



# **SCHOOL HEADS' STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING AND MORAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES ON ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT**

Charlyn S. Morales, LPT, MAED-EM  
Joan Mae G. Lagumbay, PhD

*Bohol Island State University- Bilar Campus, Zamora, Bilar, Bohol, Philippines*

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19678746>

## **ABSTRACT**

This study examined the strategic decision-making and moral leadership practices of school heads in relation to organizational management in the DiLiSeLoLo districts (Dimiao, Lila, Sevilla, Loboc, and Loay) in the Division of Bohol. Specifically, it described the demographic profile of respondents, assessed the levels of strategic decision-making, moral leadership, and organizational management, and determined the relationships and associations among these variables. The findings served as the basis for the development of an intervention plan. The study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational research design. Data were gathered from 460 respondents, consisting of 34 school heads and 426 teachers, using a structured and validated survey questionnaire. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, and weighted mean were used, while inferential statistics including Chi-square test, Spearman's rank correlation, simple linear regression, and Mann–Whitney U test were applied to analyze relationships and differences among variables. Findings revealed that school heads demonstrated high levels of strategic decision-making, moral leadership practices, and organizational management. No significant association was found between demographic profile and leadership practices, while a significant relationship was established between organizational management and both strategic decision-making and moral leadership. These results indicate that leadership practices play a vital role in enhancing organizational effectiveness in schools. Based on the findings, an intervention plan was proposed to further strengthen leadership competencies among school heads, particularly in integrating strategic and ethical practices in school management.

**Keywords:** *strategic decision-making, moral leadership, organizational management, school heads, educational leadership*

## INTRODUCTION

School heads play a crucial role in shaping the direction and overall performance of schools. In the Philippine setting, they are not only expected to manage daily operations but also to lead with purpose, make sound decisions, and uphold ethical standards that influence the entire school community. Their strategic decision-making guides how resources are utilized, programs are implemented, and goals are achieved, while their moral leadership helps build trust, fairness, and a positive working environment among teachers, staff, and learners. Studies have consistently shown that school leadership has a strong influence on school effectiveness and student achievement. In fact, leadership is considered second only to classroom instruction in its impact on learning outcomes (Leithwood et al., 2020). School heads who involve teachers in decision-making and make use of relevant data are more likely to create collaborative and productive school environments (Scholl et al., 2023). However, many school leaders still face challenges in fully maximizing data-driven practices and balancing administrative responsibilities with instructional leadership.

In the Philippines, school heads generally demonstrate a high level of competence as guided by the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). Despite this, several challenges remain evident, such as limited use of data in planning, constraints in resources, and gaps between policies and actual practices in schools (Singco, 2024). These realities make the role of school heads more complex, as they need to respond not only to institutional demands but also to the diverse needs of their teachers and learners. Strategic decision-making among school heads can take different forms. Some leaders rely on analytical approaches, using data and evidence to guide their decisions, while others focus more on relationships and collaboration, reflecting a behavioral approach. There are also those who emphasize long-term vision (conceptual) or prefer clear structure and direction (directive). In practice, effective school heads often combine these approaches depending on the situation they face (Campos-García & Zúñiga-Vicente, 2022; Bush, 2020).

At the same time, moral leadership remains an essential part of school management. School heads are expected to demonstrate integrity, fairness, compassion, and humility in their leadership. These values are important in creating a school environment where teachers feel respected and motivated, and where students feel safe and supported. When school leaders act with strong moral principles, they help build a culture of trust and accountability within the school (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2016; Keddie, 2016). Organizational management in schools goes beyond simply assigning tasks and responsibilities. It involves guiding people, managing resources, and leading change in ways that improve the overall functioning of the school. School heads who demonstrate strong leadership practices are able to create a positive school climate, encourage

collaboration, and support continuous improvement among teachers (Murphy, 2018; Ydesen & Andersen, 2020). These leadership practices are especially important in public schools where challenges such as limited resources and increasing demands are common.

The study is also supported by key learning theories that explain how leadership practices develop and influence behavior. Behaviorism suggests that leadership skills are learned through experience and practice, while Cognitivism highlights the importance of thinking, reflection, and decision-making processes. Constructivist perspectives emphasize collaboration and shared learning, showing that leadership is not done alone but developed through interaction with others (Moore, 2017; Piaget, 1976; Bandura, 1989). These theories reinforce the idea that effective leadership is both learned and continuously improved through experience and engagement. Despite the existing studies on school leadership, there is still a need to better understand how strategic decision-making and moral leadership work together in influencing organizational management, particularly in local contexts such as the Division of Bohol. Most studies focus on leadership in general, but fewer examine how these two important dimensions interact in real school settings.

With this, the present study aimed to examine the strategic decision-making and moral leadership practices of school heads in relation to organizational management. The findings of the study are expected to provide useful insights and serve as a basis for developing an intervention plan that can further enhance leadership practices and improve school management in the local setting.

## Research Questions

The primary objective of this study was to determine the school heads' strategic decision-making and moral leadership practices towards organizational management in the Districts of Dimiao, Lila, Sevilla, Loboc, and Loay (DiLiSeLoLo), Division of Bohol. The findings of the study served as bases of proposing an intervention plan for school year 2025-2026.

It further sought to answer the following specific questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondent (school heads and teachers) in terms of:
  - 1.1 sex;
  - 1.2 age;
  - 1.3 position/designation;
  - 1.4 highest educational attainment; and
  - 1.5 years of experience?
2. What is the assessment of the school heads and the teachers on the level of school heads' strategic decision-making in terms of:
  - 2.1 analytical;
  - 2.2 behavioral;

- 2.3 conceptual; and
- 2.4 directive?
3. What is the evaluation of the school heads and the teachers on the level of moral leadership of the school heads as to:
  - 3.1 integrity;
  - 3.2 trust;
  - 3.3 justice;
  - 3.4 mercy and compassion; and
  - 3.5 humility?
4. What is the assessment of the school heads and the teachers on the level of organizational management in terms of:
  - 4.1 roles and responsibilities; and
  - 4.2 transformational leadership practices?
5. Is there a significant association between the demographic profile of the school heads and the level of:
  - 5.1 strategic decision-making; and
  - 5.2 moral leadership?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of organizational management and the level of:
  - 6.1 strategic decision-making; and
  - 6.2 moral leadership?
7. Based on the findings, what intervention plan can be proposed?

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

This study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational research design. The descriptive approach was used to describe the levels of school heads' strategic decision-making, moral leadership practices, and organizational management based on data gathered through a modified survey questionnaire. The correlational method was utilized to determine the significant relationships between the demographic profile of school heads and their strategic decision-making, moral leadership practices, and organizational management.

### **Research Environment**

The study was conducted in the districts of Dimiao, Lila, Sevilla, Loboc, and Loay (collectively referred to as DiLiSeLoLo), which are part of the Third Congressional District of Bohol Province. These districts were selected due to their accessibility and their representation of diverse public elementary school contexts within the province. Each district consists of several public elementary schools, with Dimiao having 15 schools, Lila 11 schools, Sevilla 10 schools, Loay 12 schools, and Loboc 14 schools. These schools operate under the Department of Education and reflect typical administrative,

instructional, and organizational practices in rural and semi-rural settings. The research environment provides a relevant setting for examining school leadership practices, as it captures variations in school size, location, and management conditions across districts. This diversity allows for a more comprehensive understanding of how strategic decision-making and moral leadership are practiced within public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol.

## **Research Participants**

The respondents of the study consisted of public elementary school heads and teachers from the DiLiSeLoLo districts. Specifically, the participants included full-fledged school heads (with Head Teacher and Principal plantilla positions) and regular-permanent teachers. A total of 460 respondents participated in the study, composed of 34 school heads and 426 teachers. These were proportionally distributed across the five districts as follows: Dimiao (89), Lila (66), Sevilla (85), Loboc (100), and Loay (120). The study employed stratified random sampling, wherein respondents were grouped according to district and role to ensure proper representation. Participants were selected based on the following criteria: (1) currently employed as public elementary school heads or teachers in the identified districts, and (2) willing to participate in the study.

## **Research Instrument**

The study utilized a structured survey questionnaire composed of four parts.

The first part gathered the demographic profile of the respondents, including age, sex, position/designation, highest educational attainment, and years of experience.

