

# Strategic Planning Quality, Innovation Practices, and Networking Strategies on the Resource Mobilization Capability of School Leaders

Dr. Zyra B. Andoy<sup>1</sup>, Dr. James L. Paglinawan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Education, Division of Bukidnon, Sumpong, Malaybalay City, Bukidnon, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Department of Professional Education, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Maramag Bukidnon, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400577>

Received: 23 April 2026; Accepted: 29 April 2026; Published: 19 May 2026

## ABSTRACT

This study investigated the impact of strategic planning quality, innovation practices, and networking strategies on the resource mobilization capability of 501 school leaders in Region 10, Philippines, during the 2025-2026 school year. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational research design, the study sought to address the persistent challenges of chronic funding gaps and classroom shortages that hinder the delivery of high-quality education.

Findings revealed that school leaders exhibit high strategic planning quality (mean=4.16) and innovation practices (mean=4.13), with their greatest strengths lying in monitoring progress and modelling transparency. Furthermore, networking strategies (mean=4.28) and resource mobilization capability (mean=4.23) were practiced at "very high" levels, indicating exceptional skills in responsiveness to change and effective resource utilization. Statistical analysis demonstrated a highly significant positive correlation ( $p < 0.01$ ) between all examined leadership practices and the capability to mobilize resources.

Multiple regression analysis identified five critical predictors of resource mobilization: resource linking strategies, active engagement, modelling and transparency, monitoring and continuous improvement, and trust-building. Notably, resource linking emerged as the most potent predictor of success. The study concludes that fostering an innovative leadership culture and intentional networking are essential for securing the financial, material, and social resources necessary to bridge gaps in public funding. These results provide a vital roadmap for targeted leadership development programs aimed at enhancing school sustainability and educational outcomes.

## INTRODUCTION

Educational leaders today work in environments with limited resources and constant changes, yet they are expected to sustain school improvement, expand learning opportunities, and respond to diverse stakeholder expectations. In many primary and secondary schools, especially in developing and under-resourced areas, formal budgets and government allocations often fall short of covering basic infrastructure, learning materials, and support services. In the Philippines, the Department of Education estimates a classroom shortage of around 159,000 to 165,000 classrooms. This shortfall requires hundreds of billions of pesos to address, while current capital outlay can only finance a small portion of the necessary construction (GMA News Online, 2023; Cariaso, 2025). If this continues, the gap between what schools need and what they have will only grow wider, making it even harder for school leaders to provide a high-quality education unless they develop better ways to find and manage resources. This ongoing gap shows that public funding alone cannot meet the needs of school infrastructure. School leaders must rely more on careful planning, innovation, and networks to gather financial, material, and social resources for quality education. This makes resource mobilization a critical part of today's school leadership.

School leaders face several significant challenges in resource management. These include a lack of funds and delays in receiving them, poor financial management skills, low stakeholder involvement, bureaucratic constraints on decision-making, and heavy administrative workloads. All of these issues prevent leaders from

effectively acquiring and distributing resources, especially in underfunded schools. As a result, schools often deal with poor infrastructure, teacher shortages, and negative impacts on student learning. Leaders find it hard to secure external funding, engage with their communities, or address urgent needs, all while dealing with fluctuating government budgets and competition for scarce resources. Despite policies that encourage partnerships, social mobilization, and school-based management, many school heads struggle to move beyond simple compliance and routine budgeting to proactive resource mobilization. Studies across various developing contexts reveal that principals often report limited knowledge of resource mobilization, weak skills in proposal writing and partnership building, and low stakeholder participation. These challenges limit their ability to meet increasing educational demands (Melese, 2022; Sadiki & Mugenyi, 2025).

A study by Sadiki and Mugenyi (2025) also finds that school managers struggle with resource mobilization. It notes that internal financial strategies are lacking, especially in fee-free education settings where government funds are insufficient for essential facilities. This situation forces schools to rely on uncertain supplementary measures and ad hoc fundraising rather than on systematic, capability-based approaches to generate and use resources. These findings suggest that equipping school leaders to mobilize resources—rather than just increasing allocations—might be crucial for sustaining educational programs in challenging environments (Mkhize & Ndwandwe, 2024).

In the context of basic education in the Philippines, remote and marginalized schools still face shortages of functional libraries, laboratories, learning resources, and trained personnel. School leaders encounter several serious challenges, including chronic funding gaps and delays, limited financial management skills, low stakeholder involvement, bureaucratic constraints on decisions, and heavy administrative workloads. These issues hinder leaders from effectively acquiring and distributing resources. In underfunded and isolated schools, this results in poor infrastructure, teacher shortages, and negative impacts on student learning (Clarito et al., 2025). If these leadership capability gaps go unaddressed, under-resourced schools will likely continue to face chronic deficiencies in facilities, materials, and support. Broader efforts to improve learning outcomes may suffer because school leaders cannot mobilize the resources their schools need.

The quality of strategic planning in educational leadership involves a careful process in which school leaders define clear missions and visions, assess needs, prioritize goals, and create actionable strategies for resource allocation and engagement to achieve long-term educational outcomes (Bagano & De Guzman, 2024). High-quality planning emphasizes evidence-informed decision-making, alignment with organizational values, and monitoring systems that allow adjustments to changing conditions. This enables leaders to turn broad goals into concrete plans that maximize limited resources and support school improvement (Verano et al., 2024).

The innovation practices of school leaders involve strategically using new teaching, management, and technology approaches to improve schools and adapt to changing educational environments (Chafa & Ncube, 2025). These practices include promoting collaborative problem-solving, adopting emerging technologies such as data analytics, and fostering inclusive cultures that support curriculum redesign for 21st-century skills. Leadership innovation has become especially important in the context of K–12 reforms. School heads are expected to lead data-driven initiatives, reorganize existing resources, and co-design solutions with stakeholders to tackle learning losses and equity gaps (Koh et al., 2023).

Networking strategies involve building intentional relationships with parents, teachers, students, local governments, non-government organizations, and community groups to support educational goals and implement programs. The effectiveness of these strategies is evident through active participation, open communication, shared responsibility, and pooling resources. This transforms routine involvement into meaningful partnerships. Recent studies highlight that such networks are critical for breaking down barriers in governance and ensuring fair resource distribution in underfunded educational settings—especially where government assistance alone cannot meet growing demands (Lopez & Bauyot, 2025).

The quality of strategic planning, innovation practices, and networking strategies should work together to mobilize resources effectively. Effective strategic planning helps leaders identify priorities and develop targeted strategies for acquiring resources. At the same time, innovation practices enhance this by

reconfiguring existing resources and introducing new partnership models that diversify funding sources. The leadership efforts involved in building and managing stakeholder networks connect these elements by fostering collaborative resource sharing. Strong relationships with parents, communities, and external partners can enhance the execution of strategic plans and innovative projects (Lopez & Bauyot, 2025; Chafa & Ncube, 2025; Tayanés et al., 2025).

