

Contextual Factors and Strategic Management Approach of Education Program Specialists Transformative Leader on Human Capital Development of the School Heads

Emmanuelle Merginio Barrago

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: julierosemendoza002@gmail.com

Abstract—This study investigated the structural and psychological dynamics between the transformative leadership of Education Program Specialists (EPS), their strategic management approaches, and the resulting human capital development of School Heads within the Department of Education (DepEd). Specifically, the study determined the level of Contextual Factors, the level of Strategic Management Approaches employed, and the level of Human Capital Development among the respondents. Furthermore, it tested the hypotheses regarding the significant differences in the perceptions of the EPS and School Heads across these variables, and the significant correlations between the contextual factors, strategic management approaches, and human capital development. The research employed a quantitative, descriptive-correlational design to systematically evaluate the transmission mechanisms between meso-level leadership interventions and organizational outcomes. The respondents consisted of 52 Education Program Specialists and 125 School Heads, selected through total population and purposive sampling techniques. Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire, and the statistical treatments utilized included weighted mean, standard deviation, independent samples *t*-test, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation, and multiple regression via path analysis. Contextual Factors findings revealed that the respondents perceived at a High level of occurrence. In terms of Strategic Management Approaches, the respondents perceived at a Moderately High level of practice, functioning as operationally agile but strategically constrained by deficient Knowledge Management Systems. Consequently, for Human Capital Development, it was perceived as a Moderately High implication in Access, Equity, and Quality, but fell to a critical Neutral level for Well Being. In testing for significant differences between the two respondent groups, the statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of the EPS and School Heads regarding the contextual factors and human capital development; therefore, the null hypotheses for these domains are accepted. However, there is a significant difference in agile resource allocation, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis for this variable, while accepting it for the remaining variables. Hypothesis testing for correlation and regression revealed a substantial correlation between equity and quality and strategic management strategies. Ultimately, the correlational hypothesis is accepted; the study confirms that EPS Strategic Management has a highly significant correlation with Human Capital Development. The study reveals that the division operates within an environment characterized by systemic work overload and bureaucratic constraints, forcing educational leaders into tactical survival rather than strategic innovation. Although strategic management is operationally agile, it remains constrained by siloed knowledge management systems. Consequently, while

School Heads demonstrate high pedagogical competence and resilience, they are psychologically vulnerable, sustaining educational quality at the expense of their personal well-being. Given the critical drop in leader well-being and the pervasive administrative deluge, it is recommended the formal institutionalization of the Context-Responsive Strategic Leadership Framework: Project H.R.D. (Holistic, Responsive, and Defensive) framework. The division may deploy strategic shielding by consolidating redundant data reporting to reclaim instructional time, while simultaneously expanding school-based Learning Action Cells (LACs) to include dedicated psychological first aid and boundary management modules to sustainably protect the mental health of school leaders.

Keywords— Transformative Leadership, Education Program Specialists, Strategic Management Approach, Contextual Factors, Human Capital Development.

I. INTRODUCTION

In a rapidly evolving educational landscape, the capacity of an institution to adapt and flourish depends heavily on the alignment between specialized technical support and frontline leadership. While national mandates set the trajectory for growth, the realization of institutional excellence relies on the ability of technical experts to navigate complex organizational structures. This study examines the critical role of Education Program Specialists (EPS) in serving as the vital link between national educational reforms and school-level implementation through their specialized instructional expertise. It is important to make it clear that within the DepEd organizational structure, EPS are not classified as middle-level managers with direct supervisory or administrative authority over school heads. Instead, they occupy a unique role as Specialized Technical Professionals and Program Experts. Their influence does not stem from a traditional top-down position in the organizational chart, but from their deep technical knowledge, instructional expertise, and their role as key implementers of national educational reforms. This operational dynamic aligns perfectly with the concept of distributed leadership, where expertise, shared responsibility, and collaborative practice, rather than formal hierarchical titles, dictate the flow of influence, resulting in higher teacher empowerment and organizational commitment (Delos Santos et al., 2025). Furthermore, equipping technical specialists to assume

mentoring and leadership roles is vital in guiding instructional adjustments across schools (Guzman, 2025).

This study is grounded in the legal framework provided by Republic Act No. 10533 (Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013) and its implementing rules and regulations, which mandate continuous professional development and capacity-building for all education personnel. Furthermore, DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020 outlines the expected competencies of school leaders, emphasizing their role in instructional leadership and people management. School principals possess a very high level of accountability in managing these outcomes and steering school-based management. It is within this policy environment that the Education Program Specialists (EPS) operate, providing the necessary technical assistance and professional development programs to support these school heads in bridging macro-level policy and localized practice. Transformational leadership is not a uniform set of behaviors but a highly contextualized practice. Leaders who exhibit idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration significantly enhance organizational performance and foster an environment conducive to innovation. Crucially, the strategic management aspect comes into play as the EPS must systematically coordinate professional development, render technical assistance, and align these efforts with broader regional objectives. Strategic management approaches are recognized as vital tools for educational leadership, serving a specific role in mediating the relationship between EPS leadership and school heads' professional growth. The effectiveness of this leadership-to-outcome channel is either limited or facilitated by critical contextual challenges that interact with these strategic management approaches.

The effectiveness of this support system is operationalized through Strategic Management Approaches, which serve as the essential vehicle for transformational leadership. Specifically, this study explores how EPS leaders employ Agile Resource Allocation to bypass bureaucratic bottlenecks, Technology Integration to enhance professional delivery, and robust Knowledge Management Systems (KMS) to institutionalize instructional wisdom. While grounded in the four dimensions of transformational leadership, this leadership vision must navigate significant systemic tensions. Recent systematic reviews identify major structural challenges, including bureaucratic constraints, poor technological access, and heavy workloads. Therefore, this study explores how EPS can best direct their leadership and strategic management to leave a lasting impact on human capital development despite these prevailing contextual hurdles.

It is through these specific theoretical and practical lenses that the researcher sought to examine the Contextual Factors and Strategic Management Approach of Education Program Specialists (EPS) Transformative Leader on Human Capital Growth of the School Heads.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

In an effort to understand better how particular contextual factors and strategic management strategies affect the connection between EPS transformative leadership and school heads' human capital development, this research sought to close a significant gap in the literature.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the contextual factor level of the EPS transformative leader in terms of:
 - 1.1 Bureaucratic Constraints;
 - 1.2 Organizational Culture;
 - 1.3 Technological Limitations;
 - 1.4 Geographic Challenges; and
 - 1.5 Excessive Work Overload?
2. What is the strategic management approach level of EPS transformative leader in terms of:
 - 2.1 Knowledge Management System;
 - 2.2 Agile Resource Allocation;
 - 2.3 Technology Integration;
 - 2.4 Performance Analytics; and
 - 2.5 Change Management?
3. What is the level of human capital development of the school heads in terms of:
 - 3.1 Access ;
 - 3.2 Equity;
 - 3.3 Quality;
 - 3.4 Resiliency; and
 - 3.5 Well-being?
4. Is there a significant difference between the perception of the respondents in the contextual factor of EPS transformative leader?
5. Is there a significant difference between the perception of the respondents in strategic management approach of the EPS transformative leader?
6. Is there a significant difference between the perception of the respondents in human capital development of the school heads?
7. Do the contextual factors of EPS transformative leader significantly correlate to the human capital development of the school heads?
8. Do the strategic management approaches of EPS transformative leader significantly correlate to the human capital development of the school heads?