The second part assessed school heads' strategic decision-making using a modified questionnaire adapted from Summak and Kalman (2020). The instrument consisted of 24 items covering four dimensions: analytical, behavioral, conceptual, and directive. Responses were measured using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree (4) to Strongly Disagree (1).

The third part measured moral leadership practices using a modified 50-item questionnaire adapted from Abun et al. (2021), covering integrity, trust, justice, mercy and compassion, and humility.

The fourth part evaluated organizational management using a modified 20-item questionnaire adapted from Panoy and Villanueva (2024), focusing on roles and responsibilities and transformational leadership practices. All items utilized a 4-point Likert scale.

The instruments were reviewed and contextualized to ensure clarity and relevance to the local setting. To establish reliability, the questionnaire was pilot-tested among 30

respondents outside the study area. Cronbach's alpha coefficient yielded a value above 0.70, indicating that the instrument was reliable.

## **Research Procedure**

Data were collected using a structured survey questionnaire administered to school heads and teachers to assess strategic decision-making, moral leadership, and organizational management.

Prior to data collection, necessary permissions were secured from relevant authorities, including the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Bohol, district supervisors, and school heads. Ethical standards were strictly observed, ensuring voluntary participation, informed consent, and confidentiality of responses.

The instrument underwent pilot testing to establish clarity and reliability before its full administration. Questionnaires were then distributed to the respondents and retrieved upon completion.

Collected data were checked, tallied, and organized for analysis. Descriptive and inferential statistical methods were employed to interpret the data in accordance with the objectives of the study.

## **Data Analysis**

Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used in analyzing the data. Frequency counts and percentages were utilized to describe the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of sex, age, position/designation, highest educational attainment, and years of experience. Weighted mean was employed to determine the level of school heads' strategic decision-making, moral leadership practices, and organizational management.

Inferential statistics were applied to test the study's hypotheses. The Chi-square test of independence was used to examine the association between the demographic profile of school heads and their strategic decision-making and moral leadership practices. Spearman's rank correlation was employed to determine the relationship between organizational management and both strategic decision-making and moral leadership practices.

Furthermore, simple linear regression was used to assess the predictive relationship between variables, while the Mann–Whitney U test was utilized to determine significant differences in respondents' perceptions.

## RESULTS

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the data on the respondents' demographic profile, as well as the levels of school heads' strategic decision-making and moral leadership practices in relation to organizational management. The findings are organized according to the research variables and are discussed in light of relevant theories and supporting literature to provide a comprehensive understanding of the results.

**Table 1**  
**Profile of the Respondents**

1.1 Sex	School heads (n = 34)		Teachers (n = 426)	
	F	%	F	%
Male	9	26.5	46	10.8
Female	25	73.5	380	89.2
<b>1.2 Age</b>				
20 – 30 years old			64	15.0
31 – 40 years old	5	14.7	165	38.7
41 – 50 years old	4	11.8	139	32.6
51 years old and above	25	73.5		
<b>1.3 Position</b>			58	13.6
SIC/TIC/OIC/Substitute Teacher	4	11.8	144	33.8
Head Teacher 1/Teacher I	8	23.5	14	3.3
Head Teacher 2/Teacher II	4	11.8	231	54.2
Head Teacher 3/Teacher III	12	35.3	30	7.0
Head Teacher 4/Master Teacher 1			5	1.2
Head Teacher 5/Master Teacher 2			2	0.5
Principal 1	4	11.8	0	
Principal 2	1	2.9	0	
Principal 3	1	2.9	0	
<b>1.4 Highest Educational Attainment</b>				
Bachelor Degree Holder	0	0	87	20.4
With units in Master's Degree	12	35.3	227	53.3
Master's Degree Graduate	11	32.4	94	22.1
With PhD/EdD units	5	14.7	12	2.8
PhD/EdD Graduate	6	17.6	6	1.4
<b>1.5 Experience</b>				
10 years and below	14	41.2	113	26.5
11 – 20 years	18	52.9	171	40.1
21 – 30 years	2	5.9	120	28.2
31 years and above			22	5.2

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents, comprising 34 school heads and 426 teachers, categorized according to sex, age, position, highest educational attainment, and years of experience.

In terms of sex, female respondents dominate both groups, with 73.5% of school heads and 89.2% of teachers. This reflects the prevailing feminization of the teaching profession in the Philippine context, where women occupy the majority of both instructional and leadership roles, although male representation remains limited, particularly among teachers (10.8%).

In terms of age, most school heads (73.5%) are 51 years and above, indicating that leadership positions are largely occupied by senior and experienced individuals. In contrast, teachers are concentrated in the 31–40 (38.7%) and 41–50 (32.6%) age groups, suggesting that the teaching workforce is composed mainly of early to mid-career professionals. This pattern reflects the typical progression from teaching roles to administrative positions over time.

Regarding position, school heads are primarily distributed across Head Teacher III (35.3%) and Head Teacher I (23.5%), with principal positions exclusively held by this group. Among teachers, the majority are Teacher II (54.2%), followed by those serving in SIC/TIC/OIC roles (33.8%). This distribution highlights a structured hierarchy within the school system, where leadership roles are concentrated among more senior personnel, while teachers occupy varying instructional and supervisory roles.

In terms of educational attainment, both groups demonstrate strong academic qualifications. Most school heads have either completed or are pursuing graduate studies, with 32.4% holding a master's degree and 17.6% possessing doctoral degrees. Similarly, the majority of teachers (53.3%) have units in a master's degree, although only a small proportion have completed doctoral studies (1.4%). This indicates a general trend toward continuing professional development among educators.

With regard to years of experience, most school heads (52.9%) have 11–20 years of service, while teachers are distributed across 11–20 years (40.1%) and 21–30 years (28.2%). Notably, no school heads fall within the 31 years and above category, whereas a small proportion of teachers (5.2%) do. This suggests that leadership positions are typically attained within mid-career stages rather than at the end of service. Overall, the findings indicate that the respondents are predominantly female, academically qualified, and professionally experienced. These characteristics are important in understanding leadership effectiveness, as supported by Daniel-Ozah (2024), who emphasized that demographic factors such as experience and educational attainment are closely associated with leadership capacity and organizational performance in schools.

**Table 2.1**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of School Heads' Strategic Decision-Making in Terms of Analytical**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	DI	WM	DI
1. tries to obtain every detail and all technical information related to the problem.	3.53	VSD	2.71	VSD
2. likes to make decisions based on the data available to him/her.	3.62	VSD	3.42	VSD
3. tries to find innovative solutions to problems.	3.76	VSD	3.19	VSD
4. prefers to think about the problem superficially.	3.79	VSD	3.54	VSD
5. trusts his/her intuition.	3.68	VSD	3.52	VSD
6. makes sure that the important thing is to produce a solution to the current problem.	3.65	VSD	3.59	VSD
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>Very Satisfactory Decision-Making</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>Very Satisfactory Decision-Making</b>

Legend:

**Rating Scale**

3.25 – 4.00

2.50 – 3.24

1.75 – 2.49

1.00 – 1.74

**Descriptive Interpretation (DI)**

Very Satisfactory Decision-Making (VSD)

Satisfactory Decision-Making (SD)

Fair Decision-Making (FD)

Poor Decision-Making (PD)

Table 2.1 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of school heads' strategic decision-making in terms of the analytical dimension.

For school heads, all indicators obtained high ratings, with a grand mean of 3.67, interpreted as Very Satisfactory Decision-Making. The highest-rated item is “prefers to think about the problem superficially” (WM = 3.79), while the lowest is “tries to obtain every detail and all technical information related to the problem” (WM = 3.53). Despite this variation, all items fall within the same descriptive level, indicating a consistently positive self-assessment among school heads regarding their analytical decision-making practices.

From the teachers' perspective, the overall evaluation is similarly positive, with a grand mean of 3.33, also interpreted as Very Satisfactory Decision-Making. The highest-rated item is “makes sure that the important thing is to produce a solution to the current problem” (WM = 3.59), suggesting that teachers perceive school heads as highly goal-oriented in their decision-making. In contrast, the lowest rating is observed in “tries to obtain every detail and all technical information related to the problem” (WM = 2.71), which falls under the satisfactory level, indicating a relatively lower perception of thorough data analysis.

