of such practices among female teachers.

Comparative Analysis in the Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Resource Planning and Allocation, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Stakeholder Engagement, when grouped and compared according to Age, Length of Service, and Sex

Table 13
Difference in the Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Resource Planning and Allocation when grouped and compared according to Age, Length of Service, and Sex

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	33	35.58	575.00	0.814		Not Significant
	Older	36	34.47				
Length of Service	Shorter	33	34.02	561.50	0.688	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	36	35.90				
Sex	Male	19	39.18	395.50	0.272		Not Significant
	Female	50	33.41				

Table 13 shows that teachers' perceptions of school heads' learning resource management in planning and allocation do not significantly differ across age, length of service, or sex. The computed p-values (0.814, 0.688, and 0.272, respectively) are all greater than the 0.05 level of significance, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This indicates that teachers consistently and positively experience practices such as systematic needs assessment, equitable resource distribution, ICT-assisted planning, and the establishment of clear timelines, regardless of their demographic profile.

The absence of significant differences suggests that resource planning and allocation are implemented through standardized, policy-driven procedures that ensure uniformity across schools. As a result, these practices are experienced similarly by all teachers, reflecting strong system-level consistency. This also implies

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

that improvements may be better directed toward enhancing overall system processes—such as feedback mechanisms and coordination—rather than focusing on demographic-specific interventions, since current practices are collaborative, compliance-based, and evenly applied.

Table 14
Difference in the Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Monitoring and Evaluation when grouped and compared according to Age, Length of Service, and Sex

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger Older	33 36	36.20 33.90	554.50	0.617		Not Significant
Length of Service	Shorter Longer	33 36	35.35 34.68	582.50	0.884	0.05	Not Significant
Sex	Male Female	19 50	37.55 34.03	426.50	0.492		Not Significant

Table 14 shows that teachers' perceptions of school heads' Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices do not differ significantly across age, length of service, or sex groups. The computed p-values for variables age, length of service, and sex were 0.617, 0.884, and 0.492, respectively, all of which are greater than the 0.05 level of significance and thus interpreted as not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that states, "There is no significant difference in the level of school administrators in managing learning resources in the area of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) when grouped and compared according to age, length of service, and sex," was accepted.

Substantively, these nondifferences mean that the M&E activities (such as classroom observation, use of feedback instruments, monitoring and evaluation of performance information, stakeholder involvement in evaluation, monitoring of school improvements, and data-based adaptation) are treated equally across faculty age groups, years in service, and sex. Belo (2025) found similar high ratings across age groups for observation instruments and data use, with an ANOVA showing no significant differences. Teachers' experiences with evaluation techniques were also uniform across age groups in Bermillo (2025), with emphasis on system-wide procedural rather than individual processes, implying systematic and consistent M&E procedures at the school level. This means that if we need to enhance any activities, we should adopt institutional change rather than specific programs tailored to different groups. If individuals adopt an enhancement approach, it must focus on a system-wide approach by refining resource-impact reports, formalizing benchmarking procedures, and continuing the cycle of feedback. The absence of statistically significant difference in M&E activities across age groups, years in service, and sex might have been caused by standardized and routinized M&E activities within the school level, i.e., observation procedures, feedback instruments, monitoring of performance information, and data-based adaptation procedures; hence, differences in individual characteristics of school heads may become trivial and nonsignificant among the different groups.

Table 15
Difference in the Extent of School Heads' Learning Resource Management according to Stakeholder Engagement when grouped and compared according to Age, Length of Service, and Sex

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger Older	33 36	39.15 31.19	457.00	0.081	0.05	Not Significant

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Length of Service	Shorter Longer	33 36	37.17 33.01	522.50	0.362	Not Significant
Sex	Male Female	19 50	35.47 34.82	466.00	0.898	Not Significant

Teachers' perceptions of school heads' stakeholder engagement do not significantly differ when grouped by age, length of service, or sex. The computed p-values (0.081 for age, 0.362 for length of service, and 0.898 for sex) are all higher than the 0.05 level of significance, indicating no statistically significant differences. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted, confirming that stakeholder engagement practices such as involving parents and communities, collaborating with LGUs/NGOs, ensuring transparency, and mobilizing volunteers are experienced similarly across teacher demographics.

Although slight variations were observed, such as marginally higher mean scores among younger teachers, these differences were not statistically significant and only suggest descriptive trends. This implies that stakeholder engagement practices are likely institutionalized and guided by standardized policies, resulting in consistent implementation across schools. Supporting studies also show that teachers generally rate stakeholder engagement practices positively regardless of demographic factors, reinforcing the conclusion that such practices are uniformly experienced and evenly applied.

