

Resource Enablement, Organizational Behavior, and Instructional Leadership Orientation on School Leaders' Administrative Support Responsiveness in National Assessments

Gerlie Rose C. Magdato^{1*}, Dr. James L. Paglinawan²

¹Head Teacher, Tugaya Integrated School

²Associate Professor IV, Central Mindanao University

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400537>

Received: 25 April 2026; Accepted: 30 April 2026; Published: 18 May 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of Instructional Leadership Orientation (ILO), Resource Enablement Capacity (RE), and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) on Administrative Support Responsiveness (ASR) in national assessments among school leaders in the Division of Valencia City. Employing a quantitative, non-experimental descriptive-correlational design, data were gathered from 230 school leaders selected through convenience sampling during School Year 2025–2026. Standardized and validated instruments with high reliability ($\alpha = 0.975\text{--}0.979$) were used. Mean, Pearson r , and multiple regression analysis were utilized to analyze the data.

Findings revealed that school leaders demonstrated high levels of resource enablement ($M = 4.403$), organizational citizenship behavior ($M = 4.488$), instructional leadership orientation ($M = 4.508$), and administrative support responsiveness ($M = 4.480$), all interpreted as highly to exceptionally manifested. Correlation analysis showed significant positive relationships between ILO ($r = 0.733$), RE ($r = 0.658$), and OCB ($r = 0.656$) with ASR ($p < 0.01$). Regression analysis indicated that managing the instructional program, resource allocation support, defining the school mission, and altruism significantly predicted ASR, collectively explaining 61.2% of its variance ($R^2 = 0.612$). The study concludes that administrative responsiveness is strongly influenced by instructional leadership practices, resource alignment, and voluntary organizational behaviors. It further highlights that technical instructional management is the strongest predictor of effective data-driven school responsiveness. The findings underscore the importance of integrating leadership competencies to enhance sustained improvement in national assessment outcomes.

Keywords: Resource Enablement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Instructional Leadership Orientation, Administrative Support Responsiveness, National Assessments.

INTRODUCTION

Educational systems have long relied on large-scale assessments as key indicators of learner achievement and school effectiveness. In the Philippine basic education context, national assessments such as the Early Language, Literacy, and Numeracy Assessment (ELLNA) and the National Achievement Test (NAT) have been used to evaluate learning outcomes and inform both policy and school-level interventions. However, despite the availability of such assessment data, persistent gaps between expected standards and actual learner performance have continued to raise concerns regarding how school leaders respond to these results in practice.

Existing literature has consistently emphasized the critical role of school leadership in improving student outcomes. Instructional leadership, in particular, has been identified as a significant influence on teaching quality and learner achievement, as it involves goal setting, supervision of instruction, and the creation of a supportive learning environment (Hallinger, 2018; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). In addition, organizational

citizenship behavior, which refers to voluntary actions that extend beyond formal role expectations, has been shown to contribute to improved organizational functioning, collaboration, and overall school effectiveness (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2014). Furthermore, the effective allocation and utilization of resources have been recognized as essential components of school capacity to implement instructional improvement initiatives (OECD, 2020).

While these variables have been widely studied, much of the existing research has focused on leadership styles, teacher outcomes, or resource availability. Less attention has been given to how these factors influence the actual administrative actions taken by school leaders in response to assessment results. This gap is significant because the presence of assessment data alone does not ensure improvement; rather, it is the manner in which school leaders interpret, act upon, and sustain responses to such data that determines the effectiveness of school improvement efforts.

In the Division of Valencia City, assessment results have reflected ongoing performance challenges that underscore the importance of examining administrative responsiveness. For School Year 2023–2024, the division ranked 12th out of 14 divisions in ELLNA and 14th out of 14 divisions in NAT Grade 6, with Mean Percentage Scores (MPS) of 52.95 and 51.33, respectively, both below the national MPS of 60.50 (ELLNA) and 57.94 (NAT). In School Year 2024–2025, although the division improved slightly to 13th place, the MPS of 46.25 remained below expected performance levels. These results indicated that while assessment data were available, consistent improvement across schools had not been fully realized. Variations in school-level performance, for instance, Tugaya Integrated School recorded higher MPS values (e.g., 70.19 in ELLNA and 55.99 in NAT) compared to the division average, further suggested differences in how school leaders implemented and sustained improvement strategies.

These conditions highlighted the importance of examining Administrative Support Responsiveness in National Assessments, which refers to the extent to which school leaders engage in data-informed decision-making, implement targeted interventions, and sustain improvement efforts over time. This construct captures the actual administrative behaviors that connect leadership practices with learner performance outcomes, making it a critical area of investigation.