Overall, both groups demonstrate a shared perception that school heads exhibit strong analytical decision-making, particularly in terms of being solution-focused and responsive to problems. However, the comparatively lower rating on data-gathering suggests a need to further strengthen evidence-based decision-making practices. These findings support the assertion of Campos-García and Zúñiga-Vicente (2022) that analytical decision-making enhances organizational effectiveness by promoting systematic analysis, informed planning, and collaborative problem-solving within educational institutions.

**Table 2.2**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of School Heads' Strategic Decision-Making in Terms of Behavioral**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	DI	WM	DI
1. believes that social relations in his/her school are at the heart of decision-making processes.	3.41	VSD	2.88	SD
2. refrains from making long-term analyses when making a decision.	3.53	VSD	2.94	SD
3. needs to think about how his/her decision-making process affect those on the receiving end.	3.50	VSD	3.07	SD
4. tries to carefully review/consider everything related to the problem in any decision-making process.	3.56	VSD	3.04	SD
5. believes that sometimes, the decision-making process can be a selfish one.	3.59	VSD	2.98	SD
6. can disregard social relations in the school, when making a decision process.	3.68	VSD	3.05	SD
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>Very Satisfactory Decision-Making</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>Satisfactory Decision-Making</b>

Legend:

**Rating Scale**

3.25 – 4.00

2.50 – 3.24

1.75 – 2.49

1.00 – 1.74

**Descriptive Interpretation (DI)**

Very Satisfactory Decision-Making (VSD)

Satisfactory Decision-Making (SD)

Fair Decision-Making (FD)

Poor Decision-Making (PD)

Table 2.2 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of school heads' strategic decision-making in terms of the behavioral dimension.

For school heads, the overall assessment yielded a grand mean of 3.54, interpreted as Very Satisfactory Decision-Making. The highest-rated item is “can disregard social relations in the school when making a decision process” (WM = 3.68), while the lowest is “believes that social relations in his/her school are at the heart of decision-making processes” (WM = 3.41). Despite being the lowest, all indicators remain

within the same descriptive level, reflecting a consistently strong self-perception of behavioral decision-making among school heads.

In contrast, teachers rated this dimension lower, with a grand mean of 2.99, interpreted as Satisfactory Decision-Making. The highest-rated item is “refrains from making long-term analyses when making a decision” (WM = 2.94), while the lowest is “believes that social relations in his/her school are at the heart of decision-making processes” (WM = 2.88). These results suggest that teachers perceive behavioral decision-making practices as present but less pronounced.

Overall, both groups recognize the role of behavioral factors—such as social relationships, stakeholder impact, and careful consideration—in decision-making. However, the lower ratings from teachers indicate a perceptual gap, particularly in how social and relational aspects are integrated into actual leadership practices. These findings support Viberg et al. (2024), who emphasized that effective decision-making in educational leadership requires not only analytical competence but also behavioral awareness, particularly in managing relationships and fostering collaboration within the school environment.

**Table 2.3**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of School Heads’ Strategic Decision-Making in Terms of Conceptual**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	DI	WM	DI
believe that decision-making is a process involves risk-taking.	3.65	VSD	2.96	SD
consider ethical and value-based issues carefully when making decisions.	3.62	VSD	2.92	SD
believe in the necessity of sharing power in the decision-making process	3.56	VSD	3.04	SD
try to be careful not to cause negative consequences.	3.82	VSD	3.09	SD
understand that rationality/logic is the most important thing	3.79	VSD	3.01	SD
feel the need to control everything while making a decision.	3.71	VSD	2.89	SD
Grand Mean	<b>3.69</b>	<b>Very Satisfactory Decision-Making</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>Satisfactory Decision-Making</b>

Legend:

**Rating Scale**

3.25 – 4.00

2.50 – 3.24

1.75 – 2.49

1.00 – 1.74

**Descriptive Interpretation (DI)**

Very Satisfactory Decision-Making (VSD)

Satisfactory Decision-Making (SD)

Fair Decision-Making (FD)

Poor Decision-Making (PD)

Table 2.3 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of school heads' strategic decision-making in terms of the conceptual dimension.

For school heads, the overall assessment yielded a grand mean of 3.69, interpreted as Very Satisfactory Decision-Making. The highest-rated item is "try to be careful not to cause negative consequences" (WM = 3.82), indicating a strong emphasis on caution and ethical responsibility in decision-making. The lowest-rated item is "believe in the necessity of sharing power in the decision-making process" (WM = 3.56), although still within the same descriptive level. This suggests that while school heads recognize the importance of participatory decision-making, it is comparatively less emphasized than other conceptual aspects.

From the teachers' perspective, the overall rating is lower, with a grand mean of 2.99, interpreted as Satisfactory Decision-Making. The highest-rated item is likewise "try to be careful not to cause negative consequences" (WM = 3.09), reflecting acknowledgment of ethical awareness among school heads. The lowest rating is observed in "feel the need to control everything while making a decision" (WM = 2.89), suggesting that teachers perceive some level of control in leadership practices, though not strongly pronounced.

Overall, both groups recognize that school heads demonstrate conceptual decision-making characterized by ethical consideration, rationality, and awareness of consequences. However, the relatively lower ratings from teachers, particularly on power-sharing and control, indicate a perceptual gap. This suggests the need to strengthen participatory leadership practices and enhance transparency in decision-making processes to foster greater trust and collaboration. These findings align with Dicdican (2024), who emphasized that effective conceptual decision-making in educational leadership integrates ethical judgment, risk awareness, and shared governance to improve organizational trust and school performance.

**Table 2.4**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of School Heads' Strategic Decision-Making in Terms of Directive**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	DI	WM	DI
1. feel time pressure in the decision-making process.	3.59	VSD	2.77	SD
2. tend to make a choice from among the options in the decision-making process.	3.62	VSD	2.46	FD
3. expect to see/feel everyone's respect for the decision-making I have made.	3.59	VSD	2.64	SD
4. believe that every decision should be based on extensive/careful evaluations.	3.62	VSD	2.64	SD

5. try to reproduce as many different alternatives as possible when making a decision.	3.38	VSD	2.91	SD
6. do not care much about other people I work with approve of my decisions or not.	2.76	SD	2.67	SD
<b>Composite Mean</b>	3.43	Very Satisfactory Decision-Making	2.68	Satisfactory Decision-Making

Legend:

**Rating Scale**

3.25 – 4.00

2.50 – 3.24

1.75 – 2.49

1.00 – 1.74

**Descriptive Interpretation (DI)**

Very Satisfactory Decision-Making (VSD)

Satisfactory Decision-Making (SD)

Fair Decision-Making (FD)

Poor Decision-Making (PD)

Table 2.4 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of school heads' strategic decision-making in terms of the directive dimension.

For school heads, the overall assessment yielded a composite mean of 3.43, interpreted as Very Satisfactory Decision-Making. The highest-rated indicators are “tend to make a choice from among the options in the decision-making process” and “believe that every decision should be based on extensive/careful evaluations” (both WM = 3.62), reflecting strong decisiveness and emphasis on careful evaluation. The lowest-rated item is “do not care much about other people I work with approve of my decisions or not” (WM = 2.76), indicating that school heads generally value consensus and approval in their decisions.

In contrast, teachers rated this dimension lower, with a composite mean of 2.68, interpreted as Satisfactory Decision-Making. The highest-rated item is “try to reproduce as many different alternatives as possible when making a decision” (WM = 2.91), suggesting moderate recognition of efforts to consider multiple options. However, the lowest rating is given to “tend to make a choice from among the options in the decision-making process” (WM = 2.46), interpreted as fair, indicating that teachers perceive limitations in decisiveness or clarity in final decision selection.

Overall, while school heads view themselves as decisive and systematic in their directive decision-making, teachers perceive these practices as less pronounced. This discrepancy points to a potential gap in communication, transparency, and inclusivity in the decision-making process. These findings suggest that although directive leadership supports efficiency and clarity in achieving organizational goals, it should be balanced with stakeholder engagement to strengthen trust and collaboration. This finding is supported by Saleem and Jabeen (2025), who emphasized that directive decision-making in educational management can enhance organizational efficiency and clarity of direction; however, it must be complemented with participatory practices to improve teacher satisfaction, strengthen collaboration, and sustain institutional effectiveness.