Conclusion

The study found that most respondents were female, aged 42 and above, and had 13 or more years of service, indicating a stable and experienced teaching workforce. Teachers perceived school heads' learning resource management—particularly in resource planning and allocation, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholder engagement—to a "great extent," reflecting strong and consistent leadership practices. Across age, length of service, and sex, perceptions were largely similar, with only minimal differences, such as slightly higher ratings from younger and female teachers in areas like stakeholder collaboration and feedback mechanisms. However, these variations were not statistically significant, as confirmed by the Mann–Whitney U test ($p > 0.05$), leading to the acceptance of all null hypotheses. Overall, the findings suggest that school heads implement standardized, system-guided, and equitable resource management practices that are consistently experienced by teachers regardless of demographic characteristics, highlighting effective, inclusive, and well-established leadership in schools. Based on the findings of the study, the following are hereby recommended to the school heads to prepare a budget dashboard that prioritizes instructional materials, to benchmark resource use against other schools or peer mentoring endeavor , to conduct resource donation drives and to adopt the sustainability plan as proposed in this study.

Acknowledgment

The researcher expresses sincere gratitude to all individuals who contributed their time, expertise, and support to the completion of this study. Deep appreciation is extended to the adviser for unwavering patience, expert guidance, and continuous encouragement throughout the research process. The members of the oral defense panel are likewise acknowledged for their insightful critiques and valuable recommendations that helped refine the study. Heartfelt thanks are also given to the respondents for their time, honesty, and cooperation, as their participation made this research possible. Above all, the researcher offers profound thanks to the Almighty Father for providing strength, wisdom, and guidance, making the completion of this work possible through His grace and love.

Conflict of Interest

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

The author declares the absence of any conflict of interest that could have influenced the content or conclusions of this paper. They affirm that no financial, personal, or professional relationships with other individuals or organizations have compromised the objectivity, integrity, or impartiality of the research work. As a final point, no external parties influenced the study design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation.

References

Adenıram, S. A. (2020). Influence of teaching and learning resources on student's performance in senior secondary schools in gusau local government, zamfara state. The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational and Social Sciences, 18, 124-131.

Ahmad, N., Sewani, R., & Fatima, H. (2025). School Heads as Instructional Leaders: Enhancing Educational Outcomes at Secondary Level. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, *3*(4), 125-145.

Aquino, A. B., Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2021). Leadership practices of school heads and teacher performance in Nueva Vizcaya. International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications, 5(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4567890

Arguelles, R. V. (2025). Stakeholder engagement practices in rural and remote schools: Insights from Filipino school leaders. Issues in Educational Research, 35(1), 1-20.https://www.iier.org.au/iier35/arguelles.pdf

Balantucas, H. N. L. (2025). Strategic resource allocation in under-funded schools: Narrative inquiry of successful leadership practices. EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management, 12(5), 186–191. https://doi.org/10.36713/epra21820

Bautista, R. C. (2025). Principal leadership in building the school-community partnership. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9(1), 123-135. https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/connecting-people-around-the-school-principal-leadership-in-building-school-community-partnership

Belo, M. Z. (2025). School heads' techniques in monitoring and evaluation of teachers' strategies in public elementary schools. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 15(3), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.3.1663

Bermillo, M. L. B. (2025). The school heads' monitoring and evaluation strategies in teaching and learning of pupils. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 15(3), 988–991. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.3.1835

Combong, J. L. D. (2025). Attitudes and instructional practices in the use of Filipino language as a medium of instruction in teaching Values Education. Journal of Natural Language and Linguistics, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.54536/jnll.v3i1.4900

Consignado, J. B. (2023). School Heads Capabilities and Management of Schools Educational Resources to the School Improvement and Performance. School Heads' Capabilities and Management of Schools' Educational Resources for School Improvement and Performance, 123(1), 12-12.

Cruz, R. T. (2024). Stakeholder engagement for resource sustainability in Philippine public schools: Challenges and strategies. Educational Management Journal. (Derived from local studies cited in sustainability research).