To further clarify, Administrative Support Responsiveness (ASR) is conceptualized in this study as a distinct, action-oriented leadership construct that emphasizes the translation of assessment data into sustained administrative practices. While instructional leadership focuses on setting direction and supervising instruction, and resource enablement highlights the provision of organizational capacity, ASR specifically captures how leaders operationalize these elements through timely decision-making, targeted intervention, and continuous monitoring.

This distinction is important because the presence of leadership competencies does not automatically result in improved outcomes unless these are enacted through concrete administrative responses. In this sense, ASR reflects the behavioral manifestation of leadership effectiveness, particularly in contexts where schools are required to respond to standardized assessment data. It bridges the gap between leadership intention and implementation by focusing on how school leaders interpret evidence, initiate actions, and sustain improvement efforts over time.

The conceptualization of ASR is grounded in literature on data-driven decision-making, which emphasizes that the impact of assessment systems depends largely on leaders' ability to transform data into actionable strategies (Datnow & Park, 2018; Schildkamp, 2019). Moreover, studies highlight that sustained school improvement requires not only initial intervention but also continuous monitoring and adjustment, reinforcing the multidimensional nature of responsiveness (Mandinach & Gummer, 2011; Poortman & Schildkamp, 2016). These findings reinforce the importance of leadership practices that move beyond data interpretation toward consistent and informed action within the school context.

By positioning ASR as an outcome-oriented construct, this study contributes to the literature by offering a more direct lens for examining how leadership practices influence school-level responses to national assessments. This is particularly relevant in the Philippine context, where accountability systems increasingly require school

leaders to demonstrate not only planning and resource management but also measurable and sustained responses to learner performance data.

Given these considerations, this study examined the influence of Instructional Leadership Orientation, Resource Enablement, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior on School Leaders' Administrative Support Responsiveness in National Assessments. Using a quantitative research design with multiple regression analysis, the study aimed to determine the extent to which these variables predict administrative responsiveness.

Objectives

This study primarily aimed to establish relationship between resource enablement, organizational citizenship behavior, and instructional leadership orientation on school leader's administrative support responsiveness in national assessments. Specifically, it aimed to:

- 1) assess the level of resource enablement capacity of school leaders in terms of:
 - 1.1) resource allocation support,
 - 1.2) instructional resource provision,
 - 1.3) professional support enablement, and
 - 1.4) intervention resource coordination.
- 2) find out the organizational citizenship behavior school leaders manifest in the areas of:
 - 2.1) altruism,
 - 2.2) conscientiousness,
 - 2.3) sportsmanship,
 - 2.4) courtesy, and
 - 2.5) civic virtue.
- 3) determine the instructional leadership orientation of school leaders in the fields of:
 - 3.1) defining the school mission,
 - 3.2) managing the instructional program, and
 - 3.3) developing the school learning climate.
- 4) gauge the level of administrative support responsiveness of school leaders in national assessments in terms of:
 - 4.1) data-informed decision making,
 - 4.2) intervention implementation, and
 - 4.3) monitoring and sustainability.
- 5) correlate resource enablement, organizational citizenship behavior, instructional leadership orientation and administrative support responsiveness of school leaders in national assessments.
- 6) identify the factor, singly or in combination, best predicts administrative support responsiveness of school leaders in national assessments.

Hypothesis

The subsequent null hypotheses were developed and examined using a 0.05 significance level.

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between 1) resource enablement, organizational citizenship behavior, instructional leadership orientation and administrative support responsiveness of school leaders in national assessments.

H₀₂: There is no predictor variable of administrative support responsiveness in national assessments of school leaders.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative, non-experimental research design utilizing descriptive-correlational approach to examine the influence of leadership competencies on administrative responsiveness. This design was appropriate as it allowed for the systematic investigation of naturally occurring relationships and the

predictive influence of Instructional Leadership Orientation, Resource Enablement, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Administrative Support Responsiveness in National Assessments.

The respondents consisted of 230 public school leaders (program holders, master teachers, school heads, and teachers with designated leadership roles) in the Division of Valencia City during the final academic quarter of School Year 2025–2026. A convenience sampling technique was employed due to practical considerations such as accessibility, time constraints, and the need to gather data within the limited academic window. While this approach enabled efficient data collection from readily available participants, it may limit the generalizability of the findings beyond the study context. As noted in methodological literature, convenience sampling is appropriate in exploratory and context-specific studies but requires cautious interpretation when extending conclusions to broader populations (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). Despite this limitation, the sample still provides meaningful insights into leadership practices within the division, particularly given the inclusion of participants across various leadership roles.

Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire composed of four validated parts. The Instructional Leadership Orientation (ILO) section was adapted from Hallinger’s (1982) Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) to measure practices such as defining the school mission and managing instructional programs. Resource Enablement (RE) was conceptually adapted from Hoy and Tarter’s (1997) School Organizational Health frameworks, while Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) was adapted from Podsakoff et al. (1990) to cover dimensions like altruism and civic virtue. Finally, Administrative Support Responsiveness (ASR) was patterned after the framework of Bass and Avolio’s (1995) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, contextualized to measure data-informed decision-making and monitoring. All items were modified into first-person, behavior-based statements and measured using a 5-point frequency scale ranging from 5 (Always) to 1 (Never).

To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, the instruments underwent content validation by experts in educational leadership. Reliability testing yielded excellent internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of 0.977 for ILO and RE, 0.979 for OCB, and 0.975 for ASR. These values confirm that the instruments were highly reliable, ensuring consistent and valid measurement of the study’s variables. Ethical considerations were strictly observed, including securing formal permission from the Schools Division Office of Valencia City, obtaining informed consent, and maintaining participant anonymity and confidentiality throughout the research process.

The statistical analysis of the data involved Mean to profile the levels of each variable, while Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (*r*) was calculated to explore the strength and direction of the relationships among them. Furthermore, Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was conducted to identify which specific factors, singly or in combination, best predict Administrative Support Responsiveness. All null hypotheses were examined and tested at a 0.05 level of significance, providing a robust framework for understanding the drivers of effective administrative support in the context of national assessments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table I. School leaders’ level of resource enablement capacity.

INDICATORS	MEAN	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Professional support enablement	4.463	Always	Exceptionally resourceful
Resource allocation support	4.404	Often	Highly resourceful
Instructional resource provision	4.387	Often	Highly resourceful
Intervention resource coordination	4.359	Often	Highly resourceful
Resource Enablement Capacity	4.403	Often	Highly resourceful

Table I indicates that school leaders demonstrate a high level of resource enablement capacity (*M* = 4.403), reflecting consistent engagement in providing instructional and organizational support. Among the dimensions, professional support enablement emerged as the most prominent, suggesting that leaders prioritize capacity-building mechanisms such as mentoring, coaching, and collaborative learning structures. In contrast,

intervention resource coordination, while still high, registered the lowest mean, indicating comparatively less consistency in mobilizing resources for sustained and system-wide interventions.

Rather than merely reflecting availability of resources, these findings point to a leadership pattern that emphasizes human capital development as the primary lever for school improvement. This aligns with contemporary perspectives that position professional learning as the most critical school-level resource influencing instructional quality and student outcomes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; OECD, 2020). In this context, the strong emphasis on professional support suggests that school leaders act not only as resource managers but also as facilitators of teacher growth.

However, the relatively lower rating in intervention resource coordination highlights a critical operational gap. While resources are available and teachers are supported, the systematic alignment and sustained deployment of these resources—particularly involving external stakeholders and long-term programs—appear less consistently practiced. This distinction is important, as effective school improvement depends not only on access to resources but also on how coherently they are organized and sustained over time (Leithwood et al., 2020).

In the Philippine context, similar patterns have been observed. For instance, Deal and Lopez (2024) found that while school leaders actively implement school-based professional development such as Learning Action Cells (LAC), challenges remain in coordinating broader intervention efforts due to structural and administrative constraints. This suggests that while internal capacity-building mechanisms are well-established, extending these into integrated, multi-level interventions remains an area for strengthening.

These findings imply that resource enablement among school leaders is strong but uneven, with greater emphasis on immediate, school-based professional support than on long-term, coordinated intervention systems. Addressing this imbalance may enhance the sustainability and overall effectiveness of responses to national assessment results.

Table II. School leaders’ organizational citizenship behavior.

INDICATORS	MEAN	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Courtesy	4.549	Always	Exceptionally committed
Sportsmanship	4.521	Always	Exceptionally committed
Civic virtue	4.505	Always	Exceptionally committed
Conscientiousness	4.448	Often	Highly committed
Altruism	4.416	Often	Highly committed
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	4.488	Often	Highly committed

Table II shows that school leaders demonstrate a high level of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) ($M = 4.488$), indicating strong voluntary commitment beyond formal role expectations. Among the dimensions, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue obtained the highest ratings, reflecting consistent efforts to maintain positive interpersonal relationships, uphold organizational harmony, and actively participate in school governance. In contrast, altruism and conscientiousness, while still highly rated, were relatively lower, suggesting that individualized assistance and exceeding formal task requirements are practiced with slightly less consistency.