II. METHODOLOGY

The research employed a quantitative, descriptive-correlational design to systematically evaluate the transmission mechanisms between meso-level leadership interventions and organizational outcomes. The respondents consisted of 52 Education Program Specialists and 125 School Heads, selected through total population and purposive sampling techniques. Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire, and the statistical treatments utilized included weighted mean, standard deviation, independent samples t-test, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation, and multiple regression via path analysis.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents the analysis and interpretation of the data collected, organized systematically according to the specific problems raised in this study. It details the statistical findings regarding the Contextual Factors facing Education Program Specialists (EPS), their corresponding Strategic Management Approaches, and the resulting levels of Human Capital Development among School Heads.

Table 1. Level of Contextual Factor of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Bureaucratic Constraints

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
Complex administrative procedures delay program implementation.	5.36	0.96	Agree
Documentation requirements are reasonable and allow sufficient time for other program implementation supervision.	5.39	1.43	Agree
Multi-layered approvals slow decision-making processes.	5.21	0.75	Somewhat Agree
Compliance requirements are flexible enough to accommodate educational innovation.	4.72	1.58	Somewhat Agree
Bureaucratic processes affect resource allocation timeliness.	5.86	0.66	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.31		
SD	0.48		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 1 shows that the respondents' level of contextual factors in terms of Bureaucratic Constraints is High, as evidenced by an overall mean of 5.31 (SD = 0.48). The data identifies that the most severe constraint is that bureaucratic processes affect resource allocation timeliness, which obtained the highest mean of 5.86. Other significant systemic barriers include complex administrative procedures delaying program implementation (M = 5.36) and multi-layered approvals slowing decision-making (M = 5.21). Conversely, the item stating that compliance requirements are flexible enough to accommodate educational innovation received the lowest mean score of 4.72.

Based on the low overall standard deviation (0.48), which confirms that this bureaucratic rigidity is a structural reality uniformly experienced across the division, the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads regarding these systemic hurdles, mathematically proving that both groups suffer equally under these rigid compliance requirements.

Given the critically high mean score regarding delayed resource allocation (M = 5.86) and the exceptionally low score regarding the flexibility of compliance requirements (M = 4.72), it is strongly recommended that the DepEd Regional and Division leadership implement "Strategic Shielding." Policymakers must draft localized memorandums allowing Agile Resource Allocation to decentralize approval protocols, thereby allowing educational leaders to bypass multi-layered red tape for urgent, localized program implementations.

Table 2 shows that the respondents perceive the level of contextual factors in terms of Organizational Culture as Moderately High, with an overall mean of 4.45 (SD = 0.55). The data reveals a cultural paradox: respondents agreed most

strongly that mistakes in the division are viewed as constructive opportunities for learning (M = 5.26, SD = 1.51), while simultaneously agreeing that the prevailing culture discourages trying new approaches if they deviate from established traditions (M = 5.14, SD = 1.16). Conversely, items measuring fear of seniority (M = 3.43) and vision-behavior gaps (M = 3.38) scored the lowest, indicating that junior specialists do not heavily hesitate to voice concerns.

Table 2. Level of Contextual Factor of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Organizational Culture

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
The prevailing culture discourages trying new approaches if they deviate from established traditions.	5.14	1.16	Somewhat Agree
Departments within the Schools Division Office share information promptly, which enhances planning efficacy.	5.04	1.35	Somewhat Agree
Junior specialists often hesitate to voice concerns or suggestions due to a strong culture of deference to seniority.	3.43	1.64	Somewhat Disagree
Mistakes in the division are viewed as constructive opportunities for learning rather than criticism.	5.26	1.51	Somewhat Agree
There is a disconnect between the stated vision of the division and the actual daily behaviors of its staff.	3.38	1.49	Somewhat Disagree
Weighted Mean	4.45		
SD	0.55		
Verbal Interpretation	Moderately High		

Based on the overall standard deviation of 0.55, which indicates a tight consensus and uniformity across the division regarding these cultural dynamics, the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving that both leadership tiers experience and navigate this exact same paradoxical culture.

Given the high mean score indicating that the prevailing culture discourages trying new approaches (M = 5.14), it is strongly recommended that leadership interventions deliberately focus on dismantling the institutional traditions that penalize innovation. Interventions should not focus on fixing the personnel, who already show a willingness to speak up and learn from mistakes (M = 5.26), but rather on revising division policies to explicitly reward evidence-based, non-traditional approaches.

The implication of these findings is that localized psychological safety currently coexists with systemic traditionalism, essentially trapping human capital development in a state of compliance. It implies that true transformative leadership cannot flourish unless the division actively shifts from merely tolerating mistakes to genuinely incentivizing calculated risk-taking, allowing school leaders to operationalize innovative strategies without fear of administrative backlash.

Table 3 shows that the respondents perceive the level of contextual factors in terms of Technological Limitations as Moderately High, with an overall mean of 5.13 (SD = 0.46). The data identifies a highly specific technological paradox within the division: the primary constraint is that outdated hardware/software reduces administrative efficiency, earning

the highest mean of 5.60 (SD = 0.72). Conversely, respondents indicated that internet connectivity is generally reliable enough to support online professional development activities (M = 5.53); however, this specific item exhibited a notably high standard deviation of 1.38, indicating vastly different internet experiences among respondents.

Table 3. Level of Contextual Factor of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Technological Limitations

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
Inadequate technology infrastructure hinders program implementation.	4.80	1.56	Somewhat Agree
Digital access is sufficient to maintain high professional development quality.	4.77	1.86	Somewhat Agree
Insufficient technical support compromises technology integration.	4.93	1.82	Somewhat Agree
Internet connectivity is reliable enough to support online professional development activities.	5.53	1.38	Agree
Outdated hardware/software reduces administrative efficiency.	5.60	0.72	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.13		
SD	0.46		
Verbal Interpretation			Moderately High

Based on the low overall standard deviation of 0.46, which indicates a tight consensus across the division regarding this general technological friction, the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, mathematically proving that both leadership tiers are equally constrained by the exact same outdated hardware issues.

Given the critically high mean score establishing that outdated hardware and software reduce administrative efficiency (M = 5.60), it is strongly recommended that policymakers and DepEd Central Office prioritize localized physical hardware upgrades before mandating any additional digital reporting systems. Procuring updated processors and administrative software for the division offices must take precedence over rolling out new online frameworks.

The implication of these findings is that the division's current hardware infrastructure cannot efficiently upload or process the deep analytics required by national frameworks without causing massive administrative bottlenecks. It implies that unless technological modernization is achieved, the transformational efforts of EPS and School Heads will remain structurally capped, as their time and cognitive bandwidth will continue to be wasted on navigating slow, obsolete administrative systems rather than actual human capital development.

Table 4 shows that the respondents assess the level of contextual factors in terms of Geographic Challenges as High, with an overall mean of 5.43 (SD = 0.54). The data identifies that the most severe constraint within this domain is that natural disasters regularly disrupt programs and activities, which obtained the highest mean of 5.85 (SD = 0.70). Simultaneously, respondents indicated strong agreement that collaborative activities between schools are maintained effectively regardless of physical distance (M = 5.79) and that reliable transportation options enable consistent school visits

(M = 5.75). Conversely, the statement regarding remote locations delaying the timely delivery of necessary resources received a neutral score, the lowest in this category (M = 4.36).

