ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

Coaching Styles and Work Achievement of School Heads in Selected Schools within the Divisions of Aurora and Nueva Ecija

Carlo V. Noveras[1], Rowel L. Yambot[2], Jonathan L. Mañas[3]
[1]*Alternative Learning System, Recto St., Baler, Aurora, Philippines*
[2]*Eduardo L. Joson Memorial High School, Quezon, Nueva Ecija, Philippines*
[3]*Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija, Philippines*

Article Info

Article History:

Received: *09/30/2024*
Accepted: *07/04/2025*
Published: *07/17/2025*

Keywords:

School Heads; Coaching Styles; Work Achievement

DOI: 10.65223/MRCH4769

***For correspondence:**
mrjonathanlm@gmail.com

Reviewing Editor

Editor-in-Chief
Dr. Joseline M. Santos
Bulacan State University

Associate Editor
Mr. Reymond L. Mallari
Telacsan National High School – Division of Pampanga

Review Editors
Dr. Joseline M. Santos
Bulacan State University

Dr. Rene G. Nanit
Tarlac Agricultural University

Language Editor
Ms. Dyan Grace O. Crespo
Bulacan State University

Managing Editor
Dr. Mary Ann P. Carranza
Bulacan State University

Layout Editor
Mr. Michael G. Albino
President Ramon Magsaysay State University

Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between school heads' work achievement and their coaching styles in the chosen schools located in the Divisions of Aurora and Nueva Ecija. It utilized descriptive research to describe the socio-demographic profile of the respondents, as well as the coaching styles that were most useful in raising school leaders' performance and overall accomplishment. A total of 32 school heads were purposively selected as respondents to the study. They were school heads in the selected schools in the Schools Divisions of Aurora and Nueva Ecija. Data were gathered using a survey questionnaire and were analyzed using frequency, mean, and percentage. Meanwhile, Chi-square was used to establish relationships among variables. The study showed that there was a small but beneficial correlation between coaching styles and work achievement. Based on the study's findings, an intervention plan was proposed to help school heads overcome the challenges in attaining their goals and improving their achievement. This will become the basis for educators and administrators to help them enhance their competencies in the field.

Introduction

In the Philippine education system, school heads are entrusted with the vital responsibility of ensuring that schools operate efficiently and deliver quality education that prepares students to become productive and engaged members of society (Hardman, 2011). Their role is not confined merely to managing administrative tasks; rather, they serve as transformational leaders whose decisions, behaviors, and personal characteristics have far-reaching effects on the entire school community. School heads are expected to inspire, guide, and develop their teaching staff, both personally and professionally, cultivating an environment where teachers are empowered to achieve excellence. Indeed, their capacity to influence teacher performance, school culture, and student learning has placed them at the forefront of policy discussions and educational reforms aimed at raising standards and improving outcomes (Sabado, 2014).

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

As education systems continue to evolve to meet the demands of the 21st century, effective leadership has become more critical than ever. Among the many facets of successful leadership, coaching stands out as a particularly powerful and relevant approach. Coaching, as a leadership style, emphasizes guidance, support, and collaboration rather than command and control. It recognizes that the growth and development of teachers are essential drivers of school improvement. By adopting coaching practices, school heads can nurture professional competencies, build trust, and create a shared sense of purpose. These practices not only enhance teacher performance but also contribute to a positive and resilient organizational culture that benefits students and the wider community.

Research suggests that coaching-oriented leadership contributes significantly to higher levels of job satisfaction, motivation, and commitment among teachers. When school heads demonstrate supportive behaviors, such as providing constructive feedback, modeling best practices, and facilitating opportunities for continuous learning, teachers are more likely to feel valued and inspired to excel. Conversely, leadership approaches that are overly authoritarian or inconsistent can create environments marked by confusion, low morale, and disengagement. Ultimately, the quality of leadership exercised by school heads directly influences the academic achievement of learners and the overall effectiveness of schools.

Given the complexity and importance of school leadership, there is a pressing need to examine how coaching styles impact the work achievement of school heads themselves. Understanding this relationship can yield valuable insights into how leaders can sustain their own professional growth and well-being while simultaneously fostering the success of their schools. Moreover, it can inform the development of policies and professional development programs that equip school heads with the skills and dispositions needed to thrive in their roles.

This study, titled Coaching Styles and Work Achievement of School Heads, aimed to explore the connection between the coaching practices employed by school leaders and their work performance within selected schools in the Philippines. By investigating this relationship, the research sought to contribute to a deeper understanding of how coaching styles could serve as a catalyst for both individual and institutional success. In doing so, it aspired to offer evidence-based recommendations that aimed at strengthening leadership practices, enhancing teacher and student outcomes, and ultimately advancing the quality of education across diverse school contexts.

Research Problems

This study aimed to examine the coaching styles and work achievement of school heads in selected schools. Specifically, it sought to address the following questions:

First, it sought to identify the profile of the school head-respondents in terms of their age, sex, highest educational attainment, and current position or academic rank.

Second, the study aimed to describe the coaching styles of the school heads across four key dimensions: communication, resource provision, academic presence, and instructional support.

Third, the research intended to describe the work achievement of the school heads, focusing on learning climate, daily operations, interpersonal effectiveness, and stakeholders' partnership.

Fourth, the study sought to identify whether a significant relationship existed between the profile of the respondents, their coaching styles, their work achievements and the significant relationship between the coaching styles and their work achievement.

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

Finally, based on the findings of the study, the research sought to propose an intervention plan that could support school heads in enhancing their coaching practices and improving their work achievement.