These findings suggest that school leaders prioritize relational and organizational stability as key components of their leadership practice. High levels of courtesy and civic virtue indicate a leadership approach grounded in collaboration, mutual respect, and shared responsibility- factors that are essential for fostering trust and collective engagement within schools. Such behaviors contribute to a supportive environment where teachers are more likely to participate in and sustain school improvement initiatives.

From a theoretical standpoint, OCB has been consistently linked to enhanced organizational effectiveness, particularly in educational settings where collaboration and discretionary effort are critical (Podsakoff et al., 2014). In schools, leaders who model these behaviors help establish norms of cooperation and professionalism, which in turn facilitate smoother implementation of instructional and administrative reforms.

However, the slightly lower emphasis on altruism points to an important note. While leaders are highly committed to maintaining organizational harmony, the extent to which they engage in individualized, extra-role support for teachers may vary. This distinction is significant because personalized support has been shown to directly influence teacher motivation and instructional improvement (Somech & Oplatka, 2015).

These findings are consistent with existing research in the Philippine setting. Abun et al. (2021) found that Filipino educational leaders tend to exhibit stronger expressions of courtesy and civic virtue compared to other OCB dimensions, reflecting cultural values that emphasize interpersonal harmony and collective responsibility. This cultural orientation reinforces the role of OCB as a stabilizing force in schools, particularly in high-pressure contexts such as national assessments.

The results indicate that Organizational Citizenship Behavior among school leaders is consistently strong, particularly in maintaining a positive organizational climate. Strengthening altruistic practices may further enhance leadership responsiveness by ensuring that support extends not only to the organization as a whole but also to the specific instructional needs of individual teachers.

Table III. School leaders’ instructional leadership orientation.

INDICATORS	MEAN	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Developing the school learning climate	4.561	Always	Exceptionally oriented
Defining the school mission	4.515	Always	Exceptionally oriented
Managing the instructional program	4.450	Often	Highly oriented
Instructional Leadership Orientation	4.508	Always	Exceptionally oriented

Table III indicates that school leaders exhibit a very high level of Instructional Leadership Orientation (M = 4.508), reflecting a consistent emphasis on guiding teaching and learning processes. Among the dimensions, developing the school learning climate and defining the school mission obtained the highest ratings, suggesting that leaders are particularly strong in establishing a shared vision and fostering a supportive, achievement-oriented environment. In contrast, managing the instructional program, while still highly rated, showed relatively lower consistency, indicating less frequent direct engagement in instructional supervision and curriculum alignment.

These findings point to a leadership profile that is strong in strategic and cultural dimensions but comparatively less intensive in technical instructional management. The high emphasis on mission-setting and school climate suggests that leaders are effective in articulating goals and building environments conducive to learning. However, the relatively lower focus on managing the instructional program highlights a critical distinction between leading instruction conceptually and managing it operationally.

This distinction is significant because research consistently shows that direct involvement in instructional processes- such as classroom observation, feedback, and curriculum monitoring- has a stronger and more immediate impact on teaching quality and student outcomes (Hallinger, 2018; Robinson et al., 2008). While vision-setting provides direction, it is the systematic supervision of instruction that translates these goals into improved classroom practices.

In relation to the division’s performance context, this pattern suggests that while school leaders have established clear goals and supportive environments, the consistent execution and monitoring of instructional practices may require further strengthening. This may help explain why performance gaps persist despite high levels of leadership orientation, as improvement depends not only on clarity of direction but also on the quality of instructional implementation.

Recent studies further reinforce this interpretation. Liu and Hallinger (2020) emphasize that the impact of instructional leadership is most pronounced when leaders actively engage in managing teaching and learning processes, rather than focusing solely on vision and climate. Similarly, Leithwood et al. (2020) highlight that successful school leadership involves the integration of both strategic direction and instructional oversight, with the latter playing a crucial role in sustaining improvement efforts.

In the Philippine setting, leadership practices often emphasize relationship-building and vision-setting; however, strengthening instructional supervision has been identified as a continuing priority for improving learning outcomes. This underscores the need for a more balanced leadership approach that combines strong organizational direction with consistent, data-informed instructional management.

The findings suggest that while instructional leadership among school leaders is exceptionally strong in orientation, enhancing the technical aspects of instructional supervision may further improve the effectiveness of leadership practices in addressing national assessment performance gaps.

Table IV. School leaders’ level of administrative support responsiveness in national assessments.