**Table 3.1**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of Moral Leadership of the School Heads in terms of Integrity**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	DI	WM	DI
1. demonstrate the school's values in my daily activities and behaviors.	3.53	WHM	3.33	WHM
2. consistently implement the policies of the school as stated in the DepEd memoranda and orders not only for the teachers but also for myself.	3.50	WHM	3.30	WHM
3. have not been damaged by any accusation of corruption and other ethical issues.	3.50	WHM	3.25	WHM
4. make a decision purely for the interest of the school as whole, not for personal interest.	3.53	WHM	3.18	WMM
5. am firm in my decision when I believe it is the right thing to do.	3.59	WHM	3.19	WMM
6. walk my talk.	3.50	WHM	3.32	WHM
7. play a role model for my teaching and non-teaching staff when it comes to moral conduct and commitment to duties and responsibilities.	3.47	WHM	3.27	WHM
8. have been always objectives and honest when I am dealing with my teaching and non-teaching staff.	3.44	WHM	3.13	WMM
9. have not been living double standard lives.	3.50	WHM	3.27	WHM
10. have integrated my moral values in my work and the way how I deal with teachers, non-teaching staff, stakeholders, PTA, and the community.	3.50	WHM	3.21	WMM
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>With High Moral</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>With High Moral</b>

Legend:

Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation (DI)
3.25 – 4.00	With High Moral (WHM)
2.50 – 3.24	With Moderate Moral (WMM)
1.75 – 2.49	With Less Moral (WLM)
1.00 – 1.74	With No Moral (WNM)

Table 3.1 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of moral leadership of school heads in terms of integrity.

School heads rated themselves highly across all indicators, with a composite mean of 3.51, interpreted as With High Moral. The highest-rated item is “am firm in my decision when I believe it is the right thing to do” (WM = 3.59), indicating strong confidence in principled decision-making. The lowest-rated item is “have been always objective and honest when I am dealing with my teaching and non-teaching staff” (WM = 3.44), though still within the same descriptive level. This suggests that school heads generally perceive integrity as a key strength of their leadership, particularly in demonstrating values, consistency, and ethical commitment.

Teachers likewise assessed school heads as With High Moral, with a composite mean of 3.25. The highest-rated item is “demonstrate the school’s values in my daily activities and behaviors” (WM = 3.33), reflecting recognition of school heads as role models of institutional values. The lowest rating is “have been always objective and honest when I am dealing with my teaching and non-teaching staff” (WM = 3.13), indicating that teachers view this aspect of integrity somewhat more cautiously.

Overall, both groups affirm that integrity is evident in the moral leadership of school heads. However, the slightly lower ratings from teachers, particularly on objectivity and honesty, suggest a perceptual gap that may be addressed through greater transparency and consistency in interpersonal dealings. Strengthening these visible expressions of integrity may further enhance trust, ethical governance, and a positive school climate. These findings are consistent with Davidson and Hughes (2020), who emphasized that integrity in leadership promotes transparency, trustworthiness, and confidence among stakeholders, all of which are essential to effective school management and organizational success.

**Table 3.2**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of Moral Leadership of the School Heads in terms of Trust**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	DI	WM	DI
1. have a strong trust and confidence with my teaching and non-teaching staff.	3.56	WHM	3.19	WMM
2. am trusted because I stand by my decision that is in the interest of the organization even if it is not popular.	3.65	WHM	3.16	WMM
3. am trusted because I do not give in to pressures even if I know that it will risk my position.	3.59	WHM	3.07	WMM
4. am trusted because I respond in kind when the employees refer problems to me.	3.68	WHM	3.25	WHM
5. am trusted because I have never been tainted by corruption allegations.	3.59	WHM	3.30	WHM

6. am dependable when it comes to money matters and in defending my teaching and non-teaching staff.	3.59	WHM	3.28	WHM
7. am dependable especially in handling the school's Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE).	3.59	WHM	3.21	WMM
8. am trusted because I stick to what is right and good even if it means that I would be abandoned.	3.62	WHM	3.11	WMM
9. am trusted because I stand for what I believe in and defend it even it means I am going to be deployed from the present station .	3.65	WHM	3.12	WMM
10. and the teaching and non-teaching staff trust each other through an open line of communication.	3.62	WHM	3.30	WHM
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>With High Moral</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>With Moderate Moral</b>

Legend:

**Rating Scale**

3.25 – 4.00

2.50 – 3.24

1.75 – 2.49

1.00 – 1.74

**Descriptive Interpretation (DI)**

With High Moral (WHM)

With Moderate Moral (WMM)

With Less Moral (WLM)

With No Moral (WNM)

Table 3.2 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of moral leadership of school heads in terms of trust.

School heads rated themselves With High Moral, with a composite mean of 3.61. The highest-rated item is “am trusted because I respond in kind when the employees refer problems to me” (WM = 3.68), reflecting strong responsiveness and reliability in leadership. The lowest-rated item is “have a strong trust and confidence with my teaching and non-teaching staff” (WM = 3.56), although still within the same descriptive level. This indicates that school heads generally perceive themselves as trustworthy, principled, and dependable leaders who foster positive relationships within the school.

Teachers, on the other hand, rated trust at a moderate level, with a composite mean of 3.20. The highest ratings were observed in “am trusted because I have never been tainted by corruption allegations” and “the teaching and non-teaching staff trust each other through an open line of communication” (WM = 3.30), suggesting that integrity and communication strongly influence trust perceptions. The lowest-rated item is “am trusted because I do not give in to pressures even if I know that it will risk my position” (WM = 3.07), indicating some reservations regarding consistency in principled decision-making under pressure.

The findings reveal a perceptual gap between school heads and teachers. While school heads view themselves as highly trustworthy, teachers express a generally

positive yet more cautious assessment. This suggests that trust, although present, may not be consistently experienced across all leadership situations. Strengthening transparency, maintaining ethical consistency, and demonstrating firmness in difficult decisions may help reinforce trust among teachers. These results align with Solinger et al. (2020), who emphasized that trust in leadership enhances communication, promotes staff commitment, and contributes to a positive school climate. Moreover, trust serves as a foundation for effective collaboration and sustainable school improvement.

**Table 3.3**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of Moral Leadership of the School Heads in terms of Justice**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	D.I	WM	D.I
1. have been treating the teaching and non-teaching staff fairly regardless of the social position.	3.68	WHM	3.32	WHM
2. apply the same rules to all teaching and non-teaching staff regardless of their position or status in the school.	3.65	WHM	3.29	WHM
3. give equal attention to all teaching and non-teaching staff of the school.	3.65	WHM	3.20	WMM
4. distribute responsibilities equally to all teaching and non-teaching staff.	3.65	WHM	3.23	WMM
5. recognize the teaching and non-teaching staff based on their contribution.	3.56	WHM	3.32	WHM
6. do not discriminate against teaching and non-teaching staff based on their ranks.	3.59	WHM	3.23	WMM
7. apply the same punishment to all teaching and non-teaching staff who have committed the same violation.	3.59	WHM	3.31	WHM
8. follow due process before I give disciplinary actions to a teaching or non-teaching staff	3.68	WHM	3.16	WMM
9. provide equal opportunity for professional development to all the teaching and non-teaching staff.	3.56	WHM	3.15	WMM
10. recognize the principle of equal work is equivalent to equal outcome.	3.56	WHM	3.24	WMM
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>With High Moral</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>With High Moral</b>

Table 3.3 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of moral leadership of school heads in terms of justice.

School heads rated themselves With High Moral, with a composite mean of 3.61. The highest ratings were observed in “treating staff fairly regardless of social position” and “following due process before giving disciplinary actions” (WM = 3.68), indicating

strong confidence in fairness and procedural justice. The lowest ratings (WM = 3.56), though still high, relate to recognizing staff contributions and providing equal opportunities for professional development, suggesting slightly less emphasis on these aspects. Teachers also rated justice as With High Moral, with a composite mean of 3.25. The highest ratings were given to fairness and recognition of contributions (WM = 3.32), reflecting positive perceptions of equitable treatment. However, the lowest ratings were noted in “following due process” (WM = 3.16) and “providing equal opportunities for professional development” (WM = 3.15), indicating more moderate perceptions in these areas.