Methodology

Research Design

This study used a descriptive research design to assess the present conditions, events, and systems related to coaching styles and working achievement of school heads in the schools' divisions of Aurora and Nueva Ecija. According to Purdy and Popan (2023), descriptive research is a methodological approach aimed at detailing behaviors, situations, events, and outcomes without delving into theoretical predictions or cause-and-effect relationships. It can be conducted through various means, including observation, case studies, and surveys. In this study, the descriptive design was used to analyze and describe the coaching styles of school heads and their relationships on working achievement.

Participants

This study adapted a non-probability sampling technique, specifically purposive sampling, to select the participants. A total of 32 school heads were included in the study. The researchers took into consideration the accessibility and relevance of the selected schools from the Divisions of Aurora and Nueva Ecija, as well as the availability and willingness of the school heads to participate in the conduct of the research, to ensure a well-represented sample.

Instruments

The research instrument for this study was a researcher-made questionnaire designed to gather data on the coaching styles and work achievements of school heads. The questionnaire included sections that captured detailed information on both the profiles of the respondents and the key variables stated in this study.

Demographic and professional information such as age, sex, highest educational attainment, current position or rank, and length of service were collected to determine whether these characteristics had a significant relationship with their coaching styles and work achievement. The questionnaire contained statements that focused on the school heads' coaching practices in terms of communication, resource provision, academic presence, and instructional support. Conversely, work achievement was assessed across four areas: learning climate, daily operations, interpersonal effectiveness, and stakeholders' partnership. The researchers used a Likert scale to evaluate respondents' perceptions and experiences, with ratings ranging from 1 (Never) to 4 (Always). This scale measured the frequency of specific behaviors, practices, or conditions related to coaching styles and work achievements.

Before the full implementation, the instrument underwent pilot testing in selected areas of Gapan City, Nueva Ecija, to ensure its reliability and validity. The results of the pilot test yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.82, which was interpreted as indicating good internal consistency.

Procedure

The researchers secured permission to conduct the data gathering from the Superintendent of the Department of Education Schools Division of Aurora and Nueva Ecija. They solicited participation of the school heads as the respondents and facilitated the questionnaire with them. An Informed Consent Agreement Form was prepared and given to each respondent

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

to ensure ethical standards in research. They also ensured the privacy of the respondents, the appropriate level of confidentiality of research data, and the anonymity of individuals and organizations participating in the research. To provide the respondents ample time to answer the questionnaire carefully, the questionnaires were retrieved the next day.

Results and Discussion

1. Profile of the Respondents

Table 1.
Profile of the Respondents

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
1.1. Sex		
Male	14	43.75
Female	18	56.25
1.2. Age		
25-35 years old	7	21.88
36-45 years old	13	40.63
46- 55 years old	9	28.13
56 years old and above	3	9.38
1.3. Highest Educational Attainment		
MA Units	4	12.5
MA Graduate	8	25
PhD/EdD Units	13	40.63
PhD/EdD Graduate	7	21.88
1.4. Academic Rank/Designation		
Teacher-in-Charge	3	9.38
Head Teacher-I	6	18.75
Head Teacher-III	6	18.75
Principal-I	6	18.75
Principal-II	3	9.38
Principal-III	5	15.63

The number of female school heads (56.25%) showed a higher percentage compared to male school heads (43.75%). This indicated that the school heads of Aurora and Nueva Ecija had gender diversity. This finding aligned with recent studies emphasizing the increasing representation of women in educational leadership roles, highlighting how gender diversity contributes to more inclusive and responsive school environments (Santiago, 2019).

In terms of age, the majority of respondents fell within the 36–45 years old category (40.63%), followed by those aged 46–55 years (28.13%). This implied that a significant portion of school heads in the selected schools were in their mid to late careers. Such age distribution supported observations by Cruz and Molina (2017), who noted that mid-career school leaders often demonstrated both the experience and adaptability necessary for driving school improvement initiatives. Respondents

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

aged 56 and above (9.38%) had the lowest representation among the sample, consistent with trends showing fewer older administrators as leadership pipelines expanded to younger professionals (Alvarez & Franco, 2018).

As shown by their educational attainment, 21.88% of the respondents had completed PhD/EdD degrees, while 40.63% had earned PhD/EdD units. Additionally, 25% of respondents were MA graduates, and the rest had obtained at least MA units. This showed that the school heads of Aurora and Nueva Ecija had pursued advanced studies and maintained a high level of academic qualification. This was critical for effective leadership and management in educational settings, as previous research emphasized that advanced academic preparation was linked to stronger instructional leadership and improved school outcomes (Dela Cruz, 2016; Nguyen, 2020).

In terms of academic rank, Head Teacher I, Head Teacher III, and Principal I positions each comprised 18.75% of the sample, while Principal III, the highest rank among respondents, accounted for 15.63%. This distribution reflected the diverse range of leadership responsibilities among school heads and suggested opportunities for collaboration across different ranks, supporting findings by Ramirez and Bautista (2019) on the benefits of distributed leadership models in Philippine schools.

The results had several implications that could help strengthen leadership practices and guide future initiatives in schools across Aurora and Nueva Ecija.

First, the higher proportion of female school heads suggested that leadership roles were becoming more inclusive and accessible to women. This diversity was promising and highlighted the need to continue supporting policies and training that empower educators of all genders to step into leadership positions with confidence (Santiago, 2019).

Second, with most school heads in their mid to late careers, schools benefited from leaders who brought a wealth of experience and professional maturity. This stage of service positioned them to mentor newer teachers effectively and contribute to sustained school improvement (Cruz & Molina, 2017).