INDICATORS	MEAN	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Intervention implementation	4.496	Always	Exceptionally responsive
Data-informed decision making	4.479	Always	Exceptionally responsive
Monitoring and sustainability	4.465	Always	Exceptionally responsive
Administrative Support Responsiveness in National Assessments	4.480	Always	Exceptionally responsive

Table IV shows that school leaders demonstrate a very high level of Administrative Support Responsiveness ($M = 4.480$), indicating consistent and proactive engagement in actions following national assessment results. Among the indicators, intervention implementation obtained the highest rating, followed closely by data-informed decision-making, while monitoring and sustainability, although still high, showed relatively lower consistency.

These findings suggest that school leaders are particularly effective in initiating immediate responses to assessment outcomes, especially through the implementation of targeted interventions and data-driven planning. This reflects a leadership approach that prioritizes action and responsiveness once performance gaps are identified. However, the slightly lower emphasis on monitoring and sustainability indicates that the continuity and long-term evaluation of these interventions may not be as consistently practiced as their initial implementation.

Conceptually, Administrative Support Responsiveness extends beyond traditional leadership constructs by focusing specifically on the translation of assessment data into sustained administrative action. While instructional leadership emphasizes vision-setting and supervision, and resource enablement focuses on capacity provision, ASR captures the extent to which leaders act on evidence, implement interventions, and ensure their continuity over time. In this sense, it represents a more action-oriented and outcome-linked dimension of leadership practice.

The pattern observed in this study aligns with research on data-driven decision-making, which highlights that the effectiveness of assessment systems depends largely on how leaders interpret and apply data to guide improvement efforts (Datnow & Park, 2018; Schildkamp, 2019; Magdato et al., 2025). Leaders who actively engage in data use are more likely to implement relevant interventions; however, sustaining these efforts requires ongoing monitoring, feedback, and adjustment mechanisms.

Recent studies further emphasize the importance of this distinction. Prenger and Schildkamp (2018) found that while many schools demonstrate strong initial use of data for planning, fewer sustain systematic monitoring processes over time, limiting long-term impact. Similarly, Mandinach and Gummer (2016) highlight that transforming data into “actionable knowledge” requires not only technical skills but also organizational routines that support continuous evaluation and refinement.

In the local context, school leaders are increasingly encouraged to adopt data-informed practices through national policies and accountability systems. However, challenges in sustaining interventions- such as resource constraints and competing administrative demands- may affect the consistency of long-term monitoring efforts. This reinforces the need to strengthen not only responsiveness in action but also the institutionalization of feedback and sustainability mechanisms.

These results indicate that Administrative Support Responsiveness among school leaders is highly proactive but slightly implementation-heavy, with stronger emphasis on immediate intervention than on sustained monitoring. Enhancing long-term evaluation practices may further improve the effectiveness of leadership responses to national assessment results.

Table V. Correlation of resource enablement capacity, organizational citizenship behavior, and instructional leadership orientation on administrative support responsiveness of school leaders in national assessments.

Independent Variables	Pearson Coefficient (r- value)	Probability (p- value)
Instructional Leadership Orientation	0.733	0.000**
Managing the instructional program	0.725	0.000**
Defining the school mission	0.706	0.000**
Developing the school learning climate	0.665	0.000**
Resource Enablement Capacity	0.658	0.000**
Resource allocation support	0.651	0.000**
Instructional resource provision	0.637	0.000**
Intervention resource coordination	0.618	0.000**
Professional support enablement	0.580	0.000**
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	0.656	0.000**
Conscientiousness	0.628	0.000**
Altruism	0.613	0.000**
Civic virtue	0.611	0.000**
Sportsmanship	0.586	0.000**
Courtesy	0.583	0.000**

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

Table V presents the relationships between Instructional Leadership Orientation (ILO), Resource Enablement Capacity (RE), Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), and Administrative Support Responsiveness (ASR). The results reveal strong and statistically significant positive correlations among all variables ($p < 0.01$), indicating that higher levels of leadership competencies are consistently associated with greater administrative responsiveness to national assessment outcomes.

Among the variables, Instructional Leadership Orientation shows the strongest relationship with administrative responsiveness ($r = 0.733$), particularly through managing the instructional program. This suggests that leaders who are more actively engaged in supervising instruction, aligning curriculum, and monitoring teaching practices are more likely to translate assessment data into concrete and timely administrative actions. This reinforces the central role of instructional leadership as a direct driver of school improvement processes.

Resource Enablement Capacity and Organizational Citizenship Behavior also demonstrate strong positive relationships with administrative responsiveness. These findings indicate that leadership effectiveness is not solely dependent on instructional expertise but is also supported by the availability of resources and the presence of voluntary, collaborative behaviors within the organization. In this sense, responsiveness emerges as a product of both structural capacity and relational dynamics.

