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Abstract: This study is aimed to find out the relationship between leadership domains and relationship building acumen of school heads. This study utilized the non-experimental quantitative research design using descriptive technique involving teachers in Kiblawan North District, Davao del Sur Division, Philippines. The study was conducted on the second semester of School Year 2023-2024. Research instruments on leadership domains and relationship building acumen of school heads were used as source of data. Using mean and pearson-r as statistical tools to treat the data, the study showed the following results: the study found to exhibit a high level of leadership domains of school heads. This means that the provisions relating to leadership domains of school heads embodied in the item is often manifested. The study revealed a high level of relationship building acumen of school heads. This indicates that the provisions relating to relationship building acumen of school heads embodied in the item is often manifested. The results of the study also confirm that there is a significant relationship between leadership domains of school heads and relationship building acumen of school heads. This implies that the higher the leadership domains of school heads, the higher is the relationship building acumen of school heads of students. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between leadership domains of school heads and relationship building acumen of school heads was rejected.
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1. Introduction

The public-school system of the United States urges the school heads to focus on the relationship management competencies in order to function effectively in a changing education environment as the new research affirms much of what earlier studies have found that teachers left the profession because of school principals who were arbitrary, abusive, neglectful, and unjust (Cobanoglu, 2021).

The importance of leadership of school heads cannot be discounted in all public-school systems. However, there are school heads who do not possess the necessary skills in managing the school and the teachers, including school staff. They care less about the progress of the school, and they do not have a good relationship with teachers and the stakeholders aside from being less visible in school. There are some others who are too dependent on their teachers and entrust some tasks to teachers (Tindowen, 2019).

In the Philippines, the emphasis on the relationship managerial role of the school heads has led to a renewed interest as teachers often complain that some school heads do not acknowledge and recognize teacher’s accomplishments, fail to consistently model good behavior, and underestimate teacher’s capacity to do certain task aside from being unable to connect with teacher both socially and professionally. There are also school heads who are not accommodating and do not entertain some concerns of teachers (Magulod, 2017).

In the local setting, it is stressed that school heads should give an utmost regard to their leadership domains with the teachers and should end and resolve the conflict they have with their teachers and focus on collective
partnership for the betterment of the school and the students in general. School heads should be motivated to continue to inspire and develop every teacher’s potential in order to successfully carry out the tasks of teaching the students instead of getting into troubles with teachers.

In the many instances in the school setting, the relationship building acumen of school heads has become one common problem. This is manifested by showing favoritism and unfair treatment to others. Similarly, the school heads lack the skills to inspire teachers and do not acknowledge and reward strengths and accomplishments of teachers. This has resulted to lack of interest among teachers do more in the school.

The leadership domains of the school heads is one of the aspects in school management which may never be over emphasized. Currently, there have been a sizable quantity of research concerning the topic on leadership domains and relationship building acumen of school heads but the researcher has rarely come across of a similar study in the local setting. This prompts the researcher to consider the conduct of this study in order to prove the authenticity of the problems presented and inquire whether or not there is a relationship exists between the variables of the study, making this study sought a new knowledge in the field of education.

Research Objectives

This study aims to determine the relationship between leadership domains and relationship building acumen of school heads. Specifically, it sought to answer the following objectives:

1. What is the extent of leadership domains of school heads in terms of:
   1.1. demonstrating personal qualities;
   1.2. working with others;
   1.3. managing services;
   1.4. improving services;
   1.5. setting direction;
   1.6. creating the vision, and
   1.7. delivering the strategy?
2. What is the extent of relationship building acumen of school heads in terms of:
   2.1. inspire;
   2.2. influence;
   2.3. develop;
   2.4. initiate change;
   2.5. manage conflict; and
   2.6. establish teams and collaboration?
3. Is there a significant relationship between leadership domains significantly influence relationship building acumen of school heads?

Hypothesis

The following hypothesis will be treated at 0.05 level of significance.

1. There is no significant relationship between digital competence and regulation of academic behavior of the students.
2. No domains of digital competence best influences regulation of academic behavior of the students.

2. Methods

This study used quantitative non-experimental utilizing causal method. A substantial proportion of quantitative educational research is non-experimental because many important variables of interest are not manipulable. Because non-experimental research is an important methodology employed by many researchers, it is important to use a classification system of non-experimental methods that is highly descriptive of what we do and also allows us to communicate effectively in an interdisciplinary research environment. Correlational research designs evaluate the nature and degree of association between two naturally occurring variables (Johnson, 2012).
3. Results

**Level of Leadership Domains of School Heads**

Presented in Table 1 is the level of Leadership Domains of school heads with the overall mean of 4.13 with a descriptive equivalent of high indicating that all enumerated indicators were always observed. The overall mean was the results obtained from the mean of the indicators for the specific items from the questionnaire intended for this particular indicator which is appended in this study.