Studies on the strategic planning practices of secondary school heads in Baguio City have shown that participatory planning with stakeholders significantly enhances resource allocation and improves school management effectiveness (Luyosen & Gawaen, 2025). Another study on stakeholder involvement in school-based programs at Mapula National High School in Davao City revealed that active collaboration among administrators, teachers, parents, and communities boosts resource mobilization and program sustainability (Lopez & Bauyot, 2025).

Additionally, an investigation into resource availability and mobilization in remote schools in Palawan found that community support and the optimization of human resources—through effective stakeholder networks—predict successful resource mobilization despite geographic challenges (Clarito et al., 2025). However, these existing studies typically examine strategic planning, innovation, or stakeholder involvement separately. They focus on specific programs or locations and mainly use descriptive and qualitative methods. Very few have treated resource mobilization capability as a separate leadership factor. Even fewer have tested how the quality of strategic planning, innovation practices, and networking strategies work together to predict this capability in the Philippine basic education. None have examined these three areas together in public schools in Region 10, where school heads need to implement K–12 reforms and manage learning recovery with limited funding.

At the policy level, the Department of Education emphasizes the need for partnerships, social mobilization, and networking to support schools. Initiatives like Brigada Eskwela put this expectation into practice by requiring schools to use formal resource mobilization forms and tasking Social Mobilization and Networking units with coordinating volunteers, donations, and partnerships to supplement limited school resources (DM 42 s. 2025). Yet without a clear, evidence-based understanding of which leadership capabilities—strategic planning quality, innovation practices, or networking strategies—most strongly enhance resource mobilization capability, leadership development programs may end up being generic and fragmented. Social mobilization efforts might not address the real needs and capacities of school heads.

Given this situation, this study examines how the levels of strategic planning quality, innovation practices, and networking strategies influence the resource mobilization capability of school leaders in the school divisions of Region 10 for the school year 2025–2026. The findings are expected to guide school divisions and leadership development programs in designing focused interventions and training that strengthen school leaders' capacity to mobilize resources, foster strategic and innovative school environments, and build networks that improve outcomes for students, staff, and schools.

### **Statement of the Problem**

This study assessed the resource mobilization capability of school leaders in strategic quality planning, innovation practices, and networking strategies for the school year 2025–2026 in Region 10. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What level of strategic planning quality do school leaders integrate in terms of:
  - a. SMART goal setting;
  - b. data-driven decision making;
  - c. strategic resource alignment; and
  - b. monitoring and continuous improvement?

2. What level of innovation practices do school leaders show concerning the following:
  - a. participative leadership;
  - b. active engagement;
  - c. resource facilitation; and
  - d. modelling and transparency?
3. What level of networking strategies do school leaders demonstrate in the following aspect:
  - a. communication strategies;
  - b. collaboration engagement strategies;
  - c. trust-building strategies; and
  - d. responsiveness strategies; and
  - e. resource linking strategies?
4. What level of resource mobilization capability do school leaders have, considering the following dimension:
  - a. resource identification capacity;
  - b. resource organization skills;
  - c. resource coordination ability; and
  - d. resource utilization effectiveness?
5. Is there a significant relationship that exists between the resource mobilization capability of school leaders and:
  - a. Strategic Planning Quality
  - b. Innovation practices
  - c. Networking strategies
6. Which of the variables, singly or in combination, best predict the resource mobilization capability of school leaders?

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

The study used a descriptive–correlational research design to identify and forecast how variables are associated in the real world, without any effort by the researcher to modify them or infer causation between them.

The descriptive design was used to define strategic planning quality, innovation practices, and networking strategies in relation to school leaders' resource mobilization capability. Pearson's correlation was utilized to determine the relationship between independent and dependent variables.

## Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in selected public schools across Region 10 (Northern Mindanao), Philippines. While the region is geographically composed of five provinces and two highly urbanized cities, the study was specifically delimited to the nine (9) Schools Division Offices (SDOs) that granted administrative approval within the research timeline. These specific divisions include: Division of Bukidnon, Division of Cagayan de Oro City, Division of El Salvador City, Division of Iligan City, Division of Lanao del Norte, Division of Malaybalay City, Division of Misamis Oriental, Division of Oroquieta City, and Division of Valencia City.

These public schools represent a wide range of contexts from bustling urban centers to remote rural communities, each with its own unique challenges and opportunities. By focusing on these schools, the study sought to understand how school leaders navigate resource mobilization through strategic planning, innovative practices, and stakeholder networks in environments that often demand creativity and resilience.

The selected locale reflects the dynamic realities of public education in Northern Mindanao, where schools are deeply rooted in their communities and often rely on partnerships with parents, local government units, and civic organizations to sustain programs and initiatives. Furthermore, the region's diversity—spanning upland, coastal, and city-based schools—offers a rich perspective on how different contexts shape leadership practices, making these nine divisions a fitting locale to explore the intersection of strategic planning, innovation, and collaboration.

## Respondents of the Study

A total sample size of 501 respondents was drawn from the population of 1,771 using proportionate stratified random sampling, wherein each SDO served as a stratum and received a share of the sample that was proportional to its number of school leaders of the school year 2025-2026.

## Research Instrument

This study used an adapted questionnaire to ensure its relevance to the research context while maintaining integrity to the original framework. Permission was obtained from the original authors before modifying and using the instruments to uphold ethical standards and respect for intellectual property. The questionnaire underwent validation by three experts in the field who hold a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Educational Administration. Their feedback was incorporated to improve clarity and relevance before pilot-testing.

Pilot-testing was conducted with 30 school leaders in Region 11 outside Region 10. This process helped identify issues related to clarity and comprehension, allowing necessary revisions before full implementation. Reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha confirmed high internal consistency with an overall reliability coefficient of 0.996. The Strategic Quality Planning questionnaire obtained a Cronbach's alpha of 0.986, the Innovation Practices had a reliability coefficient of 0.985, the Networking Strategies questionnaire showed a reliability coefficient of 0.987, and the Resource Mobilization Capability possessed a Cronbach's alpha of 0.987. Thus, this result indicates that the instruments were reliable for measuring the intended construct in the study. The strategic planning quality of school leaders survey questionnaire was patterned from Larche, P. (2025). Strategic planning quality is operationalized as the extent to which school leaders consistently carry out core strategic planning behaviors. The questionnaire for Innovation practices was adapted from the study by De Jong et al. (2020), titled Leadership practices in collaborative innovation: A study among Dutch school principals. Educational Management Administration & Leadership. The Networking strategies questionnaire was patterned from the study of Wango et al. (2025), The Impact of Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships on Educational Outcomes: A Case of East Africa. The resource mobilization capability of school leaders will be assessed using the research by Clarito et al. (2025), "Availability and Mobilization of Resources in Far-Flung Schools in Selected PALMA Areas."