Taken together, the results suggest a complementary leadership model, where instructional leadership provides direction, resource enablement ensures the means for implementation, and organizational citizenship behavior sustains cooperation and commitment. The convergence of these factors creates conditions that enable school leaders to respond more effectively to assessment data.

These findings are consistent with existing literature emphasizing that instructional leadership has a significant influence on school performance through its impact on teaching and organizational processes (Sebastian et al., 2019). Similarly, Datnow and Park (2018) and Magdato et al. (2025) highlight that effective data use in schools

depends on leadership practices that support both professional learning and resource alignment. Leithwood et al. (2020) further argue that successful school leadership involves the integration of multiple practices that collectively contribute to improved student outcomes.

Recent empirical studies further support the interconnected nature of these leadership variables. For instance, a study by Sun and Leithwood (2020) found that instructional leadership significantly enhances teachers’ data use practices, particularly when supported by collaborative structures and adequate resources. Their findings suggest that leaders who actively guide instructional processes while fostering professional collaboration create stronger conditions for evidence-based decision-making. This reinforces the present results, where instructional leadership, resource enablement, and organizational citizenship behavior collectively contribute to higher levels of administrative responsiveness.

The strong correlations observed in this study underscore that administrative responsiveness is not an isolated leadership function but rather the result of interconnected competencies that operate simultaneously to support data-informed school improvement.

Table VI. Regression analysis of variables that best predict administrative support responsiveness of school leaders in national assessments.

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	0.893	0.200		4.468	0.000
Instructional Leadership Orientation					
Managing the instructional program	0.275	0.075	0.312	3.655	0.000
Defining the school mission	0.183	0.084	0.185	2.170	0.031
Resource Enablement Capacity					
Resource allocation support	0.195	0.051	0.223	3.788	0.000
Organizational Citizenship Behavior					
Altruism	0.154	0.048	0.178	3.182	0.002
R= 0.782		R ² = 0.612		F= 88.647	
p-value= 0.000					

Table VI presents the results of the multiple regression analysis identifying the predictors of Administrative Support Responsiveness (ASR). The model explains a substantial proportion of variance (R² = 0.612), indicating that the combined influence of Instructional Leadership Orientation (ILO), Resource Enablement Capacity (RE), and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) provides a strong explanatory framework for understanding leadership responsiveness in the context of national assessments. The overall model is statistically significant (F = 88.647, p = 0.000), decisively rejecting the null hypothesis that no predictor variable exists for school leaders’ responsiveness.

Several predictors emerged as significant contributors to administrative responsiveness. Within the domain of Instructional Leadership Orientation, Managing the instructional program (B=0.275, β=0.312, p=0.000) and Defining the school mission (B=0.183, β=0.185, p=0.031) were significant. From Resource Enablement Capacity, Resource allocation support (B=0.195, β=0.223, p=0.000) was a highly significant predictor. Finally, from the Organizational Citizenship Behavior domain, Altruism (B=0.154, β=0.178, p=0.002) also emerged as a significant predictor. Using these unstandardized coefficients, the equation useful in predicting the Administrative Support Responsiveness (Y) of school leaders is illustrated as follows:

$$Y = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4$$

$$Y = 0.893 + 0.275X_1 + 0.183X_2 + 0.195X_3 + 0.154X_4$$

Where:

Y = Administrative Support Responsiveness

X₁ = Managing the instructional program

X₂ = Defining the school mission

X₃ = Resource allocation support

X₄ = Altruism

Among the predictors, managing the instructional program emerged as the strongest contributor to administrative responsiveness. This finding highlights the critical role of direct instructional supervision, suggesting that leaders who actively monitor teaching practices, analyze performance data, and provide instructional feedback are more likely to implement effective and timely interventions. This supports the argument that leadership impact is most pronounced when it is closely connected to classroom-level processes (Hallinger, 2018).

Resource allocation support was identified as the second most significant predictor, underscoring the importance of aligning financial and material resources with identified learning needs. This indicates that responsiveness is not only a function of instructional expertise but also of a leader's ability to ensure that necessary resources are strategically distributed to support intervention efforts.

Notably, altruism also emerged as a significant predictor, emphasizing the role of voluntary, extra-role behaviors in enhancing leadership effectiveness. This suggests that beyond formal responsibilities, leaders who extend individualized support and demonstrate a willingness to assist teachers contribute meaningfully to the successful implementation of school improvement initiatives. This aligns with findings that organizational citizenship behaviors enhance adaptability and collective problem-solving within educational settings (Podsakoff et al., 2014).

Defining the school mission, while less influential than the other predictors, remains a significant factor, indicating that clarity of direction continues to play a supporting role in guiding responsive actions. However, its relatively lower contribution compared to instructional management suggests that execution-oriented practices have a more immediate impact on responsiveness than purely strategic or vision-setting functions.