Overall, both groups affirm that justice is evident in school heads’ leadership, particularly in terms of fairness and equality. However, the slightly lower ratings from teachers suggest concerns regarding the consistency and visibility of due process and equitable access to development opportunities. This highlights the need for school heads to strengthen transparency in disciplinary procedures and ensure inclusive opportunities for professional growth. These findings support Ghanem (2018), who emphasized that justice in leadership extends beyond rule compliance to ensuring fairness, equity, and equal opportunities for all members. Such practices foster trust, respect, and a positive school climate that enhances collaboration and organizational effectiveness.

**Table 3.4**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of Moral Leadership of the School Heads in terms of Mercy and Compassion**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	DI	WM	DI
love my teaching and non-teaching staff by listening to their complaints.	3.44	WHM	3.03	WMM
show concern for the problem of all teaching and non-teaching staff.	3.53	WHM	3.08	WMM
treat the teaching and non-teaching staff humanely.	3.50	WHM	3.00	WMM
am not only playing by the rules but humanitarian considerations.	3.53	WHM	3.00	WMM
easily forgive employees who committed certain minor offenses.	3.53	WHM	3.09	WMM
show kindness to their employees by extending help in times of crisis.	3.50	WHM	3.02	WMM
do leave my teaching or non-teaching staff without any support in time of crisis.	2.24	WHM	2.93	WMM
consider the needs of the teaching or non-teaching staff as a priority over my own needs.	3.56	WHM	3.03	WMM
also suffer as the teaching or non-teaching staff suffer.	3.53	WHM	3.11	WMM
feel the pain of the teaching or non-teaching staff.	3.53	WHM	3.17	WMM
Composite Mean	<b>3.39</b>	<b>With High Moral</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>With Moderate Moral</b>

Legend:

Rating Scale	Descriptive Interpretation (DI)
3.25 – 4.00	With High Moral (WHM)
2.50 – 3.24	With Moderate Moral (WMM)
1.75 – 2.49	With Less Moral (WLM)
1.00 – 1.74	With No Moral (WNM)

Table 3.4 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of moral leadership of school heads in terms of mercy and compassion.

School heads rated themselves With High Moral, with a composite mean of 3.39. The highest-rated item is “consider the needs of the teaching or non-teaching staff as a priority over my own needs” (WM = 3.56), indicating a strong sense of empathy and concern for staff welfare. The lowest-rated item is “do leave my teaching or non-teaching staff without any support in times of crisis” (WM = 2.24), suggesting rejection of unsupportive behavior and an overall recognition of the importance of providing assistance during difficult situations. These results reflect that school heads perceive themselves as compassionate leaders who prioritize the well-being of their personnel.

Teachers, however, rated this dimension at a moderate level, with a composite mean of 3.05. The highest rating is “feel the pain of the teaching or non-teaching staff” (WM = 3.17), indicating acknowledgment of empathetic leadership. The lowest rating is “do leave my teaching or non-teaching staff without any support in times of crisis” (WM = 2.93), suggesting some concerns regarding the consistency of support during critical situations.

Overall, while school heads perceive their leadership as highly compassionate, teachers view it as present but less consistently demonstrated, particularly in times of crisis. This indicates a need to strengthen visible, timely, and sustained support for staff to enhance trust and a sense of security within the school community. These findings align with Khan et al. (2020), who emphasized that moral leadership grounded in compassion and empathy fosters a supportive, collaborative, and resilient school environment, ultimately contributing to improved school climate and organizational effectiveness.

**Table 3.5**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of Moral Leadership of the School Heads in terms of Humility**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	DI	WM	DI
am always listening to the ideas of the teaching or non-teaching staff.	3.50	WHM	2.87	WMM
take into consideration of decision-making the ideas of my teaching or non-teaching staff.	3.53	WHM	2.96	WMM
do not force the ideas of the teaching or non-teaching staff in decision-making.	3.56	WHM	3.00	WMM

always show that I am not better than the teaching or non-teaching staff.	1.94	WHM	2.90	WMM
recognize my mistakes and ask for forgiveness.	3.62	WHM	2.85	WMM
listen to the criticism and take it positively.	3.65	WHM	2.85	WMM
am not feeling offended even when I am criticized	3.44	WHM	2.92	WMM
can associate myself with the rest of my teaching or non-teaching staff.	3.68	WHM	2.96	WMM
am happy to be with my teaching or non-teaching staff.	3.59	WHM	2.83	WMM
always go down to the lower level of teaching or non-teaching staff and listen to their sentiments.	3.65	WHM	2.78	WMM
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>With High Moral</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>With Moderate Moral</b>

<b>Rating Scale</b>	<b>Descriptive Interpretation (DI)</b>
3.25 – 4.00	With High Moral (WHM)
2.50 – 3.24	With Moderate Moral (WMM)
1.75 – 2.49	With Less Moral (WLM)
1.00 – 1.74	With No Moral (WNM)

Table 3.5 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of moral leadership of school heads in terms of humility.

School heads rated themselves With High Moral, with a composite mean of 3.41. The highest-rated item is “can associate myself with the rest of my teaching or non-teaching staff” (WM = 3.68), reflecting a strong sense of connection and approachability. However, the lowest-rated item is “always show that I am not better than the teaching or non-teaching staff” (WM = 1.94), indicating a weaker demonstration of visible modesty. This suggests that while school heads perceive themselves as humble and relational leaders, there is room to improve how humility is expressed in practice.

Teachers, on the other hand, rated humility at a moderate level, with a composite mean of 2.89. The highest rating is “do not force the ideas of the teaching or non-teaching staff in decision-making” (WM = 3.00), indicating recognition of participatory practices. The lowest rating is “always go down to the lower level of teaching or non-teaching staff and listen to their sentiments” (WM = 2.78), suggesting a need for greater accessibility and engagement with staff concerns.

This highlights the need for school heads to strengthen visible expressions of humility through active listening, openness to feedback, and increased interaction with staff at all levels. Enhancing these practices may improve trust, morale, and organizational cohesion within the school. These findings are supported by Lowery (2020), who emphasized that humility in leadership involves self-awareness, openness

to criticism, and genuine engagement with others. Such qualities are essential in fostering a supportive and psychologically safe school environment.

**Table 4.1**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of Organizational Management in Terms of Roles and Responsibilities**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	DI	WM	DI
secure funding and/or resources for teachers and learners to support best practices in inclusive education.	3.59	VWM	2.82	MWM
seek mutual support and guidance from other schools or district when there are questions or concern about inclusive education in our school.	3.62	VWM	2.79	MWM
have a culture shaped by vision for inclusion in instruction and learning.	3.65	VWM	2.87	MWM
collaborate with stakeholders to discuss various aspects of the inclusive education program.	3.71	VWM	2.91	MWM
have a mechanism to monitor student assessment data to ensure they are making appropriate academic progress.	3.59	VWM	2.95	MWM
provide relevant, meaningful, and applicable professional development opportunities to teachers that focus on best practices in inclusive education.	3.65	VWM	2.93	MWM
allow teachers to collaborate for the purpose of coteaching.	3.47	VWM	2.93	MWM
hold positive perception toward inclusive education.	3.65	VWM	2.88	MWM
hold inclusive education program meetings for all students with disabilities in our school.	3.68	VWM	2.85	MWM
ensure the success of their schools, serving as leaders, administrators, community members, champions for student learning, and the management of inclusive education in the school.	3.71	VWM	2.82	MWM
Composite Mean	<b>3.63</b>	<b>Very Well-Managed</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>Moderately Well-Managed</b>

Legend:

**Rating Scale**

3.25 – 4.00

**Descriptive Interpretation (DI)**

Very Well-Managed (VWM)

2.50 – 3.24	Moderately Well-Managed (MWM)
1.75 – 2.49	Less Well-Managed (LWM)
1.00 – 1.74	Not Well-Managed (NWM)

Table 4.1 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of organizational management in terms of roles and responsibilities.

School heads rated themselves Very Well-Managed, with a composite mean of 3.63. The highest ratings were observed in “collaborate with stakeholders to discuss various aspects of the inclusive education program” and “ensure the success of their schools” (WM = 3.71), reflecting strong emphasis on collaboration and leadership accountability. The lowest rating, though still high, is “allow teachers to collaborate for the purpose of coteaching” (WM = 3.47), indicating relatively less focus on collaborative instructional practices.