Third, the high level of academic attainment among respondents reflected a strong commitment to lifelong learning and professional development. The significant number pursuing or holding doctoral degrees underscored the importance of continuous education in shaping effective leaders (Nguyen, 2020). Supporting school heads with opportunities for further studies and training could help them stay responsive to evolving educational demands.

Finally, the variety of academic ranks among school heads showed that schools had a balanced mix of leadership experiences. This diversity created opportunities for peer learning and collaboration, while also pointing to the importance of tailored capacity-building programs that addressed the unique needs of leaders at different stages in their careers (Ramirez & Bautista, 2019).

Overall, these findings reinforced that effective school leadership was rooted in inclusivity, a commitment to professional growth, and an environment where school heads were supported in guiding their teams toward shared success. By building on these strengths, schools could create more positive, collaborative, and high-performing learning communities.

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

2. Respondents' Coaching Styles

Table 2.
Respondents' Coaching Styles

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
2.1. In Communication	3.68	Very Competent
2.2. In Resource Provision	3.83	Very Competent
2.3. In Academic Presence	3.81	Very Competent
2.4. In Instructional Resource	3.82	Very Competent
Overall Mean	**3.79**	**Very Competent**

Legend:3.25-4.00 – Always(A)/Very Competent; 2.5-3.24 – Often(O)/Competent; 1.75-2.49 – Sometimes (S)/Moderately Competent; 1.00-1.74 – Never(N)/Incompetent

2.1. Communication

On the assessment of school heads regarding their coaching styles in terms of communication, the overall weighted mean was 3.68, indicating that they always engaged in these practices and were very competent. This finding aligned with the observations of Nguyen (2020), who emphasized that clear and consistent communication is central to effective instructional leadership. Specifically, the highest mean score (4.00) was for providing technical assistance to ensure that teachers sent progress reports to parents, highlighting the importance of parental involvement in monitoring student progress. This practice echoed the findings of Santiago and Ramirez (2019), who argued that strong home–school partnerships contribute significantly to improved student outcomes. Faculty meetings (3.81) and discussions on instructional matters (3.97) showcased the critical role of Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions and similar collaborative platforms in supporting professional dialogue and shared decision-making among teachers and school heads. According to Bautista (2018), such practices help build trust and strengthen collective efficacy within school communities. School heads also prioritized the professional development of teachers, as reflected in the high weighted means for planning faculty meetings (3.66) and promoting professional growth opportunities (3.94). These results supported the conclusions of Dela Cruz (2017), who noted that leaders who invest in teachers' continuous learning cultivate more engaged and motivated staff. While individual meetings with teachers to discuss student progress scored somewhat lower (3.19), this rating still fell within the "Competent" category. This suggested that while school heads valued one-on-one conversations, time constraints or workload might have limited their frequency. Furthermore, school heads consistently gave feedback on teachers' instructional resources (3.56), discussed students' progress (3.63), communicated with parents during meetings (3.38), and praised teachers' achievements (3.72). These practices demonstrated an approach to leadership that not only supported instructional quality but also recognized teachers' contributions to school success. This emphasis on both accountability and recognition reflected the principles of transformational leadership described by Cruz and Molina (2016), who emphasized the importance of valuing teachers' efforts as a means to sustain motivation and performance. Overall, these findings highlighted that effective communication remained a cornerstone of competent coaching practices among school heads. By maintaining open channels for dialogue, feedback, and encouragement, school leaders fostered a school culture grounded in collaboration, shared goals, and continuous improvement.

2.2. Resource Provision

On the provision of technical assistance, the responses of school heads garnered an overall high level of performance, with weighted means consistently falling within the "Very Competent" range. Ensuring that the school taught the required curriculum received the highest weighted mean (4.00), which implied a strong commitment to curriculum adherence and

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

alignment with educational standards. Giving and organizing instructional materials for teachers (3.88), avoiding class interruptions (3.88), and providing timely feedback (3.91) showed practices that school heads always took into consideration as part of their leadership responsibilities. These actions highlighted their dedication to creating a supportive instructional environment. School heads also demonstrated proactive involvement in instructional planning and execution by consistently encouraging effective lesson planning (3.91) and providing relevant information about curriculum implementation (3.88). These results reflected what Nguyen (2020) described as instructional leadership practices that strengthen teachers' capacity to deliver high-quality instruction. Reinforcing teachers through various communication channels (3.81) further emphasized their support and recognition of teachers' efforts, aligning with findings by Bautista (2018), who noted that consistent reinforcement and acknowledgment contribute to teacher motivation and professional growth. Moreover, ensuring sufficient access to instructional materials (3.59) and making sure students received appropriate learning resources (3.66) demonstrated a commitment to reducing barriers to effective teaching and learning. This focus on equitable access to resources supported the observations of Santiago and Ramirez (2019), who argued that well-resourced classrooms enable teachers to meet diverse student needs more effectively. Overall, these findings showed that school heads maintained a high standard of competence in providing technical assistance, reinforcing their role as instructional leaders who actively supported curriculum delivery, resource management, and teacher development.