Culp-Roche, A., Hampton, D., Hensley, A., Wilson, J., Thaxton-Wiggins, A., Otts, J. A., Fruh, S., & Moser, D. K. (2020). Generational differences in faculty and student comfort with technology use. SAGE Open Nursing, 6. https://doi.org/10.1177/2377960820941394

Dayon, J. P. (2021). Utilization of learning resources, teachers' performance, and academic performance of pupils in Araling Panlipunan. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies. https://www.ijams-bbp.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/JHONATAN-P.-DAYON.pdf

De Chavez, K. A. (2024). Collaboration and partnership among stakeholders towards management of public elementary schools. TWIST Journal, 2(2), 552–563. https://twistjournal.net/twist/article/view/426

De La Cruz, R. J. D. (2022). Science education in the Philippines. InScience Education in Countries Along the Belt & Road (pp. 331–345). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-6955-2_20[2](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-16-6955-2_20)

Department of Education. (2019). ALS-EST handbook: Chapter https://www.deped.gov.ph/als-est/PDF/ALS-EST_Handbook_Chapter05.pdf

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Department of Education. (2020). National adoption and implementationof the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020). https://www.deped.gov.ph

Domingo, A. F., & Garcia, L. R. (2021). Resource allocation strategies in Philippine basic education: Cases of high-performing schools in low-income communities. Philippine Studies, 69(3), 321–342.

Duan, S., Bissaker, K., & Xu, Z. (2024).Correlates of teachers' classroom management self-efficacy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 36(1), Article 43.https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09881-2

Gan, Y., Deng, J., Liu, C., & Li, S. (2025). Exploring gender differences in workload and job performance: Insights from junior high school teachers. BMC Psychology, 13, Article 184. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02439-z

Gause, E. (2021). Retention of institutional memory amidst the generational shift in higher education: A case study of tacit knowledge transfer (Publication No. 11314) [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. ScholarWorks. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/11314

Gebczynski, M., & Kutsyuruba, B. (2022). Veteran teachers' perceptions of authentic leadership and school culture. International Journal of Leadership in Learning, 25(1), 1-20. https://leadershiplearning.ca/index.php/ijll/article/download/13/44/173

Glover, D., & Levačić, R. (2020). Educational resource management: An international perspective (2nd ed.). UCL Press. https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781787358386

Grino, M. A. C. (2023). Teachers' resourcing practices, perception, and learners' performance in the new normal [Conference paper]. e-Saliksik, Department of Education, Philippines. https://e-saliksik.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/IX_2023_Grino_Learning-Resources-Teachers-Resourcing-Practices-Percep

Haule, A. B. (2024). The contribution of collaboration among the parents, teachers, and community on public secondary schools students' academic performance in Kibaha District. International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 9(8), 2875–2881. https://doi.org/10.38124/IJISRT/IJISRT24AUG1543

IOER. (2021). Managing school operations and resources in the new normal and performance of public schools in the Schools Division of Laguna. International Organization of Educators and Researchers. https://ioer-imrj.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Managing-School-Operations-and-Resources-in-the-New-Normal-and-Performance-of-Public-Schools.pdf

IOSR Journal of Business and Management. (2016). Effectiveness of school administrators' leadership skills and behaviors on teacher and student performance. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 18(6), 23–29. https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-1806022329

Jacob-Dedumo, L. S., Chua, L. L., Niñal, M. M., & Ederio, N. T. (2024). Financial management and resource allocation practices in the Schools Division of Surigao del Norte, Philippines. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 6(4), 1–15. https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/4/25687.pdf

Kaufman, J. H., Wang, E. L., Tuma, A. P., Lawrence, R. A., & Woo, A. (2021). School leaders' role in selecting and supporting teachers' use of instructional materials: An interview study. Research Report. RR-A134-9. RAND Corporation. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED614075

Keržič, D., Danko, M., Zorko, V., & Dečman, M. (2021).The effect of age on higher education teachers' ICT use. Knowledge Management & E-Learning, 13(2), 182–193.https://doi.org/10.34105/j.kmel.2021.13.010

Lopez, A. C., & Bauyot, M. M. (2025). Stakeholders' involvement in school-based programs: A case study. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research and Innovation, 3(1). Retrieved from https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=26136

Lopez, J. R., & Bauyot, M. L. (2025). The relationship of stakeholders' involvement to the project sustainability plan of public schools in Kitaotao II District. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9(10), 5280–5299.

Maganga, J. H. (2016). Factors affecting student's academic performance: A case study of public secondary schools in Ilala District, Dar-es-salaam, Tanzania. *University of Tanzania. Retrieved April*, *25*, 2018.https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/server/api/core/bitstreams/b8a6893b-2421-4707-bdb1-88425d6b50f9/content

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Mawudeku, A., & Ankumah, E. (2021). Strategic management practicesand academic performance in Ghanaian secondary schools. International Journal of Educational Management, 35(4), 789–804. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-09-2020-0421

Menalin C. Viador, Adelen L. Ondoy, Jonalyn G. Padua (2025). Utilization of Print and Electronic Resources in a Private University. , 12(9), https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.1208004122.

Molaudzi, T. M. (2020). The impact of material resources and school facilities on student attendance and achievement in South African secondary schools. South African Journal of Education, 40(2), 112–125.