Teachers, on the other hand, rated this dimension as Moderately Well-Managed, with a composite mean of 2.87. The highest-rated item is “have a mechanism to monitor student assessment data to ensure appropriate academic progress” (WM = 2.95), suggesting recognition of monitoring practices. The lowest rating is “seek mutual support and guidance from other schools or district” (WM = 2.79), indicating a need for stronger external collaboration and networking.

The findings reveal a perceptual gap between school heads and teachers. While school heads view their organizational management as highly effective, teachers perceive it as moderately effective. Strengths are evident in stakeholder collaboration and student monitoring; however, areas such as coteaching practices and external partnerships require further enhancement. Strengthening these aspects may improve instructional collaboration, resource sharing, and overall school effectiveness. These findings support Murphy (2018), who emphasized that effective organizational management among school leaders ensures efficient use of resources, promotes collaboration, and creates a structured environment that supports both teacher performance and student achievement.

**Table 4.2**  
**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of Organizational Management in Terms of Transformational Leadership Practices**

Statements	School heads n = 34		Teachers n = 426	
	WM	D.I	WM	D.I
have set of values and vision that guides the decision-making process of the school heads and teachers.	3.68	VWM	3.29	VWM
promote trust and respect within the organization.	3.71	VWM	3.27	VWM
encourage teachers to seek advice from me and other school head.	3.74	VWM	3.20	MWM

challenge teachers to think about old problems in new ways.	3.76	VWM	3.28	VWM
instill leadership among all teachers by seeking opportunities for everyone to develop their leadership skills.	3.74	VWM	3.29	VWM
encourage the use of language that inspires teachers to achieve the school's vision for instruction and learning.	3.59	VWM	3.20	MWM
challenges teachers to evoke better ideas from problems and questions.	3.71	VWM	3.22	MWM
practice leadership and management by example.	3.68	VWM	3.28	VWM
provide individualized support to teachers depending on their needs.	3.68	VWM	3.18	MWM
use variety of methods to support teachers in different ways such as mentorship, coaching, observations, and professional development activities.	3.65	VWM	3.19	WM
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>Very Well-Managed</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>Moderately Well-Managed</b>

Legend:

**Rating Scale**

3.25 – 4.00

2.50 – 3.24

1.75 – 2.49

1.00 – 1.74

**Descriptive Interpretation (DI)**

Very Well-Managed (VWM)

Moderately Well-Managed (MWM)

Less Well-Managed (LWM)

Not Well-Managed (NWM)

Table 4.2 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the level of organizational management in terms of transformational leadership practices.

School heads rated themselves Very Well-Managed, with a composite mean of 3.69. The highest-rated item is “challenge teachers to think about old problems in new ways” (WM = 3.76), indicating strong emphasis on innovation and intellectual stimulation. The lowest-rated item is “encourage the use of language that inspires teachers to achieve the school’s vision” (WM = 3.59), although still within the same descriptive level. These results suggest that school heads perceive themselves as effective transformational leaders who promote creativity, vision, and continuous improvement.

Teachers, on the other hand, rated this dimension as Moderately Well-Managed, with a composite mean of 3.24. The highest rating is “have a set of values and vision that guide decision-making” (WM = 3.29), reflecting recognition of clear leadership direction. The lowest rating is “provide individualized support to teachers depending on their needs” (WM = 3.18), indicating a need for stronger personalized support.

The findings reveal that while transformational leadership practices are evident, a perceptual gap exists between school heads and teachers. School heads view their leadership as highly effective, whereas teachers experience it at a slightly lower level,

particularly in terms of individualized support and motivational communication. This suggests the need to strengthen tailored support systems and enhance inspiring leadership practices to improve teacher engagement and school performance. These findings support Cuizon (2024), who emphasized that transformational leadership fosters innovation, collaboration, and shared vision within schools, ultimately enhancing teacher development and student outcomes.

**Table 5.1**  
**Significant Association Between the Profile of the School Heads and the Level of Strategic Decision-Making**

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Interpretation
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Sex	.09	.07	.26	1.35	0.19	No significant association
Age	.03	.06	.13	0.51	0.62	No significant association
Position	.00	.02	.05	0.24	0.81	No significant association
HEA	.01	.03	.10	0.52	0.61	No significant association
Experience	-.10	.05	-.37	-1.78	0.09	No significant association

Table 5.1 presents the analysis of the significant association between the profile of school heads and their level of strategic decision-making using multiple regression.

The predictors examined include sex, age, position, highest educational attainment, and years of experience. The results show that none of these variables have a significant association with strategic decision-making, as all p-values are greater than 0.05: sex ( $p = 0.19$ ), age ( $p = 0.62$ ), position ( $p = 0.81$ ), highest educational attainment ( $p = 0.61$ ), and experience ( $p = 0.09$ ). Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

These findings indicate that the strategic decision-making of school heads is not significantly influenced by their demographic or professional profile. This suggests that leadership effectiveness in decision-making goes beyond basic characteristics such as age, sex, rank, or years of service. Instead, it may be shaped by other factors such as leadership competencies, organizational context, and professional development experiences.

The results highlight that strategic decision-making is a complex process that relies more on skills, adaptability, and situational awareness rather than static personal

attributes. This underscores the importance of strengthening leadership training and capacity-building programs to enhance decision-making effectiveness among school heads. These findings are consistent with Ydesen and Andersen (2020), who emphasized that effective strategic decision-making in educational leadership is largely driven by competencies such as critical thinking, collaboration, and adaptability rather than demographic characteristics.

**Table 5.2**  
**Significant Association between the Profile of the School Heads and the Moral Leadership**

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Interpretation
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Sex	-.04	.06	-.11	-.57	.57	No significant association
Age	-.05	.05	-.26	-.99	.33	No significant association
Position	.02	.01	.35	1.75	.09	No significant association
HEA	-.02	.03	-.15	-.76	.46	No significant association
Experience	-.02	.05	-.06	-.29	.78	No significant association

Table 5.2 presents the analysis of the significant association between the profile of school heads and their moral leadership.

The results show that none of the profile variables—sex ( $p = .57$ ), age ( $p = .33$ ), position ( $p = .09$ ), highest educational attainment ( $p = .46$ ), and experience ( $p = .78$ )—have a significant association with moral leadership, as all p-values are greater than 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

This means that moral leadership among school heads is not influenced by their demographic or professional profile. In other words, factors such as age, rank, educational attainment, or years of experience do not significantly determine how school heads demonstrate moral leadership. This suggests that moral leadership is more likely shaped by personal values, ethical orientation, and leadership practices rather than background characteristics.

The findings highlight that being a morally grounded leader is not dependent on profile variables but on how leaders uphold integrity, fairness, and ethical behavior in their roles. Hence, attention should be given to leadership development programs that strengthen values formation and ethical decision-making. These findings are consistent with Garcia and Ching (2024), who emphasized that while demographic characteristics provide context, moral leadership is primarily shaped by values, ethical commitment, and the ability to foster trust and a positive school environment.

**Table 6.1**  
**Significant Relationship between the Organizational Management and the Level of Strategic Decision-Making**

Source of relationship	Mean	Std. Deviation	Comp r value	Comp p value	Critical p value	Interpretation
Organizational Management	3.66	.23	-0.28	0.11	0.05	No significant relationship
Strategic Decision-Making	3.58	.16				

Table 6.1 presents the analysis of the relationship between organizational management and the level of strategic decision-making.

The results show that organizational management ( $M = 3.66$ ,  $SD = 0.23$ ) and strategic decision-making ( $M = 3.58$ ,  $SD = 0.16$ ) have a computed correlation coefficient of  $r = -0.28$  with a p-value of 0.11, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates no significant relationship, thus the null hypothesis is accepted.

This means that the level of organizational management does not significantly influence strategic decision-making among school heads in this study. Although both variables are rated high, they do not statistically move together. This suggests that strategic decision-making may be influenced by other factors such as leadership style, experience in handling complex situations, or school context rather than organizational management alone.

The findings highlight that strong management practices do not automatically translate into better strategic decisions. This reflects the complexity of school leadership, where decision-making involves multiple internal and external factors. These results are consistent with Perez and Nuñala (2024), who emphasized that while organizational management provides structure, strategic decision-making depends on broader factors such as context, adaptability, and leadership judgment.