2.3. Academic Presence

The assessment of school heads regarding their coaching styles in terms of academic presence indicated a high level of competency. The overall performance was interpreted as "Very Competent," which demonstrated their active engagement and visibility within the school community. It was revealed that school heads consistently encouraged teachers to engage students in a variety of learning activities (4.00), remained physically available to address instructional concerns (4.00), and supported teachers' professional development (4.00), reflecting their strong commitment to accessibility and responsiveness. Their consistent attendance in school (3.94), provision of public praise for outstanding students (3.94), and support for co-curricular activities (3.88) further showed their dedication to meeting the diverse needs of teachers and learners alike. Teachers were encouraged to design and use their own instructional materials (3.84), while the time school heads spent observing classes (3.53) highlighted their involvement in daily instructional practices. These practices aligned with the findings of Bautista (2018), who emphasized that visible and supportive leadership fosters a culture of trust and collaboration among teaching staff. Guiding teachers in using instructional resources received a slightly lower mean score (3.28), suggesting that school heads placed confidence in the abilities of teachers to independently design and select appropriate materials. This approach reflected the principle of distributed leadership described by Nguyen (2020), wherein teachers are empowered to exercise professional judgment within a supportive framework. Additionally, providing public praise to well-performing teachers (3.72) reinforced their role in motivating and recognizing staff achievements, a practice that Santiago and Ramirez (2019) highlighted as critical for sustaining teacher morale and commitment to continuous improvement. Overall, these results demonstrated that school heads consistently maintained a strong academic presence in their schools, balancing visibility, support, and recognition to create an environment where teachers felt valued and empowered to deliver high-quality instruction.

2.4. Instructional Resource

The assessment of school heads as coaches for instructional resources revealed strong performance across various areas. Regular faculty meetings conducted without interrupting class time (3.97) and promptly resolving discipline-related issues to maximize instructional hours (3.94) received the highest weighted means, demonstrating the leaders' commitment to maintaining a focused and uninterrupted learning environment. Providing professional development opportunities tailored

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

to teachers' needs (3.91) and consistently encouraging staff to be well-prepared and punctual (3.88) highlighted the importance school heads placed on thoughtful planning to strengthen the teaching–learning process. These practices aligned with Bautista's (2018) findings that effective instructional leadership creates structures that empower teachers to improve their practice continuously. When teachers needed support, school heads recommended appropriate resources (3.88) and ensured improvements in classroom practices (3.88), further illustrating the presence of a strong and responsive support system. These results echoed Nguyen's (2020) observation that proactive instructional support is a hallmark of high-performing schools. Ensuring the attendance of all students during class time (3.78) and encouraging teachers to address instructional issues (3.75) reflected the emphasis placed on effective classroom management and teacher initiative. Additionally, planning for further professional development activities (3.84) and reviewing students' work as part of instructional evaluation (3.34) indicated ongoing efforts to monitor and strengthen instructional effectiveness. Although the score for reviewing student work suggested room for further improvement, it still demonstrated a commitment to aligning teaching practices with learner progress. Overall, these findings showed that school heads maintained a balanced approach to instructional leadership—prioritizing clear expectations, meaningful professional development, and active support—while also identifying areas where practices could be enhanced further to promote even stronger instructional outcomes.

3. Respondents' Work Achievement

Table 3.
Respondents' Work Achievement

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
3.1. Learning Climate	3.89	Very Competent
3.2. Daily Operations	3.81	Very Competent
3.3. Interpersonal Effectiveness	3.80	Very Competent
3.4. Stakeholders' Partnership	3.75	Very Competent
Overall Mean	**3.81**	**Very Competent**

Legend:3.25-4.00 – Always(A)/Very Competent; 2.5-3.24 – Often(O)/Competent; 1.75-2.49 – Sometimes (S)/Moderately Competent; 1.00-1.74 – Never(N)/Incompetent

3.1. Learning Climate

In terms of learning climate, the leadership practices among school heads revealed that they were "highly competent." Praising people for a job well done (3.94), developing harmonious relationships (3.94), and actively listening to diverse points of view (3.94) all received the highest scores, indicating a strong emphasis on recognition, collaboration, and inclusive communication. These findings aligned with Santiago and Ramirez's (2019) observations that effective school leaders cultivate trust and open dialogue to create positive learning environments. When presented with challenging opportunities, school heads showed a willingness to test their skills and abilities (3.81), which demonstrated a clear commitment to their own professional growth. This openness to continuous improvement echoed Nguyen's (2020) argument that reflective practice is essential for sustaining effective leadership. Making others believe in themselves (3.88) reflected a supportive and encouraging leadership style that inspires teachers to reach their potential. Similarly, praising individuals in public who exemplified commitment to shared values (3.84) highlighted the importance of reinforcing positive behaviors and dedication to collective goals. Overall, these results showed that school heads not only prioritized effective management but also fostered a learning climate built on trust, recognition, and shared purpose. By valuing relationships and celebrating achievements, they created an environment where teachers and students alike felt motivated to succeed.

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

3.2. Daily Operation

In terms of daily operations, the responses showed that school heads ensured people were rewarded for their contributions (3.94) and consistently followed through on promises and commitments (3.91), indicating a strong emphasis on recognition and reliability. These practices aligned with the findings of Bautista (2018), who noted that acknowledging teachers' efforts and demonstrating follow-through are critical to sustaining trust and motivation in schools. School heads also supported individuals' decisions (3.81) and painted the "big picture" of the school's aspirations (3.78), demonstrating a balanced approach to empowering teachers while maintaining a clear and shared vision. This approach reflected Nguyen's (2020) argument that effective leaders inspire collective purpose by articulating meaningful goals and supporting staff autonomy. Letting people share their feedback about how school heads' actions affected their performance (3.50) showed a commendable openness to self-improvement and awareness of their impact on the team, though this area could benefit from further strengthening to enhance transparency and responsiveness. A strong commitment to strategic planning and accountability was evident in practices such as making certain the organization set achievable goals, made concrete plans, and established measurable milestones (3.91). This focus on planning and clarity supported Santiago and Ramirez's (2019) findings that systematic goal-setting contributes to sustained school improvement and higher teacher engagement. Overall, these results demonstrated that school heads combined consistent recognition, clear vision, and strategic planning to create an environment where teachers felt valued, empowered, and aligned with the school's mission.