Taken together, the results point to a leadership model where technical instructional management, supported by resource alignment and reinforced by relational commitment, drives effective administrative responsiveness. This reinforces the idea that improving school performance in national assessments requires not only clear goals but also strong implementation mechanisms and a culture of collaborative support.

These findings are consistent with existing research emphasizing that instructional leadership directly influences student outcomes through its impact on teaching practices (Philip Hallinger, 2018; Kenneth Leithwood et al., 2020). Similarly, studies on data use highlight that responsiveness is strengthened when leaders provide both the structural support and professional conditions necessary for translating data into action (Datnow & Park, 2018; Schildkamp, 2019; Magdato et al., 2025).

These regression results demonstrate that Administrative Support Responsiveness in national assessment of school leaders is primarily driven by what leaders do in practice- particularly in managing instruction- supported by resources and strengthened by a culture of voluntary commitment. This positions technical instructional leadership as the central mechanism through which data-informed school improvement is realized.

SUMMARY

This study primarily aimed to determine the relationship between Instructional Leadership Orientation (ILO), Resource Enablement Capacity (RE), and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) on the Administrative Support Responsiveness (ASR) of school leaders in national assessments in the Division of Valencia City. Specifically, it sought to assess the levels of resource enablement capacity, organizational citizenship behavior, instructional leadership orientation, and administrative support responsiveness; examine the relationships among these variables; and identify which factors best predict administrative responsiveness.

The study employed a quantitative, non-experimental descriptive-correlational research design. A total of 230 school leaders, composed of school heads, master teachers, program holders, and teachers with leadership roles, served as respondents. They were selected through convenience sampling during School Year 2025–2026. Data were gathered using validated and highly reliable survey instruments measuring the four variables, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.975 to 0.979. Statistical tools used included mean, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, and Multiple Regression Analysis.

Findings revealed that school leaders demonstrated a high level of resource enablement capacity ($M = 4.403$), with professional support enablement rated highest. Organizational citizenship behavior was also highly manifested ($M = 4.488$), particularly in courtesy and sportsmanship. Instructional leadership orientation was exceptionally high ($M = 4.508$), with strong emphasis on developing school learning climate and defining the school mission. Administrative support responsiveness was likewise exceptionally high ($M = 4.480$), with intervention implementation as the most evident indicator.

Correlation analysis showed significant positive relationships between instructional leadership orientation ($r = 0.733$), resource enablement capacity ($r = 0.658$), and organizational citizenship behavior ($r = 0.656$) with administrative support responsiveness ($p < 0.01$). Regression analysis further identified that managing the instructional program, resource allocation support, defining the school mission, and altruism significantly predicted administrative responsiveness, collectively explaining 61.2% of its variance ($R^2 = 0.612$).

The study established that administrative support responsiveness in national assessments is strongly influenced by a combination of instructional leadership practices, resource management capacity, and organizational citizenship behaviors, with instructional leadership emerging as the strongest contributing factor.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the study concludes that school leaders in the Division of Valencia City demonstrate strong leadership capacity across instructional, resource, and behavioral domains, which collectively contribute to high levels of administrative responsiveness to national assessments.

Resource enablement is highly evident among school leaders, particularly in professional support provision, indicating a strong commitment to human capital development. However, coordination of long-term and system-wide interventions requires further strengthening to ensure sustained implementation of improvement programs.

Organizational citizenship behavior is deeply embedded in school leadership practice, with high levels of courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue reinforcing a collaborative and harmonious school environment. This cultural strength supports collective action in addressing assessment-related challenges, although individualized supportive behaviors such as altruism may be further enhanced.

Instructional leadership orientation is exceptionally strong in vision-building and climate development. However, the relatively lower emphasis on managing instructional programs suggests a need for more consistent instructional supervision and curriculum monitoring to directly improve teaching and learning outcomes.

Administrative support responsiveness is highly manifested, particularly in immediate intervention implementation and data-informed decision-making. Nevertheless, sustaining these interventions through systematic monitoring and long-term evaluation remains an area for improvement.

The study confirms that managing the instructional program is the strongest predictor of administrative responsiveness, highlighting the central role of technical instructional leadership. This is complemented by resource allocation support and altruistic behaviors, which together reinforce effective, data-driven school improvement practices.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions drawn from this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

Strengthen Instructional Supervision Capacity. School divisions may provide targeted training programs for school leaders focusing on managing instructional programs, including classroom observation, curriculum alignment, and data-driven instructional feedback based on assessment (e.g. NAT and ELLNA) results.

Enhance Coordination of School-Based Interventions. Schools may institutionalize structured mechanisms for intervention coordination involving internal and external stakeholders to ensure sustained implementation and alignment of resources with identified learning gaps.

Promote Altruistic Leadership Practices. School leaders and teachers may be encouraged to further develop altruistic behaviors through recognition systems and collaborative professional cultures that support voluntary assistance and peer mentoring.

Institutionalize Monitoring and Sustainability Systems. The Schools Division Office may strengthen monitoring frameworks that track the long-term effectiveness of interventions, ensuring that improvements in student performance are sustained over time rather than short-term gains.

Integrate Holistic Leadership Development Programs. A comprehensive leadership development framework may be adopted, integrating instructional leadership, resource management, and organizational citizenship behavior to produce well-rounded school leaders capable of data-responsive governance.

Policy Enhancement for Data-Driven School Improvement. Educational policymakers may consider reinforcing policies that promote systematic use of assessment data in planning, implementation, and evaluation processes at the school level.

REFERENCES

1. Abdul-Azeez, N. S., Ihechere, C., & Idemudia, S. (2024). Data-driven analytics for enhancing strategic decision-making in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration and Management*.
2. Abun, D., et al. (2021). Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment of administrators in Philippine higher education institutions. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*.
3. Aguila, S. et al. (2020). Employment, Skills and Work-Related Values of Engineering Graduates from a Philippine Institution of Higher Learning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 7(4), 1–10.
4. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)*. Mind Garden.
5. Darling-Hammond, L., et al. (2023). Professional development as a critical resource for school resilience and improvement. Learning Policy Institute.
6. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
7. Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2018). *Professional collaboration with purpose: Teacher learning towards equitable and excellent schools*. Routledge.
8. Deala, M. & Lopez, E. (2024). School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Implementation and its Impact on the Personal and Professional Development among Elementary Teachers. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 21(3), 253-265. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12536356>
9. Department of Education. (2016). *The Learning Action Cell as a K to 12 Basic Education Program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning* (DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016).
10. Department of Education. (2024). *Results of the fiscal year 2023 national qualifying examination for school heads (NQESH)*
11. Doğan, S., & Demirbolat, A. O. (2021). The role of data usage culture in school improvement. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*.
12. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
13. Fullan, M. (2020). *The skinny on change leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

14. Hallinger, P. (1982). Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS).
15. Hallinger, P. (2015). The evolution of instructional leadership. In L. W. Leithwood & K. Seashore Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational leadership and management* (pp. 221–239). Routledge.
16. Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652>
17. Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all. Corwin.
18. Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). School leadership and the pandemic: Moving from reactive to proactive governance. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 243–247.
19. Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (1997). *The road to open schools: The organizational health inventory*. Corwin Press.
20. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
21. Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2020). Principal instructional leadership, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher professional learning in China: Testing a mediated-effects model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(4), 501–528.
22. Magdato, G. R. C., Orongan, R. C., Caro, V. B., & Escarlos, G. S. (2025). Collaborative leadership capacity, data-driven decision-making capability, and socio-emotional competence on strategic foresight of school leaders. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(5), 2453–2465. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25may1448>
23. Mandinach, E. B., & Gummer, E. S. (2016). *Data literacy for educators: Making it count in teacher preparation and practice*. Teachers College Press.
24. OECD. (2020). *TALIS 2018 Results (Volume II): Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals*. OECD Publishing.
25. Podsakoff, P. M., et al. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142.
26. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2014). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 1–47.
27. Poortman, C. L., & Schildkamp, K. (2016). Solving student achievement problems with a data use intervention. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 60, 425–433.
28. Prenger, R., & Schildkamp, K. (2018). Data-based decision making for teacher and student learning: A psychological perspective on the role of the teacher. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 56, 63–71.
29. Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674.
30. Rohrbeck, R., & Kum, M. E. (2018). Corporate foresight and its impact on firm performance: A longitudinal analysis. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 129, 105–116.
31. Schildkamp, K. (2019). Data-based decision-making for school improvement: Research insights and gaps. *Educational Research*, 61(3), 257–273.
32. Sebastian, J., et al. (2019). The role of school leadership in supporting the instructional program. *Journal of Educational Administration*.
33. Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.
34. Somech, A., & Oplatka, I. (2015). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools: Examining the impact and opportunities within educational systems. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51(3), 1–31.
35. Spillane, J. P. (2017). *Leadership and learning: The administrative practice*. Harvard Education Press.
36. Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2020). Direction-setting school leadership practices: A meta-analytical review of evidence about their influence. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 31(3), 1–24.