INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF RESEARCH FOR INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND EXCELLENCE (IMJRISE)
Online ISSN: 3028-032X | Print ISSN: 3028-0370
PUBLISHED BY: RISEJOURNALS.ORG
Volume 2, Issue no. 9

School Heads' Preparedness, Compliance, And Accountability in Fiscal Management

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17119962

Robert J. Fernandez
School Principal, Okiot Elementary School
https://orcid.org/ 0009-0004-9257-4892

Dr. Anelito A. Bongcawil
Public School Division Superintendent, Division of Bayawan, Department of Education, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-7925-8667

Abstract:

This study aimed to assess the level of preparedness, extent of compliance, and level of accountability in the fiscal management practices of school heads. Respondents' profile included age, sex, highest educational attainment, and tenure as school head. The research employed a descriptive and comparative design to address the identified research problems, with 73 school heads serving as respondents. A researcher-developed instrument was utilized for data collection, which was validated by a panel of five research experts. This study reveals that most school heads are older, highly educated women with extensive tenure. They exhibit a very high degree of preparedness, compliance, and accountability in fiscal management. Preparedness varies: older leaders excel in procurement, while younger ones lag in budget allocation; women outperform men equally in both areas; highly educated leaders do better in procurement; and long-tenured heads show stronger planning capabilities than newer ones. Compliance patterns mirror these dynamics, with older school heads leading in financial planning and budget allocation, and males outperforming females in planning. Higher qualifications again correlate with better performance, particularly in planning, whereas less-qualified leaders' lag. Accountability trends closely follow preparedness and compliance: older and more experienced heads excel in budget allocation; males lead in planning; and higher education is linked to stronger performance across planning, budget, and procurement. Significant differences are consistently tied to educational attainment, especially in work and financial planning, budget allocation, and procurement. Experience and advanced education emerge as key drivers of effective fiscal governance in school leadership, underscoring the value of targeted training and mentorship for less experienced or less educated heads.

Keywords: Accountability, compliance, preparedness

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

Effective fiscal management is crucial for the success of any organization. It involves sourcing and utilizing funds efficiently while minimizing costs and losses to maximize profitability and enhance the welfare of students, teaching staff, and non-teaching staff. Within the school context, fiscal preparedness refers to the readiness of school heads to plan, allocate, and utilize financial resources effectively in line with school priorities and government regulations, supported by the knowledge, skills, and strategies needed to anticipate financial needs, prepare budgets, and manage funds responsibly. Compliance, meanwhile, entails strict adherence to financial policies and regulations such as R.A. 9184, its IRR, and DepEd's Customized Agency Manual (CAM), ensuring transparency, integrity, and credibility in the use of public funds. Accountability complements these by emphasizing the duty of school heads to justify and report fund utilization through proper documentation, monitoring, and reporting, thereby ensuring that resources are spent wisely and public trust is maintained.

Despite these frameworks, school administrators continue to face fiscal management problems that hinder effective school financial management. Essential fiscal management skills include mobilizing school funds, monitoring and evaluating budgets, and conducting audits; however, common challenges such as shortages of school funds and inadequate monitoring, evaluation, and auditing remain prevalent (Amos et al., 2021). As a school head, the researcher has personally encountered these problems during the utilization of fiscal resources in the school, which prompted the conduct of this study, recognizing that such issues logically affect the organization's academic performance.

Thus, this study focuses on school heads' preparedness, compliance, and accountability in fiscal management, emphasizing the careful allocation and utilization of limited financial resources to minimize waste and maximize accountability. The insights gained are expected to serve as the basis for developing resource plans for in-service training, workshops, and seminars on financial resource management skills, enabling school heads to become more effective financial managers.

Current State of Knowledge

School heads' preparedness in fiscal management is evident in their central role in budget preparation, coordination, and supervision to ensure effective allocation of resources aligned with educational goals. Budgets serve as management tools for planning, monitoring, and evaluating resources (Kenno et al., 2021), and in countries like Tanzania and Zimbabwe, school heads oversee financial resources, collaborate with departments, and draw revenues from multiple sources to support school programs (Rupia & Musa, 2022; Schleicher, 2021). Adedoyin & Soycan (2020) emphasize that budgets reflect the community's willingness to support education, while studies affirm that effective leadership and training significantly improve fiscal preparedness and school financial performance (Sagucom, Lumapenet & Mamurao, 2022).