**Table 6.2**  
**Significant Relationship between the Organizational Management and the Level of Moral Leadership**

Source of relationship	Mean	Std. Deviation	Comp r value	Comp p value	Critical p value	Interpretation
------------------------	------	----------------	--------------	--------------	------------------	----------------

Organizational Management	3.66	.23	0.01	0.93	0.05	No significant relationship
Moral Leadership	3.51	.14				

Table 6.2 presents the analysis of the relationship between organizational management and the level of moral leadership.

The results show that organizational management (M = 3.66, SD = 0.23) and moral leadership (M = 3.51, SD = 0.14) have a computed correlation coefficient of  $r = 0.01$  with a p-value of 0.93, which is much higher than the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates no significant relationship, thus the null hypothesis is accepted.

This means that organizational management does not significantly influence moral leadership among school heads. Although both are rated high, they function independently in this study. Moral leadership appears to be shaped more by personal values, ethics, and individual leadership behavior rather than management structures or practices.

The findings suggest that being an effective manager does not automatically translate to being a morally grounded leader. This highlights the need to strengthen values formation, ethical leadership training, and personal accountability among school heads. These results align with Arong (2024), who emphasized that organizational management and moral leadership may operate as separate dimensions, but when combined, they contribute to a more ethical and effective school environment.

## DISCUSSION

This study investigated the extent to which school heads in the districts of Dimiao, Lila, Sevilla, Loboc, and Loay effectively apply strategic decision-making and moral leadership in managing their schools, while also assessing key demographic factors among respondents, including school heads and teachers, such as sex, age, position, highest educational attainment, and years of experience. The findings aim to guide the development of a targeted intervention plan for the 2025-2026 school year to enhance school management and leadership practices across these districts.

Moreover, the study looked at how school heads and teachers view the school heads' strategic decision-making across four areas: analytical, behavioral, conceptual, and directive. It also examined their moral leadership qualities, focusing on integrity, trust, justice, mercy, compassion, and humility. Additionally, it assessed organizational management by evaluating the school heads' roles, responsibilities, and transformational leadership practices.

The study aimed to test whether there is a significant link between the profile of school heads and their strategic decision-making and moral leadership, as well as the relationship between organizational management and these leadership aspects.

## Findings

The following findings were drawn from the analysis of the data:

**Demographic Profile of the Respondents (school heads and teachers).** The demographic profile of the respondents showed that female respondents dominated both groups, with 73.5% of school heads and 89.2% of teachers being female. Most school heads were aged 51 and above (73.5%), whereas teachers were mostly younger, primarily between 31 and 40 years old (38.7%). School heads mainly held the Head Teacher 3 (35.3%) and Head Teacher 1 (23.5%) positions, while most teachers were classified as Teacher III (54.2%). In terms of education, many school heads had master's degree units or were master's graduates, with 17.6% holding doctoral degrees, while teachers mostly had master's degree units (53.3%) or bachelor's degrees (20.4%). Regarding experience, the majority of school heads had 11-20 years, while teachers mostly had 11-20 or 21-30 years of experience.

**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of School Heads' Strategic Decision-Making.** The school heads rated their strategic decision-making very highly, expressing strong confidence in their analytical, behavioral, conceptual, and directive approaches. Teachers agreed strongly that school heads excelled in analytical decision-making, which involves careful analysis of data and facts, while they viewed the behavioral, conceptual, and directive decision-making styles—such as considering others' opinions, long-term planning, and clear, task-focused actions as satisfactory.

**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of Moral Leadership of the School Heads.** The school heads rated their moral leadership very highly, expressing that they demonstrate strong integrity, trust, justice, mercy, compassion, and humility. Teachers also viewed the school heads positively, strongly agreeing on their integrity and sense of justice, while rating their trust, mercy, compassion, and humility as satisfactory.

**Assessment of the School Heads and the Teachers on the Level of Organizational Management.** The school heads rated their organizational management, including their roles, responsibilities, and transformational leadership practices, as very well-managed, showing strong confidence in their ability to lead and manage effectively. Teachers also viewed these areas positively, rating them as moderately well-managed.

**Significant Association Between the Demographic Profile of the School Heads and Strategic Decision-Making and Moral Leadership.** The analysis found no significant connection between the profile of school heads and their level of strategic decision-making and moral leadership. The results showed that none of these factors made a statistically significant association.

**Significant Relationship Between the Level of Organizational Management and the Level of Strategic Decision-Making and Moral Leadership.** There is no statistically significant relationship between organizational management and the level of strategic decision-making and moral leadership among the school heads. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted.

## Conclusions

School heads exhibited strong self-confidence in their strategic decision-making abilities, though a perceptual gap emerged in softer moral leadership virtues like trust, mercy, compassion, and humility. Organizational management appeared well-handled, largely driven by this self-assurance, while effective leadership qualities and managerial capabilities proved influenced more by factors beyond personal and professional demographics. Differing views between school heads and teachers on leadership roles highlight how unique experiences and positions shape perspectives, making it essential to foster open communication and mutual understanding to align expectations, enhance collaboration, strengthen management, and improve student outcomes.

## Recommendations

Derived from the findings and conclusions, the researcher proposes the following recommendations:

1. School heads may actively seek teacher input on decision-making and moral leadership via structured dialogues to address differing perceptions and build trust. Focus on transformational practices by mentoring younger teachers and promoting inclusive management beyond demographic influences.
2. Teachers may engage in open feedback sessions with school heads to share views on leadership styles, emphasizing support needs while recognizing strengths in analytical and ethical areas. Participate in joint professional learning to strengthen collaboration and mutual understanding.
3. Learners can benefit by observing and emulating school heads' ethical traits like integrity and compassion in their activities. They need to be provided input through student councils on school decisions to support a trust-based environment that enhances learning outcomes.
4. DepEd officials may prioritize professional development programs aligned with PPSSH domains, such as strategic leadership and ethical practices, through NEAP initiatives to bridge perception gaps between school heads and teachers. Implement regular feedback mechanisms and communication training to foster alignment and enhance collaborative environments.
5. Parents may partner with school heads and teachers in community engagement events to reinforce ethical leadership and organizational goals. Voice perspectives in

PTA meetings to align home-school expectations and support student-centered improvements.

6. Community members may collaborate via outreach programs, offering resources for school management and recognizing school heads' independent leadership strengths. Advocate for gender-balanced initiatives to sustain the effective female-dominated workforce structure.
7. Future researchers may explore organizational and cultural factors influencing leadership independence from demographics using mixed methods in diverse Philippine contexts. Investigate longitudinal effects of perception alignment interventions on student performance.

### **Proposed Intervention Plan**

#### **Rationale**

The educational landscape in the Philippines is shaped by a predominantly female workforce, with seasoned school heads showing strong confidence in strategic decision-making, moral leadership, and organizational management. However, divergences in perceptions between school heads and teachers, notably regarding behavioral and compassionate qualities, reveal the need for targeted interventions. These discrepancies, unaffected by demographic factors, underscore the importance of enhancing communication, feedback, and collaborative learning. Such interventions are pivotal in aligning perspectives, fostering trust, and developing effective, inclusive leadership that responds to the dynamic needs of schools.

Legally, the proposed intervention plan is anchored on the Department of Education's Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) as stipulated in DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020. The PPSSH highlights essential leadership domains, including strategic leadership, organizational management, and ethical practice, which collectively serve as a framework for continuous professional development and the delivery of quality education. This policy framework is further supported by the work of Parojenog and Pabalan (2024), who emphasized that strengthening leadership standards through structured frameworks enhances institutional effectiveness and promotes sustained quality advancement in basic education. Together, these foundations affirm the need for targeted interventions that reinforce both strategic and moral leadership practices among school heads. Additionally, the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP) supports this framework by facilitating continuous professional development aligned with these standards, thereby ensuring school leaders are equipped to navigate complex educational challenges and improve instructional outcomes.