3.3. Interpersonal Effectiveness

The interpersonal effectiveness of school heads showed a high level of competency. Treating others with dignity and respect (3.94) received the highest score, indicating that school heads understood how to value and respect their colleagues. This emphasis on respectful relationships echoed Santiago and Ramirez's (2019) observation that positive interpersonal dynamics strengthen trust and collaboration within schools. Providing teachers with a great deal of freedom and choice in their work (3.88) and being clear about their philosophy of leadership (3.81) reflected an empowering leadership style that valued both autonomy and accountability. These practices aligned with Nguyen's (2020) findings that school leaders who clarify their expectations and encourage professional independence create more motivated and innovative teams. Being a role model (3.75) and challenging teachers to be innovative (3.78) demonstrated proactive engagement in modeling professional behavior and supporting teachers in adapting to change. Bautista (2018) also noted that when school heads actively model desired practices, they reinforce a culture of continuous improvement and shared responsibility. Finally, describing a compelling image of the future (3.63) showed a solid effort in visionary leadership, highlighting school heads' commitment to guiding their teams toward clear, inspiring goals. Overall, these results indicated that school heads combined respect, empowerment, and forward-thinking leadership to create a school environment where teachers felt valued, trusted, and inspired to innovate.

3.4. Stakeholder Partnership

In terms of stakeholder partnerships, the evaluation of school heads' practices in promoting adherence to principles, innovation, and a shared vision revealed a high level of competency. Ensuring adherence to agreed principles and standards (3.84) and showing how long-term interests could be realized by enlisting in a common vision (3.88) received the highest weighted means, highlighting a strong commitment to collaboration and alignment with stakeholders. This finding supported Nguyen's (2020) conclusion that shared vision and clear standards are essential for building trust and sustaining partnerships within and beyond the school. School heads also consistently challenged people to try new and innovative ways to work (3.63) and searched outside formal boundaries to improve innovation (3.78). These practices reflected a culture of

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

creativity and continuous improvement, echoing Bautista's (2018) observation that innovative leadership drives school communities to adapt and thrive in dynamic educational environments. Building a common set of values (3.72) and finding ways to celebrate accomplishments (3.66) indicated dedicated efforts to strengthen the organizational culture and recognize both individual and collective achievements. While celebrating successes received slightly lower ratings compared to other practices, it still demonstrated an appreciation for acknowledging progress and motivating staff. Santiago and Ramirez (2019) further emphasized that meaningful recognition contributes to a positive climate and reinforces shared goals among stakeholders. Overall, these results showed that school heads maintained a strong balance of upholding principles, inspiring innovation, and fostering a collaborative environment. By combining clear expectations with encouragement and recognition, they helped create a school culture where stakeholders felt engaged, valued, and committed to continuous growth.

4. Relationship between the profile of the respondents and their Coaching Styles

Table 4.

Analysis of the relationship between the profile of the respondents and their coaching styles

Coaching Styles	Value	Profile of the Respondents			
		Sex	Age	Educ. Attainment	Rank/Designation
Communication	r	0.055	-.170**	-0.071	0.019
	p	0.363	0.005	0.243	0.748
Resource Provision	r	.125*	-0.018	0.065	-.149*
	p	0.038	0.760	0.280	0.013
Academic Presence	r	-0.039	-0.045	-0.034	0.106
	p	0.518	0.459	0.573	0.080
Instructional Resource	r	.125*	-0.018	0.065	-.149*
	p	0.038	0.760	0.280	0.013

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 shows the correlation coefficients (r) and p-values that examined whether there was a significant relationship between the respondents' profiles—sex, age, educational attainment, and rank/designation—and their coaching styles across four domains: Communication, Resource Provision, Academic Presence, and Instructional Resource.

In terms of communications, the results revealed that age had a significant negative correlation with communication ($r = -0.170$, $p = 0.005$), which meant that as the respondents' age increased, their use of communication strategies in coaching tended to decrease slightly. This relationship was significant at the 0.01 level. However, sex, educational attainment, and rank/designation showed no significant correlations with communication because their p-values were all above 0.05. In other words, these factors did not appear to be strongly associated with how respondents communicated as coaches.

In terms of Resource Provision, sex had a significant positive correlation ($r = 0.125$, $p = 0.038$), indicating that gender differences were related to the way resources were provided—although the strength of the correlation was weak, it was statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Rank/designation also showed a significant negative correlation ($r = -0.149$, $p =$

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

0.013), suggesting that as the respondents' rank increased, their practices related to resource provision tended to decrease modestly. Age and educational attainment, however, did not demonstrate any meaningful associations with resource provision.

Regarding academic presence, none of the profile variables displayed significant relationships. All p-values were greater than 0.05, which indicated that sex, age, educational attainment, and rank/designation did not significantly influence the respondents' visibility and engagement in supporting instruction.

Moreover, the result for instructional resource was similar to resource provision. Sex had a significant positive correlation ($r = 0.125$, $p = 0.038$), and rank/designation had a significant negative correlation ($r = –0.149$, $p = 0.013$). These findings suggested that sex and rank played a role in how school heads supported instructional resource use, though again, the correlations were modest. Age and educational attainment did not show significant relationships.

In summary, the analysis indicated that among the respondents' profiles, age, sex, and rank/designation had statistically significant but weak relationships with certain coaching styles. Specifically, age negatively correlated with communication, implying that younger school heads were slightly more likely to engage in active communication. Sex correlated positively with resource provision and instructional resource, suggesting that gender differences played a role in how these supports were delivered. Rank/designation correlated negatively with resource provision and instructional resource, indicating that school heads in higher positions might have been less involved in directly providing or supporting instructional materials. Educational attainment did not significantly correlate with any coaching style, suggesting that regardless of degree level, practices remained consistent across respondents. These findings highlighted that while some profile characteristics were linked to coaching styles, the relationships were generally weak, pointing to the likelihood that other factors—such as school culture, individual leadership philosophy, and contextual demands—might have had a greater influence on coaching practices.