Preparedness, however, is only meaningful when paired with accountability, which requires school heads to transparently monitor, allocate, and evaluate resources to ensure funds are properly utilized (Yasin & Mokhtar, 2024). In both education and corporate finance, accountability means answerability, integrity, and accurate reporting (Kento, 2024; Bacatan, 2019). While accountability builds trust and enhances stakeholder participation (Nugroho et al., 2021), weak governance often leads to financial mismanagement (Dwangu, 2021). Studies reveal that many school heads lack sufficient knowledge of financial laws and policies, making continuous training and re-orientation essential to strengthening their accountability and ethical practices (Espiritu, 2020). Ultimately, accountability and financial leadership strongly influence school performance and student achievement (Lapuz & Pecajas, 2022).

Closely linked to accountability is compliance, which ensures adherence to government laws and DepEd regulations such as RA 9184 and RA 9155, safeguarding transparency and efficiency in fund utilization (Enriquez, 2022; Espiritu, 2020). In the Philippine context, school heads are expected to align budgets with SIP/AIP, prepare financial management plans, and comply with MOOE, SBM Grants, and SBRMS requirements with support from PTAs and LGUs (Gaspar et al., 2022; Merano, 2023). As accountable leaders, they must make sound financial decisions to improve learning outcomes, strengthen teacher development, and foster stakeholder partnerships (Alvarez & Patane, 2024). Compliance and accountability thus act together as safeguards against corruption while ensuring that fiscal resources directly support educational objectives.

To sustain both accountability and compliance, training in accounting, transparency, and fund management becomes indispensable. School heads are expected to prepare fiscal reports, update transparency boards, and communicate financial performance to stakeholders (Ramirez & Amponin, 2019; Castillo & Gabriel, 2020). Best practices include compliance with DepEd orders on MOOE use, adherence to the Annual Procurement Plan, stakeholder engagement in financial decisions, and proper documentation (Gaspar et al., 2022). However, challenges persist due to insufficient funds, lengthy procurement processes, and limited financial expertise (Ramirez & Amponin, 2019). Research further suggests that educational background, financial training, and leadership experience significantly shape school heads' financial competence, emphasizing the importance of professional development and formal qualifications (Galigao et al., 2019).

Despite these ongoing efforts to strengthen preparedness, accountability, compliance, and training, schools continue to face challenges such as limited resources, complex liquidation processes, and lengthy procurement requirements (Gaspar et al., 2022). These issues highlight the need for continuous training and policy review to reinforce mechanisms that hold school heads accountable for financial management (Dwangu & Mahlangu, 2021). Ensuring transparency and compliance, supported by re-orientation and capacity-building programs, will enable school heads to effectively manage resources, foster stakeholder trust, and ultimately improve school performance and student outcomes.

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study is grounded on several theoretical frameworks that emphasize preparedness, financial control, and accountability in school fiscal management. Agency theory highlights the need for monitoring and guidance of decision-makers, as school heads may allocate resources differently from what higher officials or subordinates expect. However, alignment of interests can still be achieved when decisions are anchored on the school's vision, objectives, and accountability mechanisms. Similarly, the theory of financial control underscores the importance of monitoring, measuring, and regulating financial performance. It stresses the role of financial tools, systems, and relationships with funding sources such as the Department of Education, parents, and external organizations in achieving financial stability, effective planning, and resource allocation. At the school level, this theory requires regular financial analysis, adjustments, and stakeholder collaboration to ensure alignment with school improvement and budgetary plans while addressing anomalies or unforeseen challenges.

Complementing these perspectives, Public Finance Management theory stresses compliance, transparency, and accountability in the management of public resources. Non-compliance with financial regulations, such as the Public Finance Management Act, often results in poor budgeting and ineffective service delivery, undermining governance and fiscal stability. By ensuring prudent fiscal planning, monitoring, and accountability, this theory promotes trust in institutions, efficient use of resources, and sustainable growth. Additionally, Felt Accountability Theory highlights the importance of individuals feeling personally responsible for their financial decisions and actions. It fosters ethical conduct, reduces misconduct, and enhances organizational performance by promoting a culture of responsibility and transparency. Together, these theories provide a strong foundation for analyzing the preparedness, compliance, and accountability of school heads in fiscal management.

Objectives

The main objective of this study was to determine the school heads' level of preparedness, extent of compliance, and level of accountability in fiscal management of a Small Sized – Division in Central Philippines for the School Year 2023 – 2024 as basis for a resource development plan. Specifically, it attempted to answer the following: 1) the school heads level of preparedness in fiscal management in terms of work and financial plan preparation, budget allocation, and procurement; 2) the school heads' extent of compliance in fiscal management based on the aforementioned areas; 3) the school heads' level of accountability in fiscal management based on the aforementioned areas; 4) the significant difference to the school heads' level of preparedness in fiscal management when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables; 5) the significant difference in the school heads' extent of compliance in fiscal management when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables; and 6) the significant difference in the school heads' level of accountability in fiscal management when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Methodology

This section presents the discussion of the research methodology used, the subjects and respondents of the study, the research instruments used, the validity and reliability of the instruments, the procedure for data gathering, and the statistical tools and procedure for data analysis.