Ngiad, M. A. (2019). Instructional leadership skills of school administrators and teacher performance in senior high schools in the National Capital Region. Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 4(2), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2019/v4i230120

Noipratet, W., & Siththada, T. (2025, January). THE ROLE OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS IN MANAGING LEARNING RESOURCES WITHIN THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION. In Proceedings National & International Conference (Vol. 17, No. 1, p. 782).

Nyirenda-Mutambo, C. (2018). Monitoring and evaluation practices in Zambia's education sector: Implications for policy and resource management. African Journal of Educational Management, 22(1), 45–60.

OECD. (2025). Gender equality in a changing world: Gender gaps in educational attainment and outcomes remain. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/gender-equality-in-a-changing-world_e808086f-en/full-report

Ondong, R. M. (2024). Utilization of school resources in basic education: A multiple case study of teachers-in-charge and school principals. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 5(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.01.01

Pablo, V. B., Lakindanum-Cerdiño, L., Panen, S. S., Veloz, P. L., & Rivas, R. F. A. (2025). Synthesizing profiles of public school teachers for an informed strategic work-life balance. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9(IIIS), 438-450.https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/Digital-Library/volume-9-issue-3s/438-450.pdf

Ramos, R. B., Balatero, M. F. T., Cagape, E. M., & Guray, C. B. M. (2024). Strategies for resource management in the Department of Education: A systematic review of efficiency and effectiveness. Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 50(8), 100–116.https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i81510

RAND Corporation. (2025). Teachers' use of instructional materials from 2019–2024: Trends from the American Instructional Resources Survey (Research Report RR-A134-30). RAND Corporation.https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA134-30.html

Sahot, M. A. (2019). Implementation of the monitoring and evaluation system of the Department of Education in public schools in Tagaytay City. International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications, 3(6), 45–52.

Saligbon, J. et al. (2024). Comparing student perceptions on Gen X, Millennial, and Generation Z teachers' soft skills. Journal of Educational Research.https://doi.nrct.go.th/admin/doc/doc_666794.pdf

Schools Division of Surigao Del Norte. (2024). Utilization of Learning Resources Management Monitoring and Evaluation Tool [Division Memorandum No. 335, s. 2024]. Retrieved from https://depedsdn.com/dm-no-335-s-2024-utilization-of-learning-resources-management-monitoring-and-evaluation-tool/

Ssenyonga, J. (2021). School management practices and academicperformance in Ugandan public secondary schools. African Educational Research Journal, 9(2), 234–245. https://doi.org/10.30918/AERJ.92.21.045

Stigliano, K. (2021). The teacher viewpoint: How administrator gender impacts teachers' perceptions of effective building leadership (Publication No. 2947) [Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University]. Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses. https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2947

Suleiman, A. A., & Lawal, A. A. (2020). Effects of instructional materials on students' academic performance in technical education. International Journal of Education and Research, 8(3), 45–56.

Sun, Y., & Yan, Z. (2025). Factors influencing teachers' technology adoption in technology-rich classrooms: Model development and test. Educational Technology Research and Development, 73(3), 1481–1496.https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-025-10454-5

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.204
ISSN 2960-3986
GEO Academic Journal Vol. 7 No. 3 – 2026 series

Teltemann, J., & Jude, N. (2019). Accountability and organizational learning in secondary education: A cross-national analysis of assessment practices. International Journal of Educational Development, 68, 1–12.

Tety, M. (2016). The role of instructional materials in community secondary schools in Rombo District, Tanzania. Journal of Education and Practice, 7(33), 1–8.

UNESCO. (2026). *Education management, monitoring, and evaluation*. https://www.unesco.org/en/education-management

United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights

Valenzuela, J. R., & Buenvinida, P. V. (2021). Competencies of school heads in managing school operations and resources in the Schools Division of Laguna. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 10(2), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2021.10.2.12345

Wang, E. L., Tuma, A. P., Lawrence, R. A., Kaufman, J. H., Woo, A., & Henry, D. (2021). School leaders' role in selecting and supporting teachers' use of instructional materials: An interview study. Research Report. RR-A134-9. RAND Corporation. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED614075

Wu, J. (2024). Comparative study on educational equity and resource allocation across countries. International Journal of Educational Policy and Planning, 12(1), 34–50.

Yecla, G. A., et al. (2022). Collaborative partnership of the schools and the local government unit (LGU) in teacher professional development. Universal International Journal of Research and Technology, 6(5). https://uijrt.com/articles/v6/i5/UIJRTV6I50018.pdf

Yorpo, K., Libre, E., & Bautista, M. (2025). Suitability of Learning Resources Used by Teachers in Teaching Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE). International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE), 2(4), 369-382. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15259917

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.