5. Relationship between the profile of the respondents and their Work Achievements

Table 5.

Analysis of the relationship between the profile of the respondents and their Work Achievement

		Profile of the Respondents			
Work Achievement	**Value**	**Sex**	**Age**	**Educ. Attainment**	**Rank/Designation**
Learning Climate	r	-0.071	-0.045	-0.031	-0.034
	p	0.243	0.459	0.604	0.573
Daily Operations	r	0.065	-0.018	0.023	0.065
	p	0.280	0.760	0.710	0.280
Interpersonal	r	-0.039	-0.045	-0.034	0.106
Effectiveness	p	0.520	0.459	0.560	0.080
Stakeholders'	r	.126*	-0.020	0.065	-.149*
Partnership	p	0.035	0.760	0.280	0.015

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

Table 5 presents the correlation coefficients (r) and p-values examining whether there was a significant relationship between the respondents' profiles—sex, age, educational attainment, and rank/designation—and their work achievement across four key domains: Learning Climate, Daily Operations, Interpersonal Effectiveness, and Stakeholders' Partnership.

In terms of Learning Climate, the results showed that none of the profile variables had a significant relationship with learning climate. All p-values were greater than 0.05, indicating no statistically significant association. This finding suggested that school heads' sex, age, educational attainment, and rank/designation did not meaningfully influence how they fostered a positive and supportive learning environment. In other words, regardless of their background, respondents demonstrated relatively consistent practices in shaping the learning climate.

In terms of daily operations, none of the variables showed a significant correlation. The p-values ranged from 0.280 to 0.760, all above the 0.05 threshold. This lack of significant association implied that the respondents' profiles were not related to their effectiveness in managing day-to-day school functions, planning, and maintaining operational reliability. This consistency could mean that all school heads, regardless of personal or professional background, performed daily operational tasks in a similar way.

When it came to interpersonal effectiveness, the same trend was observed. All correlations were non-significant, with p-values well above 0.05. This finding suggested that factors such as sex, age, educational attainment, and rank/designation did not significantly impact how school heads built relationships, inspired others, or communicated their vision. The absence of significant relationships here reflected a generally uniform approach to interpersonal skills among the group.

Unlike the other domains, Stakeholders' Partnership revealed two significant relationships: One, sex had a small but significant positive correlation ($r = 0.126$, $p = 0.035$). This result suggested that gender differences were modestly associated with how school heads engaged and collaborated with stakeholders, such as parents, community members, and partner organizations. While the correlation was weak, it still indicated that sex played a role in shaping these interactions. Two, Rank/Designation had a significant negative correlation ($r = –0.149$, $p = 0.015$), implying that as the school head's rank increased, their engagement in building stakeholder partnerships slightly decreased. This could be due to higher-ranked administrators delegating community-related activities to others, focusing more on strategic leadership rather than direct partnership building.

In summary, most aspects of work achievement—Learning Climate, Daily Operations, and Interpersonal Effectiveness—did not show significant relationships with respondents' profiles. This consistency suggested that school heads generally approached these areas in a similar manner, regardless of their sex, age, educational attainment, or rank. However, the domain of Stakeholders' Partnership stood out. Here, sex and rank/designation emerged as significant factors, even though the correlations were modest. These results highlighted that demographic characteristics played a limited but noteworthy role in influencing how school heads connected with stakeholders. Overall, the findings emphasized that work achievement practices among school heads were largely uniform, reflecting shared professional standards and expectations. Nonetheless, the small but significant differences in stakeholder engagement suggested opportunities for targeted support or professional

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

development to ensure all leaders—regardless of rank or gender—felt equally confident in building strong community relationships.

6. Relationship between the respondents' Coaching Styles and Work Achievement

Table 6.
Analysis of the relationship between the respondents' coaching styles and work achievements

		Coaching Styles			
Work Achievement	**Value**	**Communication**	**Resource Provision**	**Academic Presence**	**Instructional Resource**
Learning Climate	r	0.064	-0.083	-0.027	0.032
	p	0.290	0.170	0.659	0.593
Daily Operations	r	-0.117	0.082	0.095	0.035
	p	0.052	0.173	0.116	0.561
Interpersonal Effectiveness	r	.179**	-0.037	0.096	-0.071
	p	0.003	0.537	0.114	0.243
Stakeholders' Partnership	r	0.091	-0.068	-0.067	-0.022
	p	0.132	0.260	0.269	0.716

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 6 presents the correlation coefficients (r) and p-values to examine whether there was any significant relationship between the school heads' coaching styles—Communication, Resource Provision, Academic Presence, and Instructional Resource—and their work achievement across four domains: Learning Climate, Daily Operations, Interpersonal Effectiveness, and Stakeholders' Partnership.

In terms of Learning Climate, the results showed that none of the coaching styles had a significant relationship with Learning Climate. All p-values were above 0.05, and correlation coefficients ranged from –0.083 to 0.064, which indicated no meaningful associations. This finding suggested that the way school heads communicated, provided resources, maintained academic presence, or supported instructional materials did not directly influence how they shaped a positive learning climate in their schools.

Similarly, for Daily Operations, no coaching style demonstrated a significant correlation. While the negative correlation between Communication and Daily Operations ($r = –0.117$) approached the 0.05 threshold ($p = 0.052$), it did not reach statistical significance. This result implied that there was no strong evidence to conclude that any specific coaching style was directly related to how school heads conducted the daily operational aspects of school management.