For the indicator *demonstrating personal qualities* obtained a mean score of 4.11 or high.
For the indicator *working with others* obtained a mean score of 4.13 or high.
For the indicator *managing services* obtained a mean score of 4.15 or high.
For the indicator *improving services* obtained a mean score of 4.12 or high.
For the indicator *setting direction* obtained a mean score of 4.11 or high.
For the indicator *creating the vision* obtained a mean score of 4.15 or high.
For the indicator *delivering the strategy* obtained a mean score of 4.15 or high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Descriptive Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating Personal Qualities</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Others</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Services</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Services</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Direction</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating the Vision</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering the Strategy</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Relationship Building Acumen of School Heads**

It can be perceived in Table 2 is the level of *Relationship Building Acumen* of school heads with an overall mean of 4.12 with a descriptive equivalent of *high* indicating that all enumerated indicators were oftentimes observed. Among the enumerated indicators, *Developing and Managed Conflict* ranked the highest, with a mean score of 4.15 with a descriptive rating of *high*. This is followed by *Inspiration* and *Initiate Change* with a mean score of 4.11 or high, and *Influence* with a mean score of 4.07 or high.

For the indicator *inspiration of school heads* obtained an overall mean of 4.11 or high.
For the indicator *influence of school heads* obtained an overall mean of 4.11 or high.
For the indicator *developing of school heads* obtained an overall mean of 4.15 or high.
For the indicator *initiate change of school heads* obtained an overall mean of 4.11 or high.
For the indicator *manage conflict of school heads* obtained an overall mean of 4.15 or high.
For the indicator *establish teams and collaboration* of school heads obtained an overall mean of 4.12 or high.
Table 2. Level of Relationship Building Acumen of School Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Descriptive Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate Change</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Conflict</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Teams and Collaboration</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Significance on the Relationship between Leadership Domains and Relationship Building Acumen of School Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair and DV</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Decision on Ho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV and DV</td>
<td>Leadership Domains and Relationship Building Acumen of School Heads</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSION

With the findings of the study, conclusions are drawn in this section. The study found to exhibit a high level of leadership domains of school heads. This means that the provisions relating to leadership domains of school heads embodied in the item is often manifested.

The study revealed a high level of relationship building acumen of school heads. This indicates that the provisions relating to relationship building acumen of school heads embodied in the item is often manifested.

The results of the study also confirm that there is a significant relationship between leadership domains of school heads and relationship building acumen of school heads. This implies that the higher the leadership domains of school heads, the higher is the relationship building acumen of school heads of students. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between leadership domains of school heads and relationship building acumen of school heads was rejected.

The result of this study revealed that the leadership domains of school heads is high. The researcher recommends (1) to the Public Schools District Supervisors to help schools heads improve in the aspect of demonstrating...
personal qualities by allowing them to reflect on how their own values and principles influence behavior and impact on others. Also, the school heads may seek feedback from their supervisor regarding their strengths and limitations so they may modify their behavior accordingly.

The researcher also (2) recommends to school heads to improve in the aspect of setting direction as they were rated lowest in this aspect. The school heads may learn to anticipate future challenges that will create the need for change so they can help themselves practice set directions for school operations and professional development. The researcher also (3) recommends to the Public Schools District Supervisors to let the school heads be actively engage in formal and informal decision-making processes regarding many issues in schools in terms of the implementation of various programs and projects, so they develop their skill in direction setting.

The study revealed a high level of relationship building acumen of school heads. The researcher recommends (4) to the Public Schools District Supervisors to guide the school heads in terms of developing their skills in the aspect of influence as this rank lowest.

The researcher also recommends (5) to the school heads to begin working on the aspect of influence through fine-tuning what they are going to say and use a variety of strategies to build consensus and support from the teachers and stakeholders. This will help the school heads take small steps in developing their skills in making influence.

The results of the study also confirm that there is a significant relationship between leadership domains of school heads and relationship building acumen of school heads. The researcher recommends that Public Schools District Supervisors may monitor the leadership domains of the school heads so that they will be able to receive feedback on their leadership skills and be able to advance their leadership skills.

The researcher also (6) recommends to future researchers to conduct similar study and explore some indicators that are not included in this study in another setting in order to uncover new knowledge relevant to the topics presented in this study.
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