Table 4. Level of Contextual Factor of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Geographic Challenges

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
Geographical isolation complicates school program implementation supervision.	5.41	0.95	Agree
Reliable transportation options enable consistent and frequent school visits.	5.75	0.84	Agree
Natural disasters regularly disrupt programs and activities.	5.85	0.70	Agree
Collaborative activities between schools are maintained effectively regardless of physical distance.	5.79	0.96	Agree
Remote locations delay the timely delivery of necessary resources.	4.36	1.43	Neutral
Weighted Mean	5.43		
SD	0.54		
Verbal Interpretation			High

Based on the low overall standard deviation of 0.54, which demonstrates a tight, division-wide consensus regarding these environmental constraints, the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both leadership tiers experience and navigate the exact same geographic friction and climate disruptions.

Given the critically high mean score indicating that natural disasters regularly disrupt programs (M = 5.85), it is strongly recommended that division-level strategic interventions abandon generic, division-wide mandates. Instead, the DepEd CALABARZON leadership must integrate localized, highly agile crisis management protocols to equitably support geographically isolated School Heads, rather than expecting uninterrupted compliance during severe weather events.

The implication of these findings is that mere physical access does not equate to supervisory equity. It implies that the geographic environment actively impedes the standardization of educational quality across the division. Consequently, unless localized crisis adaptations are formally recognized, the human capital of School Heads in vulnerable areas will continue to be drained by disaster response rather than utilized for instructional leadership.

Table 5 shows that the respondents assess the level of contextual factors in terms of Excessive Work Overload as High, with an overall mean of 5.52 (SD = 0.47). The data reveals that the primary systemic burden is that workload volume exceeds effective performance capacity, which received a verbal interpretation of Strongly Agree and obtained the highest mean score observed across all contextual factors (M = 6.19, SD = 0.75). Respondents also confirmed that time constraints limit professional development participation (M = 5.94) and administrative tasks reduce program implementation analysis (M = 5.90). Conversely, the item stating that current work demands allow for a healthy work-life balance received the lowest score, falling into the

Neutral category ($M = 4.33$) with a notably high standard deviation (2.51).

Based on the low overall standard deviation of 0.47, which demonstrates a tight, division-wide consensus regarding the severity of this environmental constraint, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both leadership tiers are uniformly overwhelmed by the sheer volume of work.

Table 5. Level of Contextual Factor of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Excessive Work Overload

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
Workload volume exceeds effective performance capacity.	6.19	0.75	Strongly Agree
Priorities are managed effectively to allow focus on strategic planning.	5.25	1.37	Somewhat Agree
Administrative tasks reduce program implementation analysis.	5.90	0.44	Agree
Current work demands allow for a healthy work-life balance.	4.33	2.51	Neutral
Time constraints limit professional development participation.	5.94	0.60	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.52		
SD	0.47		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Given the critically high mean score establishing that workload volume exceeds effective performance capacity ($M = 6.19$) and the low score for work-life balance ($M = 4.33$), it is strongly recommended that any transformative leadership model or division policy prioritize the systemic reduction of temporal bandwidth. Division leaders must implement aggressive workload rationalization and eliminate redundant administrative tasks rather than deploying individualized productivity or time management training for school heads.

The implication of these findings is that excessive workload is the primary bottleneck to human capital development within the division. It implies that until this structural overload is addressed, Education Program Specialists will struggle to act as effective strategic shields or leverage innovative technical assistance, as both they and their School Heads are essentially paralyzed by administrative compliance rather than engaged in strategic planning.

Table 6 shows that the respondents perceive the level of Strategic Management Approach of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Knowledge Management Systems (KMS) as Moderately High, with an overall mean of 4.30 ($SD = 0.52$). The data exposes a structural paradox regarding information flow within the division: while respondents highly agreed that school heads and teachers are formally recognized or rewarded for sharing their innovations ($M = 6.03$) and there are formal mechanisms for identifying successful practices ($M = 4.59$), the actual digital infrastructure is severely lacking. Specifically, items indicating that platforms exist where School Heads can systematically access and replicate solutions received a Neutral rating ($M = 3.97$), and respondents similarly felt that learning resources remain scattered across different locations ($M = 3.97$).

Table 6. Level of Strategic Management Approach of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Knowledge Management System

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
There is a formal mechanism for identifying and documenting successful practices from high-performing schools.	4.59	1.61	Somewhat Agree
The valuable experience of senior leaders often remains undocumented, limiting its transfer to others.	4.66	1.64	Somewhat Agree
Platforms exist where School Heads can systematically access and replicate solutions developed by their peers.	3.97	1.46	Neutral
Learning resources are scattered across different locations, making them difficult to retrieve systematically.	3.97	1.08	Neutral
School heads and teachers are formally recognized or rewarded for sharing their innovations with the division.	6.03	1.08	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.64		
SD	0.77		
Verbal Interpretation	Moderately High		

Based on the low overall standard deviation of 0.52, which demonstrates a tight, division-wide consensus regarding this strategic deficiency, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both leadership tiers agree the division currently operates on an inefficient "Personalization Strategy" rather than a robust and systematic "Codification Strategy."

Given the high mean score for recognizing innovations ($M = 6.03$) but critically low scores for accessible digital platforms ($M = 3.97$), it is strongly recommended that the division pivot its strategic focus from merely awarding certificates of recognition to actively funding and building a centralized, localized digital repository. Leadership must prioritize establishing a unified Knowledge Management System where the documented innovations and the valuable experiences of senior leaders ($M = 4.66$) can be systematically stored, retrieved, and replicated by all school heads.

The implication of these findings is that the failure to establish a robust KMS is not a behavioral failure or lack of effort by the EPS, but a structural consequence of systemic administrative deluge and outdated hardware. It implies that without a functional digital repository, the transfer of educational best practices remains severely bottlenecked, actively preventing the equitable scaling of human capital development across the division, especially for geographically isolated schools that cannot rely on face-to-face knowledge transfer.

Table 7 shows that the respondents assess the level of Strategic Management Approach of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Agile Resource Allocation as High, with an overall mean of 5.53 ($SD = 0.56$). The data exposes a severe operational paradox: respondents highly agreed that resources are distributed efficiently based on changing needs ($M = 5.80$, $SD = 0.85$), but paradoxically gave an identical high rating to the statement that there is a significant time lag between identifying a resource gap and the actual delivery of support ($M = 5.80$, $SD = 0.81$). Furthermore, respondents agreed that the lack of a strategic reserve leads to operational

bottlenecks ($M = 5.43$). The lowest-rated indicator within this domain was that resource distribution strictly follows equity and need-based criteria, which received a mean score of 5.28. Based on the data, the null hypothesis (H_0) is definitively rejected in this specific domain. Agile Resource Allocation is the singular variable where perceptions significantly diverge between the hierarchical tiers, mathematically proving that because formal division procurement is stalled, localized fiscal agility is driven and experienced primarily by the external survival mechanisms of the School Heads rather than through the top-down facilitation of the Education Program Specialists.

Table 7. Level of Strategic Management Approach of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Agile Resource Allocation

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
Resources are distributed efficiently based on changing needs and priorities.	5.80	0.85	Agree
The lack of a strategic reserve leads to operational bottlenecks when unforeseen issues arise.	5.43	0.88	Agree
Resource allocation is responsive enough to address emerging challenges immediately.	5.31	1.05	Agree
There is a significant time lag between identifying a resource gap and the actual delivery of support.	5.80	0.81	Agree
Resource distribution strictly follows equity and need-based criteria.	5.28	1.22	Somewhat Agree
Weighted Mean	5.53		
SD	0.56		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Given the identically high mean scores for efficient distribution ($M = 5.80$) and significant time lag ($M = 5.80$), coupled with the lower score for equity-based distribution ($M = 5.28$), it is strongly recommended that the division decentralize emergency funding. Policymakers must create a formalized strategic reserve that empowers EPS and School Heads to immediately bypass standard procurement pipelines during unforeseen issues, preventing the operational bottlenecks explicitly identified by the respondents.