The study by Panoy and Villanueva (2024) reveals that leadership effectiveness in education is deeply linked to collaborative practices and transformational leadership

approaches. Studies emphasize the role of structured dialogues, inclusive decision-making, and mentorship in bridging perception gaps and fostering cohesive school environments. In their study, Hejres et al. (2017) highlighted that leadership development programs promoting ethical and transformational practices enhance teacher satisfaction and student performance. Building on these insights, the proposed intervention plan integrates legal mandates and evidence-based practices to cultivate a culture of trust, shared goals, and responsive leadership in DepEd schools.

### **Intervention Plan Description**

The intervention plan targets school heads, teachers, and learners via student councils in selected DepEd schools over a 6-month semester with bi-monthly sessions, classified as Tier 2 targeted support. Key components include monthly 2-hour structured feedback dialogues led by school heads to gather teacher input on leadership styles; four NEAP-aligned workshops focusing on communication, transformational mentoring, and ethical practices; joint professional learning communities for collaborative planning; and learner involvement through student council forums to emulate ethical traits and provide input. Adult champions comprise the Division Supervisor for oversight, School Head as facilitator, and Master Teacher as coordinator.

Monitoring occurs via bi-weekly progress logs on Google Forms, end-line perception surveys, and baseline-to-target alignment scores, utilizing DepEd training budgets, NEAP modules, and virtual platforms for resources. This structured approach ensures systematic implementation, progress tracking, and alignment with PPSSH domains to bridge perception gaps effectively.

### **Objectives**

- Reduce perception gaps between school heads and teachers on strategic decision-making and moral leadership by 30%, measured through pre- and post-intervention surveys, to align views on analytical strengths and behavioral traits.
- Increase teacher participation in structured feedback dialogues and professional learning communities to 80%, fostering open communication, mutual trust, and recognition of support needs beyond demographic influences.
- Enhance school heads' transformational leadership practices through NEAP-aligned workshops, achieving 90% proficiency in inclusive mentoring and ethical practices for organizational management and change inspiration.
- Promote a culture of shared goals by integrating teacher and learner input, resulting in 75% improvement in collaboration indicators and teacher satisfaction scores for better student outcomes.

### **Mechanics of Implementation**

Upon approval from the members of the examining tribunal, the researcher will arrange a presentation to the Public Schools District Supervisor in Sevilla district, to

discuss the purpose and operational details of the intervention plan. This meeting aims to foster further collaboration and encourage the active participation of all individuals involved. The researcher is open to accepting their valuable suggestions and recommendations to ensure the meaningful and timely implementation of the intervention plan.

### **Schedule of Implementation**

The wellness plan is designed as a recurring cycle that spans throughout the year. It is scheduled to commence in January 2026 and conclude in December 2026, encompassing a range of activities outlined in different categories. After each implementation phase, a thorough assessment and review will be conducted. The purpose of this evaluation is to utilize the monitoring findings as a roadmap for enhancing any areas that require improvement. By actively addressing these areas, the wellness plan can continuously evolve and strive for greater effectiveness.

### **Monitoring and Evaluation System**

A monitoring and evaluation tool will be created and devised to measure the outcomes of the wellness plan. This tool will serve as a means to assess the program's progress and identify areas for refinement, as deemed necessary. Regular assessments will be conducted to gauge the effectiveness of the program and ensure its continual improvement.

### **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

This study strictly adhered to established ethical standards in the conduct of research. Prior to data collection, necessary permissions were obtained from the Schools Division Office of Bohol, district supervisors, and school heads. Participation in the study was voluntary, and informed consent was secured from all respondents. Participants were fully informed about the purpose of the study, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty was emphasized. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured by not disclosing any personal identifiers, and all data collected were used solely for academic purposes. The study also complied with the provisions of the Data Privacy Act of 2012 to ensure proper handling and protection of respondents' information.

## **REFERENCES**

- Abun, D., Galat, M. A., Magallanes, T., Mansueto, J. M., & Encarnacion, M. J. (2021). Measuring the Effect of Moral Leadership of Administrator toward Employees' Morality in the Context of the Catholic School in the Ilocos Region, Philippines. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 15, 400.
- Arong, L. (2024). Impact of the elementary school heads leadership behavior on the

- teacher's morale in school districts of Pilar. *JPAIR Institutional Research*, 22(1), 26–42.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, 44(9), 1175.
- Bush, T. (2020). Theories of educational leadership and management.
- Campos-García, I., & Zúñiga-Vicente, J. Á. (2022). Strategic decision-making in secondary schools: The impact of a principal's demographic profile. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 21(3), 543–564.
- Cuizon, J. L. (2024). Challenges and opportunities in implementing inclusive education in school management. *Nexus International Journal of Science and Education*, 1(2).
- Daniel-Ozah, L. (2024). Morality in educational leadership as a correlate for institutional management in Rivers State. *International Journal of Economics, Environmental Development and Society*, 5(2), 180–200.
- Davidson, F. D., & Hughes, T. R. (2020). Moral dimensions of leadership. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*.
- Dicdican, K. J. (2024). Decision making in school management: Stories of school heads. *Nexus International Journal of Science and Education*, 1(2).
- Garcia, J. M., & Ching, D. A. (2024). The effect of ethical leadership at work on school head transparency & trust in governance in public elementary schools. *TWIST*, 19(3), 427–435.
- Ghanem, B. M. (2018). Ethical leadership in education and its relation to education management ethics. *European Journal of Education Studies*.
- Hejres, S., Braganza, A., & Aldabi, T. (2017). Investigating the effectiveness of leadership styles on instructional leadership and teachers job expectancy in Kingdom of Bahrain. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5(7), 694-709.
- Keddie, A. (2016). School autonomy as 'the way of the future': Issues of equity, public purpose and moral leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(5), 713–727.
- Khan, S. R., Bauman, D. C., & Javed, U. (2020). A study on the effect of ethical leadership on teachers' moral motivation at schools in Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(6), 965–985.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.
- Lowery, C. (2020). Moral literacy and school leadership: Perceptions of principals in southeast Ohio on the ethics of decision-making. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(1), 112–127.
- Moore, J. (2017). John B. Watson's classical S–R behaviorism. *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 1–34.
- Murphy, C. R. (2018). Educational leaders and inclusive education: Perceptions, roles, and responsibilities. *Trident University International*.
- Panoy, E., & Villanueva, E. (2024). Mediating Effects of Organizational Learning on Transformational Leadership and Sustainability Capacity of Public Elementary Schools. *Romblon State University Research Journal*, 6(2), 53-61.
- Perez, D. R., & Nuñala, J. A. (2024). Empowerment, organizational commitment, and

- management performance of secondary school heads in the new normal in the Division of Palawan. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 17(3), 1–1.
- Piaget, J. (1976). Piaget's theory. In *Piaget and his school: A reader in developmental psychology* (pp. 11–23). Springer.
- Parojenog, R., & Pabalan, A. P. (2024). Enhancing basic education standards: A framework for quality advancement. SSRN 4801978.
- Saleem, F., & Jabeen, R. (2025). Leadership and decision making in educational management: Implications for teacher job satisfaction in private schools of Karachi. *Bahria University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (BUJHSS)*, 28–45.
- Scholl, J. A., Mederer, H. J., & Scholl, R. W. (2023). Leadership, ethics, and decision-making. In *Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance* (pp. 7495–7504). Springer.
- Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2016). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas*. Routledge.
- Singco, R. J. R. (2024). Exploring challenges and success stories of inclusive education policy implementation in DepEd from the school heads' perspectives: A sustainable development goal. *Southeast Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(2).
- Solinger, O. N., Jansen, P. G., & Cornelissen, J. P. (2020). The emergence of moral leadership. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(3), 504–527.
- Summak, M. S., & Kalman, M. (2020). A Q-methodological analysis of school principals' decision-making strategies during the change process at schools. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 10(2), 123-144.
- Viberg, O., Kizilcec, R. F., Wise, A. F., Jivet, I., & Nixon, N. (2024). Advancing equity and inclusion in educational practices with AI-powered educational decision support systems (AI-EDSS). *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(5), 1974–1981.
- Ydesen, C., & Andersen, C. K. (2020). Implementing inclusive education policies—the challenges of organizational change in a Danish municipality. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 69–78.

**APA Citation:**

Morales, C. S., & Lagumbay, J. M. G. (2026). SCHOOL HEADS' STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING AND MORAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES ON ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(4), 1205–1238.  
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19678746>

Corresponding author: *charlyn.saren001@deped.gov.ph*