## Data Gathering Procedure

Before the conduct of data gathering, the researcher secured the necessary permissions and approvals. Approval was first obtained from the Regional Director (RD) of DepEd Region X, followed by authorization

from the Schools Division Superintendents of the fourteen divisions within the region. In addition, a research permit was secured from the Research Ethics Committee of Central Mindanao University. Upon obtaining all required clearances, the researcher proceeded with the distribution of questionnaires to the respondents. The accomplished instruments were then collected, organized, and subjected to summarization, analysis, and interpretation.

Participation in the study was voluntary and non-compulsory; this was reiterated during the distribution of the instrument. Participants were informed of the study’s objectives, procedures, and their rights, including the freedom to withdraw at any stage without prejudice. The researcher guarantees that all information obtained will be treated with the highest level of confidentiality, in strict compliance with Republic Act No. 10173, otherwise known as the Data Privacy Act of 2012. The respondents received the questionnaires and rated them according to their perceptions.

The researcher personally distributed and collected completed questionnaires, and the data gathered is used solely for academic purposes, specifically for the analysis, discussion of findings, and formulation of recommendations and conclusions.

### Data Analysis

Descriptive statistical measures, such as mean, were used to analyze respondents' responses to the first four research questions concerning school leaders' strategic quality planning, innovation practices, networking strategies, and resource mobilization capability. The fifth research question used Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis to determine the relationship between independent and dependent variables. Multiple regression analysis was applied to identify the variables that predicted research practices in the sixth research question.

### Ethical Consideration

This research adheres to established ethical guidelines, ensuring that all participants from the Northern Mindanao region provide informed consent before data collection. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents were assured of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without facing any consequences. To safeguard respondent privacy and confidentiality, the study implemented strict data anonymization procedures and secure storage protocols for all research materials. As emphasized by Ali, Ndubuisi, Obiorah, Aku, Nesiam, Agbakhamen, and Okoro (2025), maintaining ethical standards not only protects participants but also enhances the credibility and societal relevance of research findings. Additionally, a permit from the Research Ethics Committee (REC) of Central Mindanao University was obtained before initiating the data gathering process.

## RESULTS

The succeeding discussions below present the study's results. Data were presented using tables to facilitate a clear discussion of the results.

### Strategic Quality Planning of the School Leaders

Table 1 presents the summary of the strategic planning quality of school leaders in Region 10. It can be gleaned that school leaders demonstrate generally high strategic planning quality, with an overall mean of 4.16, interpreted as High Quality.

INDICATOR	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Monitoring and Continuous Improvement	4.33	Very High Quality
SMART Goal Setting	4.14	High Quality
Data-Driven Decision Making	4.12	High Quality
Strategic Resource Alignment	4.04	High Quality
<b>OVERALL MEAN</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>High Quality</b>

Among the four dimensions, Monitoring and Continuous Improvement records the highest mean of 4.33 and is the only one interpreted as Very High Quality, indicating that leaders in Region 10 are strongest in using monitoring, evaluation, feedback, and regular adjustments to keep their strategic plans alive and responsive. SMART Goal Setting with a mean of 4.14, Data-Driven Decision Making with a mean of 4.12, and Strategic Resource Alignment having a mean of 4.04 are all rated high, suggesting that while leaders often set clear, measurable goals, use data in decision making, and align resources with priorities, these practices are slightly less developed than their monitoring and continuous-improvement efforts.

The result implies that school leaders already have a strong overall culture of strategic planning, but its greatest strength lies in what happens after plans are written. The very high rating for Monitoring and Continuous Improvement suggests that leaders are highly committed to tracking implementation, learning from results, and adjusting strategies over time; this means strategic plans are likely to be used actively rather than treated as compliance documents, which is favorable for sustained school improvement and accountability. In contrast, the slightly lower, though still high, means for SMART Goal Setting, Data-Driven Decision Making, and Strategic Resource Alignment indicate that the challenging elements of planning (crafting very clear, measurable goals, consistently basing decisions on data, and tightly matching budgets and human resources to priorities) are not yet as strong as the monitoring function.

The findings are supported by the following studies: Research on strategic planning and school development highlights that effective educational leaders not only set objectives but also continuously monitor and evaluate implementation, using evidence to adjust actions and sustain improvement (Tariq, 2024). The DepEd Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework likewise emphasizes that regular monitoring and feedback loops are essential to make school plans “living documents,” which supports your finding that leaders are strongest in this area (Llego, 2022).

At the same time, research on data-driven leadership and resource management notes that many schools are still developing capacity in SMART, evidence-based goal setting, and systematic resource alignment, even when their monitoring systems are already in place (Ming, 2024; Larche, 2025). Subsequently, strategic resource management in education shows that aligning budgets, staff, and learning resources with strategic priorities is crucial for translating plans into real improvements, yet it is often one of the weaker aspects of planning (Larche, 2025). Thus, the findings suggest a solid, improvement-oriented planning culture that could be further strengthened by targeted support on data-informed goal setting and strategic resource allocation.

### Innovation Practices of the School Leaders

Table 2 presents the overall innovation practices of school leaders, summarizing their practices across various indicators.

INDICATOR	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Modelling and Transparency	4.29	Highly Practiced
Participative Leadership	4.15	Often Practiced
Active Engagement	4.10	Often Practiced
Resource Facilitation	4.00	Often Practiced
<b>OVERALL MEAN</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>Often Practiced</b>

The summary table shows that school leaders’ innovation practices are generally at a high level, with an overall mean of 4.13, interpreted as a Often Practiced. Among the four dimensions, Modelling and Transparency has the highest mean of 4.29 and is qualitatively interpreted as a Highly Practiced, indicating that leaders most strongly serve as visible, learning-oriented role models for innovation. Participative Leadership (4.15), Active Engagement (4.10), and Resource Facilitation (4.00) are all rated as high extent of practice, suggesting that leaders frequently involve teachers, stay actively engaged, and provide resources for innovation, but these areas are slightly less developed than modelling and transparency.

The findings imply that school leaders already practice innovation at a generally high level, but that their strongest contribution lies in modelling and transparency rather than in the more operational dimensions of

innovation. The very high mean for Modelling and Transparency suggests that leaders are highly visible, reflective, and open about their own learning and decisions, which likely builds trust and encourages teachers to emulate innovative behaviors. In contrast, the slightly lower yet still high means for Participative Leadership, Active Engagement, and Resource Facilitation indicate that involving teachers more deeply in decisions, sustaining hands-on engagement, and strengthening time, material, and financial support are key areas where further strategic planning and resource mobilization can move schools from high to very high levels of innovation practice.

The result is consistent with the work of Resoor et al. (2024), which states that school heads were found to have leadership and innovative skills at a high level (technical, interpersonal, and conceptual), supporting the result that overall innovation practice is high rather than moderate or low. At the same time, a global scan on the leadership of innovation in education reports that while many systems expect leaders to drive innovation, actual practices remain uneven and are often stronger in symbolic and relational aspects than in fully developed operational supports (Friesen et al., 2025).