The implication of these findings is that resource agility in the division is currently a grassroots achievement rather than a reliable administrative function. It implies that marginalized schools without strong external stakeholders or local government support will suffer the longest waiting times during crises. Ultimately, the current procurement system structurally enforces inequity instead of resolving it, forcing school leaders to act as fundraisers rather than instructional managers.

Table 8 shows that the respondents perceive the level of Strategic Management Approach of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Technology Integration as High, with an overall mean of 5.39 ($SD = 0.64$). The data indicates aggressive utilization of available digital avenues for cluster management, with the highest-rated indicators establishing that technology is effectively utilized to provide immediate, documented monitoring and technical assistance ($M = 6.04$, $SD = 1.18$) and that online platforms effectively support professional development activities ($M = 5.97$). However, respondents also agreed that data management systems are rarely consulted when making key educational decisions ($M =$

5.11). Meanwhile, the statement suggesting that collaboration is hindered by a reluctance to effectively use cloud-based platforms received the lowest rating, falling into the Neutral category ($M = 4.10$).

Table 8. Level of Strategic Management Approach of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Technology Integration

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
Technology is utilized to provide immediate, documented monitoring and technical assistance.	6.04	1.18	Agree
Collaboration between EPS and School Heads is hindered by a reluctance to effectively use cloud-based platforms.	4.10	0.93	Neutral
Online platforms effectively support professional development activities.	5.97	0.90	Agree
Data management systems are rarely consulted when making key educational decisions.	5.11	1.35	Somewhat Agree
Digital tools are integrated into the core workflow rather than being treated as add-on tasks.	5.73	1.08	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.39		
SD	0.64		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Based on the inferential test results corresponding to this variable ($p = 0.053$), the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both leadership tiers share and navigate the exact same technological reality: they successfully digitize their communication but are mutually constrained from digitizing their strategic operations.

Given the exceptionally high mean score for utilizing technology for immediate monitoring and communication ($M = 6.04$), juxtaposed with the concerning agreement that data management systems are rarely consulted for key decisions ($M = 5.11$), it is strongly recommended that the division pivot its technology integration strategy. Division leaders must shift capacity-building efforts away from basic digital communication tools and instead mandate targeted training on data analytics, ensuring that EPS and School Heads are equipped and incentivized to use centralized data systems for actual strategic planning.

The implication of these findings is that the division currently operates as high-tech communicators but low-tech analysts. It implies that while leaders have successfully used technology to defeat geographic boundaries and isolation, their strategic management remains capped. Until data integration is prioritized, technology will serve merely as an administrative add-on for meetings, rather than a transformative engine for human capital development and evidence-based policy execution.

Table 9 shows that the respondents perceive the level of Strategic Management Approach of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Performance Analytics as Moderately High, with an overall mean of 5.07 ($SD = 0.72$). The data exposes a structural paradox where data availability is high, but analytical depth is severely compromised. Respondents agreed that performance data is made accessible and understandable to school heads to enable their own self-assessment ($M = 5.38$) and that historical data trends are

analyzed to predict potential failure points ($M = 5.36$). However, this transparency is undermined by the high agreement that statistical analysis is often superficial, addressing symptoms rather than the root causes of performance issues ($M = 5.31$). Furthermore, respondents only somewhat agreed that interventions are specifically tailored based on granular assessment data ($M = 5.01$), and gave a Neutral rating regarding whether meetings rely more on anecdotal discussions than on visual data dashboards ($M = 4.32$).

Table 9. Level of Strategic Management Approach of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Performance Analytics

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
Historical data trends are analyzed to predict potential failure points in school performance before they occur.	5.36	1.45	Agree
Statistical analysis is often superficial, addressing symptoms rather than the root causes of performance issues.	5.31	1.25	Agree
Technical support and interventions are specifically tailored based on granular assessment data.	5.01	1.26	Somewhat Agree
Meetings regarding school progress rely more on anecdotal discussions than on visual data dashboards.	4.32	1.14	Neutral
Performance data is made accessible and understandable to school heads to enable their own self-assessment.	5.38	0.77	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.07		
SD	0.72		
Verbal Interpretation			Moderately High

Based on the inferential test results corresponding to this variable ($p = 0.269$), the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both leadership tiers share the exact same perception of the division's analytical maturity: they universally agree that the overarching system remains structurally incapable of executing deep, root-cause analyses.

Given the concerning high mean score indicating that statistical analysis is often superficial ($M = 5.31$) and the moderate score for tailoring interventions based on granular data ($M = 5.01$), it is strongly recommended that the division reform its data utilization practices. Division leadership must provide targeted capacity-building on root-cause analysis for both EPS and School Heads, and structurally mandate that performance reviews rely on visual data dashboards rather than anecdotal discussions.

The implication of these findings is that the division currently demonstrates Operational Analytics but critically lacks Strategic Analytics. It implies that while the EPS is highly transparent in sharing compliance data, the overarching educational system uses this information merely to monitor symptoms rather than to cure underlying structural issues. Consequently, human capital development programs risk being misaligned or ineffective because they are not being driven by deep, localized data insights.

Table 10. Level of Strategic Management Approach of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Change Management

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
The "why" behind new policy changes is effectively communicated to create buy-in before implementation begins.	5.11	1.24	Somewhat Agree
Resistance from school personnel during transitions is often overlooked rather than proactively addressed.	4.16	1.20	Neutral
Key influencers (Master Teachers, other school leaders) are mobilized to support and drive change initiatives.	5.57	1.16	Agree
New initiatives often lose momentum and staff revert to old practices due to a lack of reinforcement.	4.80	1.08	Somewhat Agree
The implementation plan includes clear milestones for early success to build momentum and morale.	5.60	1.01	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.05		
SD	0.70		
Verbal Interpretation			Moderately High

Table 10 shows that the respondents perceive the level of Strategic Management Approach of the Education Program Specialist in terms of Change Management as Moderately High, with an overall mean of 5.05 ($SD = 0.70$). The data establishes a structural "Launch-Strong, Sustain-Weak" dynamic within the division. During the initiation phase, respondents agreed that the implementation plan includes clear milestones for early success to build momentum ($M = 5.60$) and that key influencers are mobilized to support initiatives ($M = 5.57$). However, respondents also somewhat agreed that new initiatives often lose momentum and staff revert to old practices due to a lack of reinforcement ($M = 4.80$), and gave a Neutral rating regarding whether resistance from school personnel during transitions is often overlooked ($M = 4.16$).

Based on the overall standard deviation of 0.70, which demonstrates a tight, division-wide consensus regarding this episodic change cycle, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both hierarchical tiers experience and agree upon the exact same operational reality: the division's change management strategy is characterized by high initial mobilization but critically low maintenance.

Given the high mean scores for setting early milestones ($M = 5.60$) and mobilizing key influencers ($M = 5.57$), coupled with the concerning reality that initiatives often lose momentum ($M = 4.80$), it is strongly recommended that the division redesign its change management protocols to prioritize the sustainment phase. Division leaders must mandate post-implementation reinforcement schedules, such as scheduled follow-up evaluations and long-term feedback loops, rather than officially closing projects immediately after their initial launch rollout.

The implication of these findings is that the division currently suffers from initiative fatigue. It implies that because policies are launched strongly but lack long-term structural reinforcement, School Heads are caught in a perpetual cycle of starting new compliance tasks without ever fully institutionalizing the previous ones. Consequently, until sustainment is prioritized over initiation, human capital development programs will remain episodic disruptions rather than achieving permanent systemic change.