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design to examine the demographic profile of respondents, the level of preparedness, extent of compliance, and level of accountability in the fiscal management of school heads in a small-sized division in Central Philippines for School Year 2023–2024. Descriptive research, as explained by Sharma (2019), is a method that observes and characterizes phenomena to provide a scientific understanding of variables within a given situation, enabling researchers to describe issues and problems through systematic data collection. This design is appropriate for the study as it allows the gathering of existing data on school heads' fiscal preparedness, compliance, and challenges, which will serve as the basis for professional judgment, conclusions, and the formulation of a resource development plan.

Study Respondents

The respondents of this study are the 73 school heads from a small-sized division in Central Philippines, selected through purposive sampling since the population is manageable. Purposive sampling, also called judgmental or selective sampling, is a non-probability technique where participants are chosen based on specific characteristics relevant to the study (Crossman, 2020). Table 1 presents the distribution of respondents across school clusters, showing Cluster 1 with 10 school heads (13.70%), Cluster 2 with 12 (16.44%), Cluster 3 with 10 (13.70%), Cluster 4 with 11 (15.07%), Cluster 5 with 8 (10.96%), Cluster 6 with 10 (13.70%), Cluster 7 with 7 (9.58%), and Cluster 8 with 5 (6.85%), for a total of 73 respondents (100%).

Instruments

The researcher utilized a self-made questionnaire composed of four parts: Part I covered the demographic profile of respondents; Part II assessed their level of preparedness in fiscal management; Part III measured their extent of compliance; and Part IV evaluated their level of accountability, with each variable containing three areas and five items each. To ensure validity, five expert jurors—comprising school heads, division officials, and doctorate degree holders—reviewed the instrument, and using the validation rating scale of Good and Scates (1972), it obtained a computed validity score of 5.00, interpreted as Excellent. Reliability was established through a dry-run with 30 non-respondent school heads, and Cronbach's Alpha results indicated excellent internal consistency, with indices of 0.951 for preparedness, 0.959 for compliance, and 0.951 for accountability, confirming the instrument's accuracy and trustworthiness in measuring fiscal management practices.

Data Gathering Procedure

After the approval of the research instrument by the panel members, the researcher then identifies 5 experts in the field of education and research for the validation of the questionnaire. After which, the reliability of the research

INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF RESEARCH FOR INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND EXCELLENCE (IMJRISE)
Online ISSN: 3028-032X | Print ISSN: 3028-0370
PUBLISHED BY: RISEJOURNALS.ORG
Volume 2, Issue no. 9

instrument was established by administering it to the school heads of the small-sized division of Region VII in Central Philippines who are not actual respondents of the study. After getting the result for the reliability of the survey questionnaire, the researcher then asked the authority of the Schools Division Superintendent through a letter request asking permission to conduct the study. Upon approval, the researcher set a schedule to the school heads for the data gathering. The administration and retrieval of the research instrument were done by the researcher to ensure 100% retrieval. After retrieval, the data were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted according to the specific problems outlined in this study. The researcher processed the gathered data using Microsoft Excel and SPSS for data analysis. They identified common themes, interpreted the results, drew conclusions, and provided recommendations based on the findings.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective 1 used the descriptive-analytical scheme and mean to assess the level of preparedness of school heads in fiscal management. This analysis identified their strengths and weaknesses, helping pinpoint areas of proficiency and those requiring improvement or additional support.

Objective 2 used the descriptive-analytical scheme and mean to determine the extent of compliance of school heads with fiscal management requirements. This analysis provided valuable insights into financial management practices in educational institutions, highlighting areas needing improvement and support.

Objective 3 used the descriptive-analytical scheme and mean to determine the level of accountability of school heads in fiscal management. Similar to Objective 3, this analysis explored the complexities of financial management, identifying opportunities for strengthening accountability and support mechanisms.

Objective 4 used the comparative-analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test to determine the significant differences in the level of preparedness for fiscal management among school heads effectively managing fiscal resources, based on selected variables.

Objective 5 used comparative-analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test to identify significant differences in the extent of compliance in fiscal management among school heads effectively managing fiscal resources, when compared across the selected variables.