The findings that Modelling and Transparency have the highest mean is supported by Jack (2023), who found that visible and approachable school leaders who communicate openly with teachers build higher trust and are perceived as strong role models, thereby encouraging teachers to emulate innovative behaviors. Likewise, Friesen et al. (2025) highlight that in high-performing systems, leaders' modelling of continuous learning and transparent communication about change are central mechanisms for mobilizing teacher innovation and sustaining reform. These studies support the implication that Region 10 leaders' most developed innovation practices are their ability to "show and explain" innovation through visible, learning-oriented leadership. On the slightly lower means are evident in principal visionary leadership research shows that while leaders' vision and modelling directly stimulate teacher instructional innovation, their impact is significantly strengthened when accompanied by structures that promote collaboration, teacher involvement, and adequate support conditions (Yang & Xu, 2026). Philippine work likewise indicates that school heads' leadership and innovative skills are high, but that constraints in resources and competing demands can limit how far these skills translate into systematic support for teachers' work and performance (Resoor et al., 2024).

### Networking Strategies of the School Leaders

Table 3 presents the summary of networking strategies of school leaders, emphasizing their practices in communication, collaboration, engagement, trust-building, responsiveness, and resource-linking. The summary table shows that school leaders' networking strategies are generally at a very high level, with an overall mean of 4.28 interpreted as Always Practice, indicating that networking behaviors are consistently demonstrated across all dimensions.

INDICATOR	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Responsiveness Strategies	4.44	Always Practice
Resource Linking Strategies	4.33	Always Practice
Communication Strategies	4.22	Always Practice
Trust-Building Strategies	4.22	Always Practice
Collaboration Engagement Strategies	4.19	Often Practice
<b>OVERALL MEAN</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>Always Practice</b>

Among the five dimensions, Responsiveness Strategies has the highest mean of 4.44, followed by Resource Linking Strategies (4.33), Communication Strategies (4.22), and Trust-Building Strategies (4.22), all rated as Always Practice, suggesting that leaders are strongest in adapting to change, linking resources, and maintaining clear and trustworthy communication with stakeholders.

Collaboration Engagement Strategies has the lowest mean of 4.19, which falls within the "Often Practice" range, indicating that while leaders regularly engage stakeholders in collaborative activities, this dimension is slightly less developed compared to the others and has not yet reached the Always Practice level. This suggests that school leaders are highly effective networkers, particularly in responsiveness and resource linking, but can still strengthen collaborative engagement to bring all networking dimensions to a consistently very high level.

The findings imply that school leaders are highly skilled and consistent networkers, meaning their ability to connect with stakeholders, share resources, communicate clearly, and respond to change is a major organizational strength that can greatly support resource mobilization and school improvement. The Responsiveness Strategies suggests that leaders' ability to remain flexible and adaptive in their networking is a key asset, allowing them to maintain strong stakeholder relationships even during challenging or uncertain situations. The high ratings for Resource Linking and Communication Strategies further imply that leaders are effective in tapping stakeholder expertise, coordinating resources, and keeping information flowing clearly and accurately, all of which are critical for sustaining partnerships and securing support for school initiatives. However, the slightly lower mean for Collaboration Engagement Strategies suggests that deeper and more structured stakeholder involvement in planning and decision making is still an area that needs attention, and that future efforts in strategic quality planning should focus on formalizing collaborative engagement so that all networking dimensions consistently reach the Always Practice level.

A meta-synthesis of school leadership competencies by Richardson and Khawaja (2025) found that high-performing leaders consistently demonstrate relational and networking behaviors to foster deeper learning and responsive schools. Additionally, the study of Valdepenas (2026) on school heads' leadership skills, collaboration, and stakeholders' participation reported that school heads were rated "very satisfactory" to "outstanding" in managing stakeholder partnerships, highlighting practices such as open communication, consultative meetings, and community outreach that enhance responsiveness and resource mobilization.

Another study on school heads' leadership styles and external stakeholders' involvement found that supportive and transformational styles foster strong external stakeholder participation, including resource contributions and cooperative problem-solving, which supports your finding that leaders are particularly effective in resource linking and trust-based communication (Maturan, 2025). By contrast, Collaboration Engagement Strategies posting the lowest mean reflects the pattern that collaborative governance, while present, is less fully developed than other networking dimensions.

A recent study on school heads' roles in promoting stakeholders' collaboration showed that although school heads were generally rated "very satisfactory" in managing partnerships, the most pressing challenges in stakeholder collaboration involved limited stakeholder interest or participation and uneven support, indicating that engagement is strong but not yet consistently maximized (Ranillo, 2026).

However, a study in the Division of Borongan City, which found active stakeholder engagement across instructional, physical, and values-development areas but reported no significant relationship between stakeholder engagement and student achievement or School-Based Management level of practice (only with awards and recognition), suggesting that even where engagement is high, its impact on core outcomes is not automatic and may depend on how collaboration is structured and focused (Fuentes & Sison, 2025). This nuance highlights the importance of not only raising collaborative engagement to a very high level but also ensuring that such collaboration is strategic and tightly aligned with teaching, learning, and governance priorities.

### Resource Mobilization Capability of the School Leaders

Table 4 presents the summary of the resource mobilization capability of school leaders, emphasizing their competencies in resource identification, organization, coordination, and utilization effectiveness.

INDICATOR	MEAN	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Resource Utilization Effectiveness	4.33	Very High Extent of Capability
Resource Coordination Ability	4.31	Very High Extent of Capability
Resource Organization Skills	4.23	Very High Extent of Capability
Resource Identification Capacity	4.04	High Extent of Capability
<b>OVERALL MEAN</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>Very High Extent of Capability</b>

The summary table shows that the resource mobilization capability of school leaders is generally at a very high level, with an overall mean of 4.23 interpreted as "Very High Extent of Capability," indicating that school

leaders are consistently and highly capable across most dimensions of resource mobilization. Among the four dimensions, Resource Utilization Effectiveness has the highest mean of 4.33, followed by Resource Coordination Ability (4.31) and Resource Organization Skills (4.23), all rated as "Very High Extent of Capability," suggesting that leaders are strongest in making effective use of resources, coordinating them across different groups and activities, and systematically organizing them. Resource Identification Capacity has the lowest mean of 4.04, which is the only dimension that falls within the "High Extent of Capability" range, indicating that while leaders are capable of identifying available resources both within and outside the school, this dimension is comparatively less developed than the others and has not yet reached a very high level.

The result implies that school leaders possess a strong and well-developed capability in resource mobilization; they are generally effective in identifying, organizing, coordinating, and utilizing resources to support school operations and improvement initiatives. The highest mean indicator, which is Resource Utilization Effectiveness and Resource Coordination Ability suggest that leaders are most capable in ensuring that resources are put to good use and that different stakeholders and groups work together in managing and sharing resources, which are critical competencies for sustaining school programs and achieving educational goals. Resource Organization Skills, also at a very high level, further implies that leaders are capable of structuring and managing resources in a systematic way, contributing to efficient and orderly school operations. However, the comparatively lower mean for Resource Identification Capacity, which is the only dimension rated as "High Extent of Capability," implies that leaders are less consistent in systematically locating, assessing, and mapping available resources from within and outside the school, which could limit the overall effectiveness of resource mobilization efforts since identifying resources is the foundational step upon which coordination, organization, and utilization depend.

The overall finding that school leaders possess a very high level of resource mobilization capability is supported by Gwaro and Ngacha's (2023) study, which showed that head teachers' resource mobilization skills significantly support the implementation of infrastructure projects in public primary schools in Kisii South Sub-County, Kenya, highlighting generally strong mobilization practices among school heads. According to UNESCO (2024) Education Monitoring Report on leadership in education emphasizes that school leaders are increasingly expected to oversee the *acquisition, allocation, and effective use* of financial, material, and human resources, and that strong leadership in these areas is associated with better school performance and more resilient systems, supporting your conclusion that leaders are generally very capable across resource mobilization dimensions. In addition, Twarary and Thinguri (2025) reports that effective resource mobilization practices of headteachers (budget management, external partnerships, stakeholder engagement) are crucial and generally strong, enabling schools to meet the higher resource demands of the CBC.

A multinational study on the impact of school leadership on teacher innovativeness found that principals who ensured the availability and purposeful use of instructional resources, and who coordinated professional support and collaboration, significantly boosted teachers' innovative practices and student learning (Hsieh et al., 2024). As stated by Gwaro and Ngacha (2023), headteachers' involvement of stakeholders and engagement in alternative income-generating activities (such as fund-raising and community initiatives) are important aspects of their resource mobilization role, showing that many heads can coordinate donors, parents, and community actors around infrastructure projects. Twarary and Thinguri (2025) also describe how headteachers rely on PTA funding, bursaries, community contributions, and NGO partnerships to support CBC, indicating that effective implementation depends on the capacity of heads to coordinate multiple resource streams and stakeholder groups.

Moreover, Pagunsan and Moyani Jr (2023) report that head teachers who maintained clear records, procedures, and accountability structures for material resources were better able to align spending with school priorities and to demonstrate transparent, orderly management, reinforcing your view that strong organizational skills contribute to efficient and orderly school operations. Furthermore, Morgan et al. (2022) show that, in many schools, educators can list some community assets, but comprehensive and regularly updated asset maps—covering internal and external resources—are rare; the authors argue that more systematic identification and mapping of resources are essential to inform strategic decisions and to ensure that coordination and utilization rest on a solid understanding of what is actually available. Likewise, Ramirez & Ramos (2026) note persistent

shortages in funding and staffing and underscore the need for additional training of school leaders in resource mobilization and community partnerships, implying that systematically identifying and tapping new resources remains a weaker area that requires capacity building.

**Relationship between Strategic Quality Planning, Innovation Practices, and Networking Strategies with Resource Mobilization Capability of School Leaders**

Table 5 presents the relationship of school leaders’ strategic planning quality, innovation practices, and networking strategies to their resource mobilization capability, highlighting how key dimensions such as goal setting, decision-making, leadership practices, and stakeholder engagement are associated with effective resource mobilization. The results indicate that all variables exhibit significant positive correlations with resource mobilization capability at  $p < 0.01$ , which is statistically significant at the ( $p = 0.000^{**}$ ) level.

Variables	Pearson Correlation	Significance
Strategic Planning Quality	0.645	0.000**
SMART goal setting	0.551	0.000**
Data-Driven Decision Making	0.522	0.000**
Strategic Resource Alignment	0.589	0.000**
Monitoring and Continuous Improvement	0.589	0.000**
Innovation Practices	0.709	0.000**
Participative Leadership	0.592	0.000**
Active Engagement	0.632	0.000**
Resource Facilitation	0.625	0.000**
Modelling and Transparency	0.666	0.000**
Networking Strategies	0.707	0.000**
Communication Strategies	0.550	0.000**
Collaboration Engagement Strategies	0.556	0.000**
Trust Building Strategies	0.559	0.000**
Responsiveness Strategies	0.659	0.000**
Resource Linking Strategies	0.631	0.000**

Legend:

\* =Significant

\*\*=Highly Significant

ns= Not Significant

Significant level ( $p < 0.05$ ) at 5% level

Strategic Quality Planning has a moderate to strong positive correlation with Resource Mobilization Capability ( $r = 0.645$ ), with all four dimensions namely, SMART Goal Setting ( $r = 0.551$ ), Data-Driven Decision Making ( $r = 0.522$ ), Strategic Resource Alignment ( $r = 0.589$ ), and Monitoring and Continuous Improvement ( $r = 0.589$ ) — showing moderate positive correlations, indicating that the more effectively leaders plan strategically, the greater their capability to mobilize resources. The findings imply that when school leaders set clear SMART goals, make data-driven decisions, align resources strategically, and continuously monitor progress, they are better positioned to identify what resources are needed, justify resource requests, and allocate resources where they will have the greatest impact, making strategic planning a critical foundation for resource mobilization.

This result is supported by Larch (2025) study on Strategic Planning in Educational Management: A Pathway to School Success which emphasize that a core function of strategic planning in schools is resource allocation, arguing that leaders must set clear, measurable goals, use data to understand needs, align financial, human, and physical resources with those priorities, and continuously monitor implementation and adjust plans and resource use. It also noted that strategic planning “allows school leaders to make tough decisions about

resource distribution and ensure that limited resources are invested in the areas that will yield the greatest impact on student success,” which directly mirrors the result that when school leaders practice SMART goal setting, data-driven decision making, strategic resource alignment, and ongoing monitoring, they are better able to identify what resources are needed, justify resource requests, and allocate resources where they will have the greatest impact.

Innovation Practices also has a strong overall correlation with Resource Mobilization Capability ( $r=0.709$ ), with all four dimensions showing moderate to strong positive relationships: Participative Leadership ( $r=0.592$ ), Active Engagement ( $r=0.632$ ), Resource Facilitation ( $r=0.625$ ), and Modelling and Transparency ( $r=0.666$ ). This suggests that leaders who practice innovation more consistently are significantly more capable of mobilizing resources. Finding this variable as a strong correlation indicates that leaders who actively engage teachers, model transparency, facilitate resources, and promote participative leadership are much more effective at mobilizing resources. It implies that an innovative leadership culture not only drives instructional improvement but also fosters an environment where resource needs are more clearly identified, communicated, and addressed through creative and collaborative means.

Evidence from recent research shows that innovative leadership is closely tied to a school’s ability to mobilize and use resources effectively. A mixed-methods study by Tuang and Quintos (2025) in Region III found that principals who exhibited high levels of innovative leadership, characterized by collaborative strategic leadership, responsive and dynamic initiatives, and empowerment of teachers, significantly enhanced teachers’ innovative work behavior and commitment, with the authors noting that such principals actively mobilized support, opportunities, and resources to sustain innovation. Similarly, a review of innovative leadership and educational quality management concluded that principals who promote participative leadership, model transparency, and foster continuous improvement play a central role in mobilizing teachers and optimizing school resources, thereby creating conditions in which innovation and resource use reinforce each other (Ariani et al., 2026). Complementing these, leadership of innovation in education shows that innovative leaders mediate innovation not only through pedagogical ideas but also through resource allocation, boundary-spanning, and capacity-building, emphasizing that systems with strong innovation-oriented leadership are better at securing and coordinating resources through networks and collaborative structures (Friesen et al., 2025).

Networking Strategies also has a high significant relationship with Resource Mobilization Capability ( $r=0.707$ ), with dimensions including Communication Strategies ( $r=0.550$ ), Collaboration Engagement Strategies ( $r=0.556$ ), Trust Building Strategies ( $r=0.559$ ), Responsiveness Strategies ( $r=0.659$ ), and Resource Linking Strategies ( $r=0.631$ ), indicating that effective networking significantly enhances leaders' ability to mobilize resources. This implies that leaders who communicate effectively, build trust, respond to stakeholder needs, and link resources through their networks are significantly more capable of mobilizing external and internal resources, reinforcing the idea that strong stakeholder relationships are a powerful mechanism for resource generation and sustainability.

These findings are consistent with Wanjiru et al. (2026). He found a significant positive connection between head teachers’ community-engagement and networking practices and the level of resources mobilized for Competency-Based Curriculum implementation. The study, grounded in Resource Dependence Theory, emphasizes that effective head teachers leverage inter-organizational relationships and stakeholder networks to secure financial and in-kind support, concluding that strong stakeholder engagement and collaboration are “essential for successful resource mobilization” in resource-constrained school systems.

Given that all main independent variables and their sub-variables have highly significant correlations with resource mobilization capability, the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between school leaders’ resource mobilization capability and strategic planning quality, innovation practices, and networking strategies is rejected. The result agrees with the study of Rupole and Ching (2025) on Instructional Leadership, Teachers’ Competence, and Stakeholders’ Engagement in the Implementation and Effectiveness of School-Based Management (SBM). They reported significant positive relationships between school leaders’ instructional/strategic leadership practices, stakeholder engagement, and key SBM outcomes, including finance and resource management, and concluded that effective SBM “relies on transparent monitoring, active

stakeholder engagement, and professional growth aligned with DepEd guidelines,” all of which strengthen schools’ capacity to mobilize and manage resources.

A similar study reported by Wanjiru (2026), who reported a positive link between head teachers’ leadership practices and the availability of resources for CBE implementation. He concluded that stronger leadership practices in mobilizing and managing resources are associated with better curriculum implementation outcomes. Likewise, Gwaro and Ngacha (2026) report that higher levels of resource mobilization skills—especially in engaging stakeholders, coordinating fundraising, and managing grants—were significantly associated with more successful completion of school infrastructure projects, again indicating that leadership practices and networking strategies are not independent of resource mobilization outcomes.

**Variables That Best Predict The Resource Mobilization Capability Of School Leaders In Region 10**

Table 6 presents the regression analysis between the independent variables and the resource mobilization capability of school leaders in Region 10. The findings reveal that resource linking strategies, trust-building strategies, active engagement, modelling and transparency, and monitoring and continuous improvement predict resource mobilization capability.

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
5	(Constant)	0.133	0.135		0.981	0.327
<b>Networking Strategies</b>						
	Resource Linking Strategies	0.286	0.032	0.295	9.005	0.000
	Trust Building Strategies	0.105	0.033	0.140	3.183	0.002
<b>Innovation Practices</b>						
	Active Engagement	0.177	0.035	0.236	5.000	0.000
	Modelling and Transparency	0.218	0.036	0.222	6.060	0.000
<b>Strategic Planning Quality</b>						
	Monitoring and Continuous Improvement	0.174	0.031	0.184	5.545	0.000
R= .0.818		R <sup>2</sup> = 0.670		F= 200.843		P – value = 0.000

The overall model shows an R-value of 0.818, indicating a very strong relationship. At the same time, the R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.670 means that 67% of the variance in Resource Mobilization Capability is explained by the five significant predictor variables included in the model, suggesting a highly robust and meaningful regression model.

Among the significant predictors, Resource Linking Strategies under Networking Strategies has the highest standardized beta coefficient ( $\beta=0.295$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), making it the strongest predictor of Resource Mobilization Capability, meaning that leaders who are more effective in linking resources through their networks are most likely to demonstrate higher resource mobilization capability. The study cited by Wango et al. (2025) emphasized that partnerships leverage combined resources and influence to improve resource allocation, enhance teacher preparation, and strengthen educational reform, concluding that effective collaboration and networked resource linking are central mechanisms for securing and sustaining the resources needed for quality education.

Active Engagement under Innovation Practices is the second strongest predictor ( $\beta=0.236$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), followed closely by Modelling and Transparency also under Innovation Practices ( $\beta=0.222$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), suggesting that leaders who actively engage in innovation and model transparent behavior significantly contribute to stronger resource mobilization. This suggests that when leaders actively engage with teachers in innovation activities and openly model the behaviors they expect, they build credibility and confidence among stakeholders, which in turn encourages greater willingness to contribute time, expertise, and resources to school initiatives, making innovation practices not just an instructional strategy but also a critical resource mobilization tool.

The findings are consistent with the conclusion of Ariani et al, (2026) that innovative leadership enhances effectiveness “by leveraging social capital rather than material resources alone,” indicating that leaders’ active engagement in innovation and their visible, transparent modeling of desired behaviors build the credibility and confidence that encourage stakeholders to invest time, expertise, and resources in school programs. Likewise, Caruz (2024) emphasizes that principals who “consistently demonstrate and champion innovative practices” create a culture in which teachers feel empowered, and stakeholders become more willing to contribute to and sustain school initiatives.

Monitoring and Continuous Improvement under Strategic Planning Quality ( $\beta=0.184$ ,  $p=0.000$ ) suggests that school leaders who regularly track progress, evaluate outcomes, and make data-driven adjustments to their plans are significantly more capable of mobilizing resources, indicating that resource mobilization is not a one-time effort but a continuous and improvement-oriented process. This implies that when leaders systematically monitor how resources are used and consistently seek ways to improve resource-related practices, they are better positioned to justify resource needs, demonstrate accountability to stakeholders, and make timely decisions that maximize the impact of available resources, reinforcing that a culture of continuous improvement is a critical strategic foundation for sustaining and enhancing resource mobilization capability over time. This is consistent with the findings of Lee et al. (2024), which show that leaders who routinely use data to monitor progress, evaluate outcomes, and adjust strategies are more effective in improving student learning and in “distributing resources to areas of greatest need.

Trust-building strategies ( $\beta=0.140$ ,  $p=0.002$ ) are also significant predictors, though with relatively smaller beta values, indicating that the ability of school leaders to establish and maintain trust with stakeholders is a meaningful and indispensable component of effective resource mobilization. This implies that school leaders should deliberately invest in trust-building practices — such as honoring commitments, maintaining transparency, protecting confidentiality, and setting clear expectations with stakeholders — as these behaviors create the relational capital necessary to attract, sustain, and expand resource partnerships over time, ultimately strengthening the overall resource mobilization capability of the school.

Meriç and Öz (2025) emphasize that when leaders openly share information, invite participation in decisions, and are accountable for finances and programs, trust is naturally built and strengthened, which in turn improves cooperation and support from teachers, parents, and students. Furthermore, Üztemur et al. (2026) insinuate that trust matters but often exerts its influence indirectly rather than as the primary driver.

The equation model useful in predicting Y, the resource mobilization capability of school leaders in Region 10, is as follows:

$$Y=0.133 + 0.286X_1+ 0.218X_2+ 0.177X_3 + 0.174X_4 + 0.105X_5$$

Where:

Y = Resource Mobilization Capability

X<sub>1</sub>= Resource Linking Strategies

X<sub>2</sub>= Modelling and Transparency

X<sub>3</sub>= Active Engagement

X<sub>4</sub>= Monitoring and Continuous Improvement

X<sub>5</sub>= Active Engagement

The equation suggest that for every one-unit increase in Resource Linking Strategies, Resource Mobilization Capability increases by 0.286, holding all other variables constant; for every one-unit increase in Active Engagement, it increases by 0.177; for every one-unit increase in Modelling and Transparency, it increases by 0.218; for every one-unit increase in Monitoring and Continuous Improvement, it increases by 0.174; and for every one-unit increase in Trust Building Strategies, it increases by 0.105, confirming that all five predictors positively and significantly contribute to the Resource Mobilization Capability of school leaders.

Given the significance of the overall model ( $F=200.843$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), which is statistically significant and reliable, and that the five predictor variables together are not just by chance, the null hypothesis that there is no variable singly or in combination that best predicts the resource mobilization capability of school leaders is rejected.

The overall findings are reinforced by the study of Rupole and Ching (2025), which reported that instructional leadership and stakeholders' engagement significantly influence the effectiveness of School-Based Management, particularly in areas of finance and resource management, concluding that stronger leadership practices positively affect schools' capacity to organize and use resources. This indicates that leadership variables do not operate by chance; rather, they make a measurable impact on how resources are planned, allocated, and monitored.

Similarly, Wanjiru et al. (2026) found that headteachers' resource mobilization strategies, such as planning fundraising activities, coordinating with community partners, and monitoring the use of funds, significantly affect the level of resources available for implementing the Competency-Based Curriculum. The results showed that these strategies exert a positive influence on resource mobility, demonstrating that what heads do strategically and relationally directly impacts their schools' resource base. Gwaro and Ngacha (2023) also showed that headteachers' resource mobilization skills impact the implementation of infrastructure projects: schools led by heads with stronger networking, planning, and fundraising skills were more likely to complete projects on time and at the required standard, meaning these leadership behaviors make a real difference to resource generation and utilization. Additionally, as cited by Jacob-Dedumo et al. (2024), the strategies school heads use to raise and link financial resources, especially through building relationships and networks.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions are drawn:

The quality of school leaders' strategic planning is high, particularly in their ability to monitor and continuously improve their plans. This shows that leaders in region 10 not only create compliance plans but also use them as active tools for school improvement. However, there is still a need to sharpen skills in setting specific goals and aligning resources more closely with them.

The innovation practices of school leaders are high, with their greatest strength being their ability to act as visible role models through modeling and transparency. While leaders are good at being accessible and sharing their learning journeys, they can still improve in providing more direct financial and material support to fuel new ideas in the classroom.

The networking strategies of school leaders are practiced at a very high level, especially in their responsiveness to change and their ability to link resources. This indicates that leaders are excellent at adapting to new situations and finding external partners to help the school. The area that can still grow is deepening the formal involvement of these partners in the school's strategic planning sessions.

The resource-mobilization capability of school leaders is very high, demonstrating that they are adept at using and coordinating the resources at their disposal to improve teaching. While they are strong at organizing and using materials, they are slightly less systematic in identifying and mapping out new potential sources of support from the wider community.

There is a significant and strong relationship between a leader's ability to plan, innovate, and network and their success in gathering resources. Innovation practices stand out as the strongest driver, meaning that a leader who is creative and open to change is much more likely to secure the resources their school needs.

The best predictors of successful resource gathering are resource linking, active engagement, modeling, transparency, monitoring, and trust-building. These specific leadership behaviors are the "secret sauce" that explains why some schools are better than others at providing the tools their students need.

## REFERENCES

1. Ariani, N. K. D., Rizal, R., Pahriadi, P., Aqil, M., Wilade, S., & Lapasere, S. (2026). Innovative leadership and educational quality management. *Journal of Innovation and Research in Primary Education*, 5(1), 662–673. <https://doi.org/10.56916/jirpe.v5i1.2851>
2. Bagano, J., & De Guzman, F. (2024). A literature review in educational leadership strategic planning. *Multidisciplinary International Journal of Research and Development*, 3(5). <https://www.mijrd.com/papers/v3/i5/MIJRDV3I50004.pdf>
3. Cariaso, B. (2025). Classroom shortage still at 165,000 – DepEd. *Philstar.com*. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2025/05/28/2446283/classroom-shortage-still-165000-deped>
4. Caruz, M. J. (2024). Innovative work behavior of principals and organizational effectiveness of public schools in Davao City. *Pedagogy Review: An International Journal of Educational Theories, Approaches and Strategies*, 2(1), 12–25. <https://doi.org/10.62718/vmca.pr-ijetas.2.1.sc-0524-008>
5. Chafa, A., & Ncube, F. (2025). The impact of educational leadership on school change and innovation. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 9(1), 1–10. <https://www.jriiejournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/JRIIE-9-2-001.pdf>. (n.d.).
6. Clarito, M. J. J., Mahinay Jr., S. D., Largonio, I. A. B., Manuang, M. G., Caybo, M. A., Borja, K. B., & Pis-an, J. B. (2025). Availability and mobilization of resources in far-flung schools in selected palma areas. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 9(14), 498-516. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.914MG0038>.
7. Friesen, S., Sum, N., Sawalhi, R., MacGregor, S., Campbell, P., Conway, J., Andrews, D., & Penner, A. (2025). The leadership of innovation in education: findings from an environmental scan. *School Leadership and Management*, 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2025.2602008>
8. Fuentes, H. C., & Sison, M. N. (2025). Stakeholders’ engagement and school performance: basis for a proposed school-community partnership program. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(2), 1–1. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=25972>
9. GMA News Online. (2023). DepEd needs P397B to address 159K classroom backlog. *GMA News Online*. <https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/topstories/nation/879794/dep-ed-needs-p397b-to-address-159k-classroom-backlog/story/>
10. Gwaro, P. A., & Ngacha, Njeri. S. (2026). Headteachers’ resource mobilization skills and implementation of infrastructure projects in primary schools. *Iajournals.org*. <https://iajournals.org/index.php/8-articles/1146-iajhrba-v4-i2-363-377>
11. Hsieh, C.-C., Tai, S.-E., & Li, H.-C. (2024). Impact of school leadership on teacher innovativeness: evidence from multilevel analysis of Taiwan TALIS 2018. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 1-18, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2024.2397040>
12. Jack, J. B. (2023). Visibility of school leadership: building trust. *I.e.: Inquiry in Education*, 15(1). <https://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie/vol15/iss1/6/>
13. Jacob-Dedumo, L. S., Chua, L., Niñal, M., & Ederio, N. (2024). Financial Management and Resource Allocation Practices in the Schools Division of Surigao Del Norte, Philippines. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 6(4). <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/4/25687.pdf>
14. Koh, G. A., Askeel-Williams, H., & Barr, S. (2023). Sustaining school improvement initiatives: advice from educational leaders. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 34(3), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2023.2190130>
15. Larche, P. (2025). Strategic planning in educational management: A pathway to school success. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 29(1), 1-3.
16. Lee, C., Camburn, E. M., & Sebastian, J. (2024). School context, school leaders’ data-informed decision making, and student achievement: evidence from Florida. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 36(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2024.2436889>
17. Llego, M. A. (2022). DepEd Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (BEMEF). *TeacherPH*. <https://www.teacherph.com/dep-ed-basic-education-monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-bemef/>
18. Lopez, A. C., & Bauyot, M. M. (2025). Stakeholders’ involvement in school-based programs: A case study. *PhilArchive*. <https://philarchive.org/archive/LOPSII-3>

19. Luyosen, C., & Gawaen, P. (2025). School-based management: strategic planning practices of secondary school heads in Baguio City. *Innovations*, 81. <https://journal-innovations.com/assets/uploads/doc/8c0c8-278-292.09446.pdf>
20. Maturan, R. (2025). School heads' leadership styles and external stakeholders' involvement: school-community partnership program. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 41(10), 1–1. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=28872>
21. Melese, H. W. (2022). Practice and challenges of school finance resource mobilization and utilization in Ethiopia. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 13(23), 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.7176/RJFA/13-23-02>
22. Meriç, E., & Öz, H. (2025). School transparency as a predictor of organizational trust. *BMC Psychology*, 41316393. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-03776-9>
23. Mkhize, T. R., & Ndwandwe, N. D. (2024). *Research in Educational Policy and Management*. [Repamjournal.org](https://repamjournal.org). <https://repamjournal.org>
24. Morgan, J. J., Bengochea, A., & Reed, J. (2022). Asset mapping in urban environments to support students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Remedial and Special Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512211051072>
25. Pagunsan, C. R., & Moyani Jr, G. (2023). School heads' accountability in school management. *Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends*, 3(2), 14–32. <https://doi.org/10.58429/pgjsrt.v3n2a120>
26. Ranillo, M. I. (2026). The school heads' roles in promoting stakeholders' collaboration and their effects on the implementation of school programs, projects and activities. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, 18(2), 001-015. <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijrsra.2026.18.2.0204>
27. Resoor, N., Serviñas, L., Retes, E., & Eltanal, G. (2024). School heads' leadership and innovative skills in relation to teachers' performance. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, 1(6), 928–940. <https://doi.org/10.1129/W09-048>
28. Richardson, J. W., & Khawaja, S. (2025). Meta-synthesis of school leadership competencies to support learner-centered, personalized education. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1537055>
29. Rupole, S. A., & Ching, D. A. (2025). Instructional leadership, teachers' competence, and stakeholders' engagement for school-based management level. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 6(6), 10581–10617. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.6.0625.2319>
30. Sadiki, J. & Mugenyi, A. (2025). Viability of internal resources mobilization for managements' complementing of fee free education in Meru District Council public secondary schools. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 9(3), 243 – 254. <https://doi.org/10.59765/jriie.9.3.24>. (n.d.).
31. Tariq, A. (2024). The role of educational leaders in strategic planning and school development. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 28(2), 1–2. <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/the-role-of-educational-leaders-in-strategic-planning-and-school-development-17160.html>
32. Tayanes, G. Z., Lozarito, K. K. S., & Escarlos, G. S. (2025). Reframing school stakeholder engagement through the lens of critical theory: A systematic review of governance and leadership perspective. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(10), 5280–5299. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.910000433>. (n.d.).
33. Tuang, J. F., & Quintos, S. B. (2025). Innovative leadership of school principals and the teachers' work behavior and level of commitment. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 4(6), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v4i6.5950>
34. Twarary, I., & Thinguri, R. W. (2025). Influence of headteachers' resource management practices on implementation of competency-based curriculum in public primary schools in Loitoktok Sub County, Kajiado County, Kenya. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.59765/jriie9-2-097>
35. Üztemur, S., Gökalp, A., İlğan, A., & Dinç, E. (2026). Leadership, autonomy, and organizational trust as predictors of teacher wellbeing and job satisfaction: a cross-cultural study based on PISA 2022 data. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1703458>

36. Valdepenas, C. E. A. (2026). School heads' leadership skill, collaboration and stakeholders' support. *International Journal on Science and Technology (IJSAT)*. <https://www.ijstat.org/papers/2026/1/9914.pdf>
37. Verano , V. S., Agrazamendez, D. D., Sarazain , K. S., & Bauyot, M. (2024). Strategic planning and management practices on quality education enhancement. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/strategic-planning-and-management-practices-on-quality-education-enhancement/>
38. Wango, N. C., Oluga, M., & Rarieya, J. F. A. (2025). The impact of multi-stakeholder partnerships on educational outcomes: a case of East Africa. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(2), 18–29. <https://doi.org/10.47941/jep.2622>
39. Wanjiru, N. Z., King, P. M., & Gitonga, R. M. (2026). Examining the influence of head teachers on mobilizing community-based fundraising for CBC implementation in Kikuyu sub-county, Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v13i1.6455>
40. Yang, C., & Xu, Z. (2026). Principal visionary leadership and teacher instructional innovation: mediating roles of teacher workplace well-being and collaboration. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1701099>