Table 11. Level of Human Capital Development of School Heads in terms of Access

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
School Heads maintain equal educational opportunities that are genuinely open to all learners regardless of background.	5.79	0.81	Agree
School Heads struggle to design learning programs that cater to diverse needs outside of traditional schooling.	3.83	1.63	Neutral
School Heads demonstrate the capability to diagnose specific socio-economic barriers preventing enrollment.	5.60	0.89	Agree
School facilities remain largely well-equipped to accommodate students with physical disabilities.	4.55	1.50	Somewhat Agree
School Heads proactively implement early warning systems to identify and support students showing signs of dropping out.	5.51	0.93	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.06		
SD	0.63		
Verbal Interpretation	Moderately High		

Table 11 shows that the respondents perceive the level of Human Capital Development of School Heads in terms of Access as Moderately High, with an overall mean of 5.06 (SD = 0.63). The data establishes a stark contrast between the cognitive capabilities of School Heads and the physical realities of their schools. Respondents gave the highest ratings to maintaining equal educational opportunities regardless of background (M = 5.79, SD = 0.81) and proactively diagnosing socio-economic barriers preventing enrollment (M = 5.60). Similarly, there is a strong focus on implementing early warning systems for dropouts (M = 5.51). Conversely, ratings declined significantly regarding whether school facilities remain well-equipped to accommodate students with physical disabilities (M = 4.55). The lowest score, falling into the Neutral category, indicates that School Heads struggle to design learning programs that cater to diverse needs outside of traditional schooling (M = 3.83, SD = 1.63).

Based on the data, the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both leadership tiers experience and agree upon the exact same operational reality: School Heads demonstrate high diagnostic skill for educational inclusion, but their capacity to fully execute Access is structurally stalled.

Given the notably low mean score regarding the struggle to design non-traditional learning programs (M = 3.83) and the inadequate physical facilities for students with disabilities (M = 4.55), it is strongly recommended that division leaders explicitly redirect their technical assistance. The EPS must facilitate targeted capacity-building on alternative pedagogies and modular learning design for School Heads, while concurrently lobbying for localized infrastructure budgets to retrofit existing school facilities for physical inclusivity.

The implication of these findings is that School Heads are currently highly competent diagnosticians but structurally constrained implementers. It implies that true educational equity and access cannot be achieved through sheer leadership intent alone. Unless the physical infrastructure is upgraded and alternative learning modalities are aggressively supported by

the division, the human capital of these leaders will remain stalled at the awareness level, unable to fully execute the inclusive education mandated by law.

Table 12. Level of Human Capital Development of School Heads in terms of Equity

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
School Heads effectively promote inclusive educational practices for all student groups.	5.54	0.75	Agree
School Heads find it difficult to distribute school funds equitably among different learner groups.	3.64	1.28	Neutral
School Heads adapt school practices to respect and integrate the cultural heritage of Indigenous Peoples or minority groups.	5.24	0.92	Somewhat Agree
Remediation programs implemented by School Heads are often generic rather than targeted at specific lagging cohorts.	4.72	1.16	Somewhat Agree
School Heads are capable of integrating gender-responsive conceptual frameworks into school planning.	5.43	0.74	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.92		
SD	0.57		
Verbal Interpretation	Moderately High		

Table 12 shows that the respondents perceive the level of Human Capital Development of School Heads in terms of Equity as Moderately High, with an overall mean of 4.92 (SD = 0.57). The data indicates a leadership group characterized by strong inclusive intent but limited operational precision. Respondents agreed that School Heads effectively promote inclusive educational practices for all student groups (M = 5.54) and are highly capable of integrating gender-responsive conceptual frameworks into school planning (M = 5.43). However, a disparity exists regarding other equity domains: adapting practices for Indigenous Peoples scored lower (M = 5.24), and respondents agreed that remediation programs are often generic rather than targeted at specific lagging cohorts (M = 4.72). The lowest score fell into the Neutral category, indicating that School Heads still find it somewhat difficult to distribute school funds equitably among different learner groups (M = 3.64).

Based on the low overall standard deviation of 0.57, which indicates a tight consensus across the division regarding these localized equity gaps, the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, mathematically proving that both leadership tiers share the exact same assessment of their current inclusive capabilities and operational limitations.

Given the concerning finding that remediation programs are often generic (M = 4.72) and the difficulty in distributing funds equitably (M = 3.64), it is strongly recommended that division leaders immediately prioritize technical assistance on differentiated instruction and equitable resource management. The Education Program Specialists must move away from generic gender-sensitivity seminars and instead provide School Heads with rigorous, data-driven training on designing and funding targeted Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for highly specific lagging cohorts.

The implication of these findings is that the division currently operates on "Intentional Equity" rather than

"Operational Equity." It implies that while the ethical will to be inclusive is genuinely high among School Heads ($M = 5.54$), the actual human capital required to execute targeted, evidence-based equity programming is severely underdeveloped due to systemic analytical and budgetary constraints. Consequently, marginalized students may be welcomed into the school environment, but their specific academic deficits are not being accurately funded or remediated.

Table 13. Level of Human Capital Development of School Heads in terms of Quality

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
School Heads successfully facilitate Learning Action Cells (LACs) that result in tangible improvements in pedagogy.	5.54	1.39	Agree
School Heads rarely use assessment results to drive adjustments in instructional planning.	4.11	1.71	Neutral
School Heads demonstrate the ability to coach novice teachers effectively, accelerating their professional growth.	5.71	1.13	Agree
School Heads struggle to guide teachers in contextualizing the curriculum to local realities.	3.97	1.51	Neutral
School Heads effectively use clinical supervision cycles to improve teaching practice.	5.31	1.27	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.93		
SD	0.86		
Verbal Interpretation	Moderately High		

Table 13 shows that the respondents perceive the level of Human Capital Development of School Heads in terms of Quality as Moderately High, with an overall mean of 4.93 ($SD = 0.86$). The data identifies that School Heads are highly proficient in instructional supervision, as evidenced by the high agreement that they demonstrate the ability to coach novice teachers effectively ($M = 5.71$, $SD = 1.13$) and successfully facilitate Learning Action Cells (LACs) that result in tangible pedagogical improvements ($M = 5.54$, $SD = 1.39$). They also effectively use clinical supervision cycles ($M = 5.31$). Conversely, the lowest score, falling into the Neutral category, indicates that School Heads struggle to guide teachers in contextualizing the curriculum to local realities ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 1.51$). Furthermore, respondents gave a Neutral rating regarding whether assessment results are rarely used to drive adjustments in instructional planning ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 1.71$).

Based on the overall standard deviation of 0.86, which demonstrates a clear consensus across the division regarding these qualitative strengths and gaps, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both leadership tiers agree that the human capital of School Heads is characterized by methodological quality in supervision but remains contextually rigid and data-starved in curriculum implementation.

Given the high mean scores in coaching novice teachers ($M = 5.71$) and LAC facilitation ($M = 5.54$), but the critically low score regarding the contextualization of the curriculum ($M = 3.97$), it is strongly recommended that division-level

training immediately pivot its focus. The Education Program Specialists should leverage the already successful, established LAC sessions to train School Heads explicitly in deep Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) and curriculum localization, rather than just basic clinical supervision.