Objective 6 used the comparative-analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test to analyze the significant differences in the level of accountability in fiscal management among school heads effectively managing fiscal resources, based on the same variables.

Ethical Consideration

The researcher sought approval from the Schools Division Superintendent to distribute questionnaires to school heads in a small-sized division in Central Philippines and personally administered them after presenting the approved permit. Ethical considerations were strictly observed, ensuring confidentiality by protecting participants' information from public disclosure and anonymity by excluding personal identifiers, although some demographic data were collected as essential variables. Participants were safeguarded from any form of harm, with their dignity and privacy prioritized, and no financial incentives were provided. The principle of informed consent was upheld, with participants voluntarily joining the study after being fully informed of its purpose, procedures, and potential risks, aligning with ethical standards that balance research benefits with participants' rights and well-being.

Results and Discussion

This section deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered to carry out the objectives of this study. All these were made possible by following certain appropriate procedures so as to give the exact data and solution to each specific problem.

School Heads' Level of Preparedness in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan, Budget Allocation, and Procurement

Table 1
School Heads' Level of Preparedness in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As school head, I prepare work and financial plan by…		
1. meeting the School Planning Team (SPT) to prioritize needs of the school	4.71	Very High Level
2. presenting the identified priority needs to the general PTA	4.82	Very High Level

3. categorizing the identified priorities based on urgency and importance	4.74	Very High Level
4. presenting the categorized needs to the SPT for deliberation and approval	4.63	Very High Level
5. posting the approved work and financial plan to the transparency board for tracking	4.68	Very High Level
Overall Mean	**4.72**	**Very High Level**

Table 1 reveals that school heads demonstrated a very high level of preparedness in fiscal management, with an overall mean score of 4.72, indicating a positive impact on the effective implementation of fiscal resources. The highest rating (4.82) was for presenting identified priority needs to the PTA, consistent with Gaspar et al. (2022), who noted school heads' strong compliance with DepEd directives on MOOE utilization. However, the lowest score (4.63) was for presenting categorized needs to the School Planning Team (SPT) for deliberation and approval, suggesting that limited involvement in this area may hinder fiscal management performance. As Simiyu (2014) emphasized, active participation in budget preparation by all school system members is vital for effective program implementation.

Table 2
School Heads' Level of Preparedness in Fiscal Management According to Budget Allocation

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As school head, I prepare budget allocation by…		
1. presenting the savings, continuing budget and the current fiscal's year budget to the SPT	4.70	Very High Level
2. revisiting the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and the identified priorities with the SPT for budget assignment	4.62	Very High Level
3. finalizing the budget allocation based on priorities	4.71	Very High Level
4. presenting the final budget allocation to the SPT for approval	4.73	Very High Level
5. presenting the approved budget allocation to the general PTA for possible support for the needed funds	4.74	Very High Level
Overall Mean	**4.70**	**Very High Level**

Table 2 shows that school heads demonstrated a very high level of preparedness in budget allocation, with an overall mean of 4.70, reflecting strong practices in presenting budget information, revisiting the School Improvement Plan (SIP), and finalizing budgets for approval. The highest score (4.74) was for presenting the approved budget to the PTA, highlighting active stakeholder engagement that promotes transparency and collaborative decision-making (Brighouse et al., 2019). The lowest score (4.62) was for revisiting the SIP with the SPT, suggesting a need to strengthen alignment between budget allocation and improvement plans, as emphasized by Caldwell (2008). Overall, the findings affirm that school heads' preparedness in budget allocation supports participatory fiscal management, accountability, and resource optimization.

Table 3
School Heads' Level of Preparedness in Fiscal Management According to Procurement

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As school head, I prepare procurement by…		
1. designating yearly Bids and Awards Committee (BAC) Members, Secretariat, Technical Working Group (TWG), and Inspectorate	4.75	Very High Level
2. orienting the BAC annually based on RA 9184	4.66	Very High Level
3. identifying recognized People's Organization as representative during BAC process	4.64	Very High Level
4. giving copy of the approved budget allocation to the BAC as guide in performing their duties and responsibilities	4.59	Very High Level
5. accommodating the feedback from the BAC due to abrupt price hike of identified supplies for budget modification	4.64	Very High Level
Overall Mean	**4.71**	**Very High Level**

Table 3 shows that school heads are highly prepared in procurement management, with an overall mean of 4.71, indicating strong practices in committee designation, stakeholder representation, orientation on regulations, and budget adjustments. The highest score (4.75) was for the proactive designation of Bids and Awards Committee (BAC) members, reflecting adherence to governance best practices that promote transparency and risk mitigation (World Bank, 2020). The lowest score (4.59) was for providing the approved budget allocation to the BAC, suggesting the need for clearer budget guidance to strengthen decision-making, as emphasized by OECD (2016). Overall, the results confirm that school heads' procurement management aligns with RA 9184 and global standards that advocate systematic processes to ensure accountability and optimal resource use.