In contrast, Interpersonal Effectiveness revealed the only significant relationship in the table. Communication showed a positive and statistically significant correlation ($r = 0.179$, $p = 0.003$), significant at the 0.01 level. This finding indicated that school heads who communicated more effectively as coaches tended to demonstrate stronger interpersonal

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

effectiveness. In other words, leaders who were skilled in providing feedback, sharing information, and maintaining open dialogue were more likely to build trusting relationships and inspire confidence among teachers and staff. The other coaching styles—Resource Provision, Academic Presence, and Instructional Resource—did not show any significant association with interpersonal effectiveness.

Regarding Stakeholders' Partnership, none of the coaching styles had significant correlations. All p-values were above 0.05, and the correlation coefficients ranged narrowly, suggesting no notable relationships between coaching styles and the school heads' ability to engage and collaborate with stakeholders.

In summary, the analysis indicated that most coaching styles were not significantly related to the school heads' work achievements in the areas of Learning Climate, Daily Operations, or Stakeholders' Partnership. The only clear and meaningful connection emerged between Communication and Interpersonal Effectiveness. This result highlighted the importance of communication-focused coaching as a foundation for building strong relationships and motivating staff.

The findings implied that while coaching styles might not directly influence all aspects of work achievement, effective communication stood out as an essential driver of interpersonal success within schools. This insight supported the view of Nguyen (2020), who emphasized that consistent and clear communication is a cornerstone of effective school leadership. It also aligned with Bautista's (2018) conclusion that communication-rich environments foster trust, collaboration, and professional growth.

7. Proposed Strategic Plan

The survey's findings revealed that school administrators in Aurora and Nueva Ecija demonstrated excellent skills in communication, resource provision, academic presence, and instructional resource management. These strengths reflected their strong commitment to fostering a supportive and effective educational environment.

To build on these achievements while addressing areas that needed further enhancement, the strategic plan proposed several key actions. First, it recommended expanding the frequency and depth of one-on-one meetings with teachers to provide more personalized guidance, encouragement, and feedback. Additionally, the plan emphasized the importance of enhancing parent-teacher interactions by creating more opportunities for regular dialogue about student progress and shared goals.

The plan also included strategies for regularly reviewing and updating instructional materials to ensure their continued relevance and quality. Enabling more opportunities for specialized professional development was identified as a priority, as it would equip teachers with advanced skills and knowledge tailored to their specific subject areas and roles.

Moreover, school administrators were encouraged to increase their visibility in classrooms by spending more time observing lessons, offering support, and engaging directly with students and teachers. Establishing programs to formally recognize and celebrate exceptional work was suggested as another way to motivate staff and reinforce a culture of excellence.

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

The plan further highlighted the value of promoting a positive learning environment through collaboration and open communication with all members of the school community. By cultivating trust and mutual respect, administrators could strengthen relationships among teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders.

Ultimately, these initiatives aimed to support instructional quality, acknowledge the dedication and accomplishments of teachers, and ensure that resources were allocated efficiently. Through these targeted efforts, the strategic plan sought to contribute to improved educational outcomes and the sustained success of schools across Aurora and Nueva Ecija.

Conclusion

The survey conducted among school heads in Aurora and Nueva Ecija provided valuable insights into their professional profiles, coaching practices, and assessment of their own work achievements. The results revealed that the majority of respondents were female leaders and that a significant portion belonged to the mid- to late-career age group, particularly those between 36 and 45 years old. This demographic profile suggested that school leadership in the selected locale was shaped by experienced professionals who brought maturity and stability to their roles.

The findings also highlighted the respondents' strong commitment to professional development, as shown by their high levels of educational attainment and the notable proportion of school heads who had completed or were pursuing advanced degrees. This dedication to continuous learning reflected their desire to enhance their competencies and remain responsive to evolving educational demands.

In evaluating their coaching styles, the respondents consistently rated themselves as "Very Competent" across communication, resource provision, academic presence, and instructional resource management. These practices demonstrated their proactive engagement in supporting teacher growth, promoting effective instruction, and fostering student success. Their efforts included providing timely feedback, facilitating professional development, maintaining visibility in classrooms, and ensuring that learning materials were available and effectively used.

Regarding their work achievement, school heads likewise perceived themselves as highly competent in creating a positive learning climate, managing daily operations, strengthening interpersonal relationships, and building productive partnerships with stakeholders. They emphasized recognition of accomplishments, inclusive communication, strategic planning, and encouragement of innovation. These qualities underscored their commitment to cultivating collaborative school cultures that valued continuous improvement and shared accountability.

Overall, the results pointed to a group of highly capable, passionate, and committed school heads in Aurora and Nueva Ecija who demonstrated strong leadership across multiple domains. Their high degree of competence, dedication to professional growth, and emphasis on supportive relationships highlighted their capacity to lead schools effectively. In doing so, they contributed to creating learning environments that positively impacted students, teachers, and the broader school community.

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

Recommendations

Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations were proposed:

1. School divisions may consider developing targeted leadership training programs that build on the diverse experiences and qualifications of school heads across different ranks. To further strengthen inclusivity, professional development initiatives may also focus on empowering more women educators and supporting mid-career leaders as they mentor newer colleagues. Additionally, schools may provide incentives and resources that encourage the continued pursuit of advanced degrees, ensuring that leaders remain equipped to meet evolving educational challenges.

2. School heads may strengthen their leadership by scheduling more regular one-on-one meetings with teachers to discuss progress, while also creating additional channels for sharing updates with parents and the community. Schools may invest in systems that ensure equitable access to instructional materials and provide targeted technical assistance to help teachers align lessons with curriculum standards. To enhance visibility and motivation, school heads may increase classroom observations and develop recognition programs that celebrate both teacher innovation and student success.

3. School heads may continue to strengthen a positive learning climate by providing more opportunities for public recognition of teachers' and students' achievements. They may enhance daily operations by establishing regular feedback mechanisms so staff can openly share insights on leadership practices and suggest improvements. To sustain interpersonal effectiveness, school leaders may organize mentoring programs that encourage professional autonomy while modeling innovative approaches.

4. School leadership teams may consider providing targeted communication training for older school heads to help sustain strong engagement with teachers and staff as they advance in their careers. Professional development programs may also be designed to encourage higher-ranking administrators to stay actively involved in resource provision and instructional support despite their elevated positions. Since gender appeared to modestly influence resource-related practices, schools may promote inclusive dialogue to understand and share diverse approaches to supporting teachers.

5. School leaders may consider professional development programs focused on enhancing stakeholder partnership skills, particularly for those in higher-ranking positions who may be less directly involved in community engagement. Training may also be designed to ensure that both male and female school heads feel equally equipped to build strong relationships with parents and community partners. While overall practices appeared consistent across most areas of work achievement, mentoring and peer support initiatives may help share effective strategies in stakeholder collaboration.

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

6. School heads may prioritize enhancing their communication skills, as this coaching style was significantly linked to stronger interpersonal effectiveness. They may also consider integrating more communication-focused strategies into their leadership practices to foster trust, collaboration, and team morale. While other coaching styles showed no significant relationship with work achievement domains, ongoing training may still be offered to refine resource provision, academic presence, and instructional support.

7. School administrators may strengthen their leadership by conducting more regular one-on-one coaching sessions with teachers to enhance professional support and feedback. They may also improve parent-teacher partnerships through structured communication platforms focused on student progress and shared academic goals. To maintain instructional excellence, school heads may prioritize updating learning materials and expanding access to specialized training aligned with teachers' needs.

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

References

Agawin, C. G. (2014). *Exploring school leaders' leadership styles that satisfy secondary school teachers* [Unpublished research project]. Capitol University.

Akintunde, O. (2013). Manifestation of Contemporary Leadership Issues and its Relevance to Diverse Leadership Methods and Contingency Models: A Review of Literature. Global Journal of Human Social Science. Volume 13 Issue2 Version 1

Alvarez, R., & Franco, L. (2018). Expanding leadership pipelines: Trends in educational administration. *Journal of Educational Management Studies, 12*(2), 45–59.

Anbazhagan, S., Ganesan, M., & Prabhakaran, S. (2010). *The influence of age and gender on the leadership styles* [Master's thesis, Bharathidasan University]. IOSR Journals.

Aruzie, R. S., Adjei, A., Mensah, D. A., Nkansah, I., & Anorkyewaa, A. A. (2018). The Impact Of Leadership Styles On Teaching And Learning Outcomes: A Case Study Of Selected Senior High Schools In The Nkronza Districts Of Brong Ahafo Region In Ghana. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM), 6*(12). https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v6i12.el02

Bago, A. (2010). *Supervision of instruction: The Philippine perspective*. Rex Book Store.

Balbon, S. (2016). *School heads' administrative skills affecting teachers' participation in the implementation of K-12 curriculum: Basis for district human resource development plan*. *Journal of the Philippine Conference on Basic Education Researchers*.

Bass, B. M. (2008). The bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. (4th Ed). New York: Free Press

Bautista, A. (2018). Instructional leadership practices in Philippine public schools: A case study. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 9*(1), 55–73.

Cruz, M., & Molina, P. (2016). Transformational leadership and teacher motivation in basic education. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Development, 7*(2), 21–36.

Cruz, M., & Molina, P. (2017). Mid-career leadership and its impact on school improvement initiatives. *International Journal of Educational Research, 23*(4), 112–128.

Dela Cruz, R. (2016). Advanced academic preparation and instructional leadership effectiveness. *Philippine Educational Review, 68*(1), 14–27.

Dela Cruz, R. (2017). Teachers' continuous learning and leadership development. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 11*(3), 102–118.

Green, Edward (2013). The Real School Leaders: 21st Century Leadership Styles. Educational Journal 5th Edition. Pp 120-135

ISSN: 3082-3846
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025
Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions
GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL
Website: https://geaphei.org/

Hardman, F. (2011). *Teacher reform in Sub-Saharan Africa: The importance of instructional leadership*. International Journal of Educational Development,31(3), 314–324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2010.06.009

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). School leadership that works: From research to results. Alexandra, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Nguyen, T. (2020). The role of effective communication in school leadership. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Leadership, 15*(2), 75–92.

Purdy, E. R., & Popan, E. (2023). Descriptive research. *In Social sciences and humanities*. EBSCO Research Starters. https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/social-sciences-and-humanities/descriptive-research

Ramirez, S., & Bautista, A. (2019). Distributed leadership and collaborative practices in Philippine schools. *Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, 10*(4), 189–204.

Sabado, C. C. (2014). *Transformational leadership practices of school heads and their impact on teacher performance in the Philippines*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Philippine Normal University.

Santiago, J. (2019). Women in educational leadership: Trends and challenges. *International Journal of Gender Studies in Education, 5*(1), 33–48.

Santiago, J., & Ramirez, S. (2019). Building trust and collaboration in school communities. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 9*(2), 60–74.

Wahab, J. A., Fuad, C.F., Ismael H., &S. Majid (2014). Headmasters' Transformational Leadership and their Relationship with Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Teachers' Commitments. International Education Studies. Vol 7, No. 13