The implication of these findings is that instructional supervision within the division is highly active but structurally generic. It implies that while School Heads are excellent at managing the mechanics of teaching (observing and mentoring), they are prevented from actually innovating what is being taught. Until leaders are equipped and given the time to contextualize the curriculum, the quality of education in the division will remain rigidly standardized, failing to address the specific, localized realities of the learners they serve.

Table 14. Level of Human Capital Development of School Heads in terms of Resiliency

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
School Heads quickly adapt school operations to align with sudden shifts in national educational policy.	5.11	0.93	Somewhat Agree
Learning Continuity Plans drafted by School Heads are often theoretical and difficult to execute during actual suspensions.	4.08	1.21	Neutral
School Heads demonstrate composure and decisive leadership during periods of high uncertainty or disaster.	5.28	1.20	Somewhat Agree
School Heads lack clear roadmaps for efficiently restoring normal operations after a crisis.	3.25	1.65	Somewhat Disagree
School Heads display the ability to secure alternative resources when standard supply chains are disrupted.	5.55	0.95	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.66		
SD	0.54		
Verbal Interpretation	Moderately High		

Table 14 shows that the respondents perceive the level of Human Capital Development of School Heads in terms of Resiliency as Moderately High, with an overall mean of 4.66 ($SD = 0.54$). The data identifies a leadership profile characterized by high practical resourcefulness during active crises, as respondents agreed that School Heads display the ability to secure alternative resources when standard supply chains are disrupted ($M = 5.55$, $SD = 0.95$). They also demonstrated composure and decisive leadership during periods of high uncertainty or disaster ($M = 5.28$). Conversely, respondents gave a Neutral rating regarding whether Learning Continuity Plans (LCPs) drafted by School Heads are often theoretical and difficult to execute during actual suspensions ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 1.21$).

Based on the low overall standard deviation of 0.54, which indicates a tight, division-wide consensus regarding this resilience profile, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both leadership tiers agree that while School Heads are highly effective in managing the immediate heat of a crisis, the formal systems meant to support them remain detached from the structural realities of the field.

Given the high mean scores for securing alternative resources ($M = 5.55$) and demonstrating composure ($M = 5.28$), juxtaposed against the concerning Neutral score for the actual execution of Learning Continuity Plans ($M = 4.08$), it is strongly recommended that the division reform its crisis management policies. Division leaders must stop demanding standardized, theoretical LCPs purely for compliance purposes. Instead, the EPS should guide School Heads in drafting highly localized, agile, and actionable crisis protocols that actually reflect and utilize their proven grassroots resourcefulness.

The implication of these findings is that resilience within the division is currently sustained by the individual endurance and grit of the School Heads rather than by robust organizational structures. It implies that unless the division transitions from Grit-Based Resilience to true Systemic Resilience, the human capital of these leaders is at high risk of eventual burnout, as they cannot perpetually absorb systemic shocks by relying solely on improvised survival tactics without functional institutional backing.

Table 15. Level of Human Capital Development of School Heads in terms of Well Being

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
School Heads are skilled in providing or referring psychological first aid to staff and students in distress.	4.92	1.28	Somewhat Agree
School Heads frequently overlook the signs of a toxic school climate that leads to staff attrition.	3.41	1.25	Somewhat Disagree
School Heads model and encourage healthy boundaries between professional duties and personal time.	5.07	1.07	Somewhat Agree
School Heads often avoid intervening in interpersonal conflicts among staff, allowing tensions to escalate.	3.15	1.28	Somewhat Disagree
School Heads prioritize and maintain a physically safe and ergonomic working environment for all personnel.	5.58	1.22	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.43		
SD	0.61		
Verbal Interpretation	Neutral		

Table 15 shows that the respondents perceive the level of Human Capital Development of School Heads in terms of Well Being at a Neutral level, with an overall mean of 4.43 ($SD = 0.61$). This represents the lowest-rated domain among all human capital variables (Access, Equity, Quality, and Resiliency), identifying Well Being as the primary vulnerability in the leadership profile. The data reveals a hierarchical trend where prioritizing and maintaining a physically safe and ergonomic working environment received the highest rating ($M = 5.58$, $SD = 1.22$). Conversely, higher-level psychological indicators received lower scores, such as modeling and encouraging healthy boundaries ($M = 5.07$) and providing or referring psychological first aid ($M = 4.92$). Notably, respondents somewhat disagreed that School Heads overlook a toxic climate ($M = 3.41$) or avoid intervening in conflicts ($M = 3.15$).

Based on the overall standard deviation of 0.61, which indicates a general consensus across the division regarding this specific developmental gap, the null hypothesis (H_0) is

accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both leadership tiers agree that Well Being is currently the weakest and most compromised pillar in their human capital profile.

Given the high mean score for maintaining physical safety ($M = 5.58$) juxtaposed against the low, neutral overall score for Well Being ($M = 4.43$) and lower capacities for psychological first aid ($M = 4.92$), it is strongly recommended that division leadership drastically redefine their wellness programs. Interventions must shift away from basic physical occupational safety checklists; instead, the EPS must facilitate targeted, professional training for School Heads focused specifically on trauma-informed management, conflict resolution, and the establishment of psychological safety boundaries.

The implication of these findings is that the division's current human capital is physically secured but psychologically vulnerable. It implies that the heavy bureaucratic constraints and excessive workloads previously identified in the division have entirely crowded out the leaders' capacity to foster genuine mental well-being. Consequently, until psychological safety is structurally prioritized and administrative burdens are lifted, the human capital of the division will remain at a critical risk of chronic burnout, attrition, and operational stagnation.

Table 16. Level of Significant Difference Between EPS and School Heads in the Contextual Factors of EPS Transformative Leader

Contextual factor	Position	N	M	SD	df	t-value	p-value	Decision on H_0	Analysis
Bureaucratic Constraints	EPS	52	5.25	0.49	175	1.126	0.262	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	5.34	0.47					
Organizational Culture	EPS	52	4.46	0.56	175	0.109	0.913	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	4.45	0.54					
Technological Limitations	EPS	52	5.06	0.48	175	1.150	0.252	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	5.15	0.46					
Geographical Challenges	EPS	52	5.38	0.62	175	0.825	0.410	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	5.46	0.50					
Excessive Work Overload	EPS	52	5.49	0.51	175	0.614	0.540	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	5.54	0.45					

Table 16 shows the level of significant difference between the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and School Heads regarding the contextual factors affecting transformative leadership. The data reveals that across all five evaluated domains, Bureaucratic Constraints ($p = 0.262$), Organizational Culture ($p = 0.913$), Technological Limitations ($p = 0.252$), Geographical Challenges ($p = 0.410$), and Excessive Work Overload ($p = 0.540$), every calculated p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance.

Based on the statistical results where all p-values exceeded the 0.05 alpha level, the null hypothesis (H_0) is universally accepted across all contextual factors. There is no statistically

significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both hierarchical tiers share the exact same diagnosis and experience of the organizational constraints within the division.

Given the definitive statistical proof that issues like excessive work overload and bureaucratic constraints are universally experienced systemic problems, it is strongly recommended that regional and division leaders cease deploying individualized resilience or time-management seminars. Interventions must prioritize division-wide, systemic workload rationalization, directly eliminating redundant administrative tasks that are equally paralyzing the strategic capacities of both the EPS and the School Heads.

The implication of these findings is that the division acts as a highly unified entity in its perception of organizational challenges, meaning there is zero leader-team perceptual distance regarding the severity of their working environment. It implies that any future intervention aiming to develop human capital will fail if it only targets the personnel's skills; because the structural friction is universally recognized and experienced, only top-down, systemic de-bureaucratization will successfully unlock the transformative capacity of the division's leadership pipeline.

Table 17. Level of Significant Difference Between EPS and School Heads in the Strategic Management Approach of EPS Transformative Leader

Strategic Management Approach	Position	N	M	SD	df	t-value	p-value	Decision on H_0	Analysis
Knowledge Management System	EPS	52	4.63	0.74	175	0.092	0.096	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	4.65	0.79					
Agile Resource Allocation	EPS	52	5.38	0.64	175	2.283	0.024	Reject H_0	Significant
	School Head	125	5.59	0.52					
Technology Integration	EPS	52	5.25	0.65	175	1.946	0.053	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	5.45	0.63					
Performance Analytics	EPS	52	4.98	0.80	175	1.109	0.269	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	5.11	0.68					
Change Management	EPS	52	4.95	0.78	175	1.189	0.236	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	5.09	0.67					

Table 17 shows the level of significant difference between the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and School Heads regarding the Strategic Management Approach of the EPS Transformative Leader. The data reveals that across the domains of Knowledge Management System ($p = 0.096$), Technology Integration ($p = 0.053$), Performance Analytics ($p = 0.269$), and Change Management ($p = 0.236$), the calculated p-values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Conversely, Agile Resource Allocation is the singular domain that yielded a statistically significant difference ($p = 0.024$). In this specific area, School Heads rated the approach notably higher ($M = 5.59$) than the EPS ($M = 5.38$).

Based on the inferential test results, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted for Knowledge Management System,

Technology Integration, Performance Analytics, and Change Management, demonstrating perceptual uniformity in these areas. However, the null hypothesis (H_0) is definitively rejected for Agile Resource Allocation. This mathematically proves that there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the EPS and the School Heads regarding resource management, with School Heads experiencing significantly higher levels of localized fiscal agility.

The high statistical alignment across the majority of the strategic domains proves that School Heads are not resisting the division's leadership; rather, they are moving in lockstep with the transformative vision and adapting to the administrative deluge as a unified front, aligning with established studies on leader-follower congruence. On the other hand, the significant divergence in Agile Resource Allocation empirically validates the theoretical lens of the Resource-Based View (RBV). The positive deviation in the School Heads' scores proves that they have developed unique, hyper-agile survival mechanisms for securing localized funding and physical resources that actively exceed the immediate visibility or standardized expectations of the Division Office.

Given the statistically significant difference in Agile Resource Allocation where School Heads demonstrate significantly higher ratings ($M = 5.59$) than the EPS ($M = 5.38$), it is strongly recommended that policymakers and division leaders do not attempt to heavily regulate or centralize these grassroots resource strategies. Instead, leadership must formally recognize, empower, and scale up these independent, school-based agile resource mechanisms to maximize human capital development across the division.

The implication of these findings is that material and financial agility within the division is not a top-down administrative achievement, but rather a demonstration of profound grassroots strength. It implies that while the EPS effectively provide the overarching strategic frameworks for technology, analytics, and change management, the School Heads independently leverage their localized networks to bypass stalled division procurement and address ground-level inequities on their own.

Table 18 shows the level of significant difference between Education Program Specialists (EPS) and School Heads regarding the Human Capital Development of School Heads. The independent samples t-test reveals no statistically significant differences between the two groups across all five pillars: Access ($p = 0.305$), Equity ($p = 0.942$), Quality ($p = 0.863$), Resiliency ($p = 0.483$), and Well-Being ($p = 0.697$). Notably, Well-Being registered the lowest mean scores among all domains for both EPS (4.45) and School Heads (4.41).

Because all computed p-values are substantially higher than the 0.05 alpha level, the null hypothesis (H_0) is universally accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the EPS and the School Heads regarding human capital development.

Given that Well-Being registered the lowest mean scores for both groups ($M = 4.45$ for EPS and $M = 4.41$ for School Heads), it is strongly recommended that policymakers

urgently implement strategic interventions aimed specifically at well-being support and bureaucratic unbundling rather than standard performance monitoring.

Table 18. Level of Significant Difference Between EPS and School Heads in the Human Capital Development of School Heads

Human Capital Development	Position	N	M	SD	df	t-value	p-value	Decision on H_0	Analysis
Access	EPS	52	4.98	0.64	175	1.029	0.305	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	5.09	0.63					
Quality	EPS	52	4.91	0.66	175	0.073	0.942	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	4.92	0.52					
Equity	EPS	52	4.95	0.87	175	0.172	0.863	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	4.92	0.86					
Resiliency	EPS	52	4.70	0.55	175	0.703	0.483	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	4.64	0.54					
Well-being	EPS	52	4.45	0.64	175	0.390	0.697	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	School Head	125	4.41	0.60					

The implication of these findings is that there is absolutely no disagreement on the current state of the division's human capital; both administrative tiers agree that School Heads are resilient, high-quality leaders who are simultaneously suffering from severe, system-induced well-being deficits. Consequently, future strategic interventions designed to alleviate these constraints will not face hierarchical resistance, as the need for reform is universally acknowledged across the division.

Table 19. Level of Correlation of Contextual Factors of EPS Transformative Leader and Human Capital Development of School Heads

Contextual Factor	Statistical Measure	Access	Equity	Quality	Resiliency	Well Being
Bureaucratic Constraints	Pearson Correlation	0.664**	0.376**	0.486**	0.417**	0.621**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	177	177	177	177	177
Organizational Culture	Pearson Correlation	0.232**	0.078	0.048	0.409**	0.511**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.002	0.302	0.522	0.000	0.000
	N	177	177	177	177	177
Technological Limitations	Pearson Correlation	-	-	-	0.083	-0.116
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.156*	0.321**	0.243**	0.272	0.123
	N	177	177	177	177	177
Geographical Challenges	Pearson Correlation	-0.046	-0.151*	0.337**	-0.229**	-0.019
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.546	0.045	0.000	0.002	0.800
	N	177	177	177	177	177
Excessive Work Overload	Pearson Correlation	0.002	0.029	0.379**	-0.128	0.320**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.974	0.704	0.000	0.089	0.000
	N	177	177	177	177	177

Legend:

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

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

Table 19 shows the level of correlation between the contextual factors of the Education Program Specialist (EPS) transformative leader and the human capital development of School Heads. The data reveals that Bureaucratic Constraints have a strong positive correlation across all pillars, particularly with Access ($r = 0.664$, $p = 0.000$) and Well-Being ($r = 0.621$, $p = 0.000$). Organizational Culture is positively correlated primarily with Well-Being ($r = 0.511$) and Resiliency ($r = 0.409$). Conversely, Technological Limitations exhibit significant negative correlations, actively degrading Equity ($r = -0.321$, $p = 0.000$) and Quality ($r = -0.243$, $p = 0.001$). Furthermore, the data isolates a profound structural warning within Geographical Challenges: it presents a split correlation where extreme physical isolation positively drives Quality ($r = 0.337$) but simultaneously and significantly degrades Resiliency ($r = -0.229$).

Based on the inferential test results showing highly significant p-values ($p < 0.05$) across multiple correlation pairings, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. The data mathematically proves that there is a highly significant relationship between the external contextual constraints (such as bureaucratic load, technological deficits, and geographical isolation) and the multidimensional human capital development of the School Heads.

Given the significant negative correlations between Technological Limitations and both Equity ($r = -0.321$) and Quality ($r = -0.243$), alongside the severe resiliency drain caused by Geographical Challenges ($r = -0.229$), it is strongly recommended that regional and division leadership urgently prioritize localized physical infrastructure investments over abstract pedagogical training. Interventions must deliver targeted technological hardware and customized psychosocial support systems specifically designed for geographically isolated School Heads to mitigate imminent burnout.

The implication of these findings is that human capital development in the division currently operates within a highly volatile, survival of the fittest ecosystem. It implies that while School Heads are emotionally fueled by overcoming administrative workloads and adapting to organizational cultures to maintain operations, the current environment forces them to sacrifice their own personal resiliency to bridge severe geographic and technological gaps. Ultimately, this means the division's leadership pipeline is structurally unsustainable; without immediate infrastructural interventions, these highly competent leaders will inevitably succumb to chronic burnout.

Table 20 shows the level of significant difference between the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and School Heads in the Human Capital Development of School Heads. The data reveals that there is no significant difference across all the evaluated domains, as every calculated p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance: Knowledge Management System ($p = 0.305$), Agile Resource Allocation ($p = 0.942$), Technology Integration ($p = 0.863$), Performance Analytics ($p = 0.483$), and Change Management ($p = 0.697$). Both hierarchical groups reported highly similar mean scores across the board, with Agile Resource Allocation showing nearly identical responses (EPS $M = 4.91$, School Head $M = 4.92$).

Based on the inferential test results where all calculated p-values strictly exceeded the 0.05 alpha level, the null hypothesis (Ho) is universally accepted. There is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists and the School Heads, proving mathematically that both groups share an exact, unified assessment of the current state of human capital development within the division.

Table 20. Level of Correlation of Strategic Management Approach of EPS Transformative Leader and Human Capital Development of School Heads

Contextual Factor	Statistical Measure	Access	Equity	Quality	Resiliency	Well Being
Knowledge Management System	Pearson Correlation	0.513**	0.607**	0.665**	0.632**	0.435**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	177	177	177	177	177
Agile Resource Allocation	Pearson Correlation	0.596**	0.431**	0.477**	0.184*	0.294**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.000
	N	177	177	177	177	177
Technology Integration	Pearson Correlation	0.583**	0.388**	0.302**	0.297**	0.206**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.006
	N	177	177	177	177	177
Performance Analytics	Pearson Correlation	0.548**	0.561**	0.557**	0.314**	0.046
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.540
	N	177	177	177	177	177
Change Management	Pearson Correlation	0.299**	0.423**	0.625**	0.077	-0.036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.306	0.638
	N	177	177	177	177	177

Legend:

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

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

Given the definitive statistical proof that EPS and School Heads share unified perceptions and very similar mean scores, particularly the comparatively lower scores in Change Management (EPS M = 4.45; School Head M = 4.41), it is strongly recommended that regional and division leadership deploy unified, system-wide capacity-building programs rather than role-segmented training. Future developmental interventions must target the shared structural constraints directly, as both groups require the same overarching support to navigate these systemic bottlenecks.

The implication of these findings is that the division benefits from total organizational congruence regarding its developmental realities. Because both the EPS and the School Heads share a singular, unified experience of their professional growth and environmental pressures, any future structural reforms or human capital investments deployed by the division will not face hierarchical resistance or conflicting priorities.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concludes that the division operates within a high-friction survival environment where systemic work overload and bureaucratic constraints are perceived at a high

level. These factors act as pervasive structural barriers that exhaust the cognitive bandwidth of leaders and force them into a state of tactical survival rather than strategic innovation.

It also concludes that strategic management in the division is Operationally Agile but Strategically Constrained. While Education Program Specialists excel in technology integration and agile resource allocation to bypass red tape, there is a significant deficit in centralized Knowledge Management Systems (KMS), leaving institutional expertise siloed and difficult to access.

Furthermore, the study concludes that the human capital of School Heads is Competent but Psychologically Vulnerable. While there are high levels of pedagogical quality and resiliency, leader well-being has stagnated at a Neutral level. This proves that the system currently maintains its high standards by burning out the personal grit and emotional resources of its frontline managers.

Based on the results of the independent samples t-test for the contextual factors of transformative leadership, including bureaucratic constraints, organizational culture, technological limitations, geographical challenges, and work overload, there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists (EPS) and the School Heads; therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Regarding the strategic management approaches, there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the EPS and the School Heads in the domains of Knowledge Management System, Technology Integration, Performance Analytics, and Change Management; therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted for these variables. However, in the domain of Agile Resource Allocation, there is a significant difference; therefore, the null hypothesis for this specific variable is rejected.

In terms of the human capital development of School Heads across the pillars of access, equity, quality, resiliency, and well-being, the statistical analysis reveals that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the Education Program Specialists and the School Heads; therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The correlational analysis measuring the link between the contextual factors of the high-friction environment and the growth of school-level human capital indicates that there is a significant relationship between the variables; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Moreover, the results of the inferential test between the strategic management approaches deployed by the Education Program Specialists and the resulting human capital development of the School Heads demonstrate that there is a significant relationship; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Finally, the study concludes that Project H.R.D. (Holistic, Responsive, and Defensive Framework) is the essential strategic response to the findings. It concludes that a transition from compliance-driven support to strategic shielding is required to protect the psychological safety of leaders, decentralize resource authority, and establish a unified data-capture system to reclaim instructional time.

To address the lowest mean in human capital development, which is leader well-being, the Division Office could institutionalize the integration of specific climate safety and Psychological First Aid modules into the existing School Learning Action Cells (LACs). Because the data specifically highlighted a struggle with intervening in interpersonal conflicts and identifying toxic school climates, these sessions could move away from purely instructional topics to focus on boundary management and peer support protocols. This is highly feasible as it utilizes an already institutionalized meeting structure and requires no additional funding, merely a shift in the LAC agenda to prioritize the replenishment of the leaders' psychological bandwidth.

To improve the Knowledge Management System, which was the lowest-rated strategic management approach, the Education Program Specialists (EPS) may establish a Localized Division Digital Innovation Repository using existing cloud-based platforms to act as a networked learning hub. This repository would serve to decentralize technical expertise, allowing School Heads, especially those in geographically isolated areas, to access administrative templates, best practices, and instructional localized materials without the delays associated with traditional bureaucratic channels. By leveraging free digital tools already used by the department, the EPS can bridge the digital context gap and ensure that strategic support is available 24/7, effectively translating their transformative leadership into a tangible, accessible resource.

Finally, to mitigate the highest contextual constraint of excessive work overload while capitalizing on the high mean

for agile resource allocation, the Division may institutionalize a practice of strategic shielding. This involves the EPS acting as systems navigators who consolidate and simplify data reporting requirements into a unified digital capture system before they reach the school level, thereby reclaiming instructional leadership time for School Heads. Simultaneously, the Division may issue a memorandum that formally recognizes and empowers the decentralized authority of School Heads to exercise high agility in MOOE utilization for immediate school-level needs. This approach is feasible because it reorganizes existing administrative workflows and validates the grassroots survival mechanisms already identified in the study, ensuring that high performance is sustained by systemic efficiency rather than the depletion of personal grit.

REFERENCE

- [1]. De Los Santos, H. B., Montecillo, F. T., & Escarlos, G. S. (2025). Learning Recovery Through Distributed Leadership: A Review on the Implementation of DepEd's ARAL Program. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(11), 929-934. <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/uploads/vol9-iss11-pg929-934-202511.pdf>
- [2]. Department of Education (DepEd). (2020). DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020: National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024.pdf
- [3]. Guzman, J. (2025, September 16). DepEd launches ARAL program to strengthen students' foundational skills. Philippine Information Agency. <https://pia.gov.ph/news/deped-launches-aral-program-to-strengthen-students-foundational-skills/>