School Heads' Extent of Compliance in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan, Budget Allocation, and Procurement

Table 4
School Heads' Extent of Compliance in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As school head, I am compliant of school's work and financial plan by:		
1. convening the School Planning Team (SPT) to prioritize needs of the school at least three months before the start of the calendar year	4.77	Very Great Extent
2. consulting the identification of priority needs to the general PTA prior to the start of the calendar year	4.73	Very Great Extent
3. presenting the categorized priority needs to the SPT prior to the first quarter of the calendar year	4.77	Very Great Extent
4. getting the approval of the SPT for the categorized needs of the school before the start of the calendar year	4.74	Very Great Extent
5. posting work and financial plan every quarter	4.78	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	**4.76**	**Very Great Extent**

Table 4 indicates that school heads show a very great extent of compliance with fiscal management practices related to the work and financial plan, with an overall mean of 4.76. The highest score (4.78) was for the quarterly posting of the plan, highlighting strong commitment to transparency and accountability, consistent with Brighouse et al. (2019) on the value of regular updates for stakeholder trust. The lowest score (4.73) was for consulting the PTA, suggesting a minor gap in community engagement, though still at a high compliance level, as Epstein (2018) stressed the importance of involving parents to align resources with school priorities. Overall, the findings affirm that compliance with financial planning ensures resource alignment with institutional goals, strengthens governance, and supports more inclusive school management.

Table 5
School Heads' Extent of Compliance in Fiscal Management According to Budget Allocation

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As school head, I am compliant of school's budget allocation by:		
1. reporting the savings, continuing budget and the current fiscal's year budget to the SPT before the start of the calendar year	4.74	Very Great Extent
2. submitting the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and the identified priorities with the SPT for budget assignment before the start of the calendar year	4.75	Very Great Extent
3. allocating the budget based on priorities before the start of the calendar year	4.79	Very Great Extent
4. getting approval from the SPT for the final budget allocation before the start of the calendar year	4.74	Very Great Extent
5. tapping stakeholders for additional financial support for the approved budget before the start of the calendar year	4.70	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	**4.75**	**Very Great Extent**

Table 5 shows that school heads exhibit a very great extent of compliance with budget allocation processes, with an overall mean of 4.75, reflecting strong adherence to best practices such as reporting budgets, submitting the SIP, prioritizing allocations, securing approvals, and engaging stakeholders. The highest score (4.79) was for allocating the budget based on priorities, underscoring the importance of aligning resources with institutional needs, as emphasized by Caldwell (2008). The lowest score (4.70) was for tapping stakeholders for financial support, indicating room to strengthen collaboration with external partners, consistent with Epstein's (2018) view on mobilizing community resources. Overall, the findings highlight that compliance with budget allocation protocols ensures accountability, resource optimization, and alignment with strategic goals while reinforcing the role of stakeholder engagement in effective school leadership.

Table 6
School Heads' Extent of Compliance in Fiscal Management According to Procurement

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As school head, I am compliant of school's procurement by:		

1. designating before the start of the calendar year, Bids and Awards Committee (BAC) Members, Secretariat, Technical Working Group (TWG), and Inspectorate based on competence and attitude	4.70	Very Great Extent
2. facilitating capacitation of the BAC annually based on RA 9184 at least once a year	4.68	Very Great Extent
3. ensuring presence of recognized People's Organization as representative during BAC process at least during Bid Opening	4.67	Very Great Extent
4. providing copy of the approved budget allocation to the BAC as guide in performing their duties and responsibilities before the start of the calendar year	4.67	Very Great Extent
5. ensuring that market survey is conducted to avoid overpricing at least once every quarter	4.68	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	**4.68**	**Very Great Extent**

Table 6 reveals that school heads comply to a very great extent with procurement practices in fiscal management, with an overall mean of 4.68, indicating strong adherence to forming competent committees, providing budget details, involving stakeholders, and ensuring cost-effective processes. The highest score (4.70) was for designating BAC members based on competence and attitude, reflecting commitment to capable procurement teams, consistent with OECD (2016) principles on efficiency and risk reduction. Slightly lower scores (4.67) for stakeholder representation and providing budget copies to the BAC suggest areas for improvement, as transparency and accountability are strengthened through engagement and documentation (World Bank, 2020). Overall, the findings affirm compliance with RA 9184 and highlight the importance of enhancing participation and transparency to build greater trust in school leadership.

School Heads' Level of Accountability in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan, Budget Allocation, and Procurement

Table 7
School Heads' Level of Accountability in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As school head, I am accountable of school's work and financial plan by:		
1. involving the School Planning Team (SPT) to prioritize needs of the school	4.68	Very High Level
2. consulting the identification of priority needs to the general PTA	4.60	Very High Level
3. presenting the categorized priority needs to the SPT	4.70	Very High Level
4. getting the approval of the SPT for the categorized needs of the school	4.68	Very High Level
5. exercising transparency in the execution of the financial plan of the school	4.67	Very High Level
Overall Mean	**4.67**	**Very High Level**

Table 7 shows that school heads demonstrate a very high level of accountability in fiscal management related to the work and financial plan, with an overall mean of 4.67. The highest score (4.70) was for presenting categorized priority needs to the SPT, reflecting the value of structured decision-making and stakeholder engagement in aligning goals (Caldwell, 2008). The lowest score (4.60) was for consulting the general PTA, suggesting the need to strengthen broader community involvement, as Epstein (2018) emphasized the role of stakeholder engagement in building trust and legitimacy. Overall, the findings confirm that school heads ensure transparency, collaboration, and accountability in financial planning, with opportunities to enhance consultation practices for greater efficiency and trust.

Table 8
School Heads' Level of Accountability in Fiscal Management According to Budget Allocation

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As school head, I am accountable of the school's budget allocation by:		
1. reporting the savings, continuing budget and the current fiscal's year budget to the SPT	4.74	Very High Level
2. adhering to the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and the identified priorities with the SPT for budget assignment	4.77	Very High Level
3. allocating the budget based on priorities	4.75	Very High Level
4. getting approval from the SPT for the final budget allocation	4.70	Very High Level
5. tapping stakeholders for additional financial support for the approved budget	4.68	Very High Level
Overall Mean	**4.73**	**Very High Level**

Table 8 shows that school heads demonstrate a very high level of accountability in budget allocation, with an overall mean of 4.73, reflecting strong practices in reporting financial details, adhering to the SIP, allocating funds, securing approvals, and engaging stakeholders. The highest score (4.77) was for adherence to the SIP and identified priorities, highlighting the importance of aligning budget decisions with institutional goals, as emphasized by Caldwell (2008). The lowest score (4.68) was for tapping stakeholders for financial support, suggesting a need to enhance collaboration with external partners, consistent with Argon's (2015) view that transparency and shared responsibility foster greater stakeholder contributions. Overall, the findings affirm that school heads maintain accountability by managing budgets systematically and involving stakeholders, thereby ensuring financial integrity and strengthening organizational trust.

Table 9
School Heads' Level of Accountability in Fiscal Management According to Procurement

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As school head, I am accountable of the school's procurement by:		
1. choosing Bids and Awards Committee (BAC) Members, Secretariat, Technical Working Group (TWG), and Inspectorate based on competence and attitude	4.73	Very High Level
2. facilitating capacitation of the BAC annually based on RA 9184	4.67	Very High Level
3. ensuring presence of recognized People's Organization as representative during BAC process	4.63	Very High Level
4. providing copy of the approved budget allocation to the BAC as guide in performing their duties and responsibilities	4.67	Very High Level
5. ensuring that market survey is regularly conducted to avoid overpricing	4.67	Very High Level
Overall Mean	**4.67**	**Very High Level**

Table 9 indicates that school heads show a very high level of accountability in procurement management, with an overall mean of 4.67, reflecting strong practices in committee selection, capacity building, stakeholder inclusion, and adherence to standards. The highest score (4.73) was for selecting competent committee members, underscoring the importance of qualified teams in ensuring efficiency and compliance, consistent with OECD (2016). The lowest score (4.63) was for ensuring stakeholder representation in the BAC process, suggesting the need for greater inclusivity, as the World Bank (2020) emphasized the role of stakeholder involvement in enhancing transparency and reducing risks. Overall, the findings affirm that school heads uphold accountability in procurement by adhering to RA 9184 and maintaining efficient and equitable processes.

Comparative Analysis in the School Heads' Level of Preparedness in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan, Budget Allocation, and Procurement When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Table 10
Difference in the School Heads' Level of Preparedness in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	35.83	624.00	.618	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	37	38.14				
Sex	Male	30	37.77	622.00	.781		Not Significant
	Female	43	36.47				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	31.53	409.00	.160		Not Significant
	Higher	54	38.93				
Tenure as a School Head	Shorter	36	32.78	514.00	.071		Not Significant
	Longer	37	41.11				

Table 10 shows that there were no significant differences in school heads' levels of preparedness in fiscal management, specifically in work and financial plan preparation, when grouped by age, sex, educational attainment, or tenure, as all p-values exceeded 0.05 in the Mann-Whitney U test. Younger and older school heads, males and females, as well as those with higher or lower educational attainment and varying lengths of service, performed comparably, indicating consistent competence in financial planning. This suggests that preparedness in managing fiscal resources is not influenced by demographic or professional variables, supporting Cañete's (2019) view that competencies in educational management are not determined by age but by professional practice, which contributes to better fiscal performance.

Table 11
Difference in the School Heads' Level of Preparedness in Fiscal Management According to Budget Allocation When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	35.31	605.00	.479	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	37	38.65				
Sex	Male	30	35.43	598.00	.580		Not Significant
	Female	43	38.09				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	32.00	418.00	.210		Not Significant
	Higher	54	38.76				
Tenure as a School Head	Shorter	36	34.60	579.50	.316		Not Significant
	Longer	37	39.34				

Table 11 reveals no significant differences in school heads' preparedness in fiscal management, specifically in budget allocation, when grouped by age, sex, educational attainment, or tenure, as all p-values were above 0.05 in the Mann-Whitney U test. Younger and older school heads, males and females, as well as those with varying educational backgrounds and lengths of service, performed comparably, indicating consistency in budget allocation preparedness. The findings also highlight school heads' commitment to professional growth, with professional development identified as essential in strengthening their financial management skills, consistent with OECD (2017), which emphasizes the importance of preparation in equipping school leaders to manage resources effectively.

Table 12
Difference in the School Heads' Level of Preparedness in Fiscal Management According to Procurement When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	35.57	614.50	.554	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	37	38.39				
Sex	Male	30	35.70	622.00	.781		Not Significant
	Female	43	37.91				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	32.03	418.50	.216		Not Significant
	Higher	54	38.75				
Tenure as a School Head	Shorter	36	35.26	603.50	.472		Not Significant
	Longer	37	38.69				

Table 12 shows that there were no significant differences in school heads' preparedness in fiscal management, specifically in procurement, when grouped by age, sex, educational attainment, or tenure, as all p-values were above 0.05 in the Mann-Whitney U test. Younger and older school heads, males and females, as well as those with higher or lower educational attainment and varying lengths of service, performed comparably, indicating that preparedness in procurement is not influenced by these factors. This supports Cañete's (2019) view that competencies in educational management are not determined by age but by professional practice, affirming that school heads, regardless of demographics, are capable of effectively managing financial resources.

Comparative Analysis in the School Heads' Extent of Compliance in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan, Budget Allocation, and Procurement When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Table 13
Difference in the School Heads' Extent of Compliance in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	35.93	627.50	.633	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	37	38.04				
Sex	Male	30	37.93	617.00	.724		Not Significant
	Female	43	36.35				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	29.21	365.00	.037		Significant
	Higher	54	39.74				
Tenure as a School Head	Shorter	36	35.64	617.00	.544		Not Significant
	Longer	37	38.32				

Table 13 shows that there were no significant differences in school heads' extent of compliance with fiscal management in work and financial planning when grouped by age, sex, or tenure, as all p-values exceeded 0.05. However, a significant difference was found based on highest educational attainment ($p = 0.037$), with school heads holding higher degrees demonstrating greater compliance and stronger commitment to professional development. This suggests that while age, gender, and tenure do not influence compliance, higher educational attainment enhances school heads' capacity to manage financial resources effectively, aligning with OECD (2017), which emphasizes the role of professional preparation in equipping school leaders with essential skills for resource management.

Table 14
Difference in the School Heads' Extent of Compliance in Fiscal Management According to Budget Allocation When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	34.47	575.00	.263	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	37	39.46				
Sex	Male	30	34.42	567.50	.333		Not Significant
	Female	43	38.80				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	30.87	396.50	.103		Not Significant
	Higher	54	39.16				
Tenure as a School Head	Shorter	36	35.38	617.00	.544		Not Significant
	Longer	37	38.58				

Table 14 shows that there were no significant differences in school heads' extent of compliance with fiscal management in budget allocation when grouped by age, sex, educational attainment, or tenure, as all p-values exceeded 0.05. Younger and older school heads, males and females, as well as those with higher or lower educational attainment and varying lengths of service, performed comparably, indicating consistent compliance across groups. These findings suggest that school heads' financial planning practices contribute to improved fiscal performance, with

INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF RESEARCH FOR INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND EXCELLENCE (IMJRISE)
Online ISSN: 3028-032X | Print ISSN: 3028-0370
PUBLISHED BY: RISEJOURNALS.ORG
Volume 2, Issue no. 9

effectiveness not determined by demographic factors, supporting Cañete's (2019) view that a school head's age does not define their competence in educational management.

Table 15
Difference in the School Heads' Extent of Compliance in Fiscal Management According to Procurement When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	35.94	628.00	.655	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	37	38.03				
Sex	Male	30	38.12	611.50	.689		Not Significant
	Female	43	36.22				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	32.03	418.50	.216		Not Significant
	Higher	54	38.75				
Tenure as a School Head	Shorter	36	35.38	617.00	.544		Not Significant
	Longer	37	38.58				

Table 15 shows that there were no significant differences in school heads' extent of compliance with fiscal management in procurement when grouped by age, sex, educational attainment, or tenure, as all p-values exceeded 0.05. Younger and older school heads, males and females, as well as those with varying educational backgrounds and lengths of service, performed comparably, indicating consistent compliance across groups. While results suggest that school heads with higher educational attainment may perform better in procurement, the difference was not statistically significant, though it reinforces Phylisters et al.'s (2018) view that education is essential for the efficient management of school finances.

Comparative Analysis in the School Heads' Level of Accountability in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan, Budget Allocation, and Procurement When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Table 16
Difference in the School Heads' Level of Accountability in Fiscal Management According to Work and Financial Plan When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	36.60	615.50	.862	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	37	37.39				
Sex	Male	30	39.52	569.50	.359		Not Significant
	Female	43	35.24				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	28.61	353.50	.030		Significant
	Higher	54	39.95				
Tenure as a School Head	Shorter	36	36.63	652.50	.872		Not Significant
	Longer	37	37.36				

Table 16 shows that there were no significant differences in school heads' accountability in fiscal management related to work and financial planning when grouped by age, sex, or tenure, as all p-values exceeded 0.05. However, a significant difference was found based on highest educational attainment (p = 0.030), with school heads holding higher degrees showing greater accountability. This indicates that while demographic factors do not influence

INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF RESEARCH FOR INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND EXCELLENCE (IMJRISE)
Online ISSN: 3028-032X | Print ISSN: 3028-0370
PUBLISHED BY: RISEJOURNALS.ORG
Volume 2, Issue no. 9

accountability, professional advancement enhances fiscal management capacity, supporting Phylisters et al. (2018), who emphasized the critical role of education in the effective management of school finances.

Table 17
Difference in the School Heads' Level of Accountability in Fiscal Management According to Budget Allocation When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	34.86	589.00	.354	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	37	39.08				
Sex	Male	30	38.42	602.50	.603		Not Significant
	Female	43	36.01				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	27.55	333.50	.014		Significant
	Higher	54	40.32				
Tenure as a School Head	Shorter	36	34.13	562.50	.213		Not Significant
	Longer	37	39.80				

Table 17 shows that there were no significant differences in school heads' accountability in fiscal management related to budget allocation when grouped by age, sex, or tenure, as all p-values were above 0.05. However, a significant difference was found based on highest educational attainment (p = 0.014), with school heads holding higher degrees demonstrating greater accountability. This indicates that while demographic factors do not affect accountability, higher educational attainment enhances school heads' capacity to manage budget allocation effectively.

It can be noted that the performance of younger school heads is comparable to that of older school heads accountability in terms of procurement. Similarly, no significant differences were observed in the performance of school heads based on sex, whether male or female, or tenure as a school head, whether shorter or longer. While there is a significant difference was observed in the performance of school heads based on highest educational attainment, whether lower or higher. The data suggest that the professional advancement of school heads can significantly impact their level of accountability in fiscal management. According to Phylisters et al. (2018), education plays a crucial role in the effective management of school finances.

Table 18
Difference in the School Heads' Level of Accountability in Fiscal Management According to Procurement When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, and Tenure as a School Head

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	35.99	629.50	.668	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	37	37.99				
Sex	Male	30	37.32	635.50	.910		Not Significant
	Female	43	36.78				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	26.97	322.50	.011		Significant
	Higher	54	40.53				
Tenure as a School Head	Shorter	36	36.75	657.00	.916		Not Significant
	Longer	37	37.24				

Table 18 shows that there were no significant differences in school heads' accountability in fiscal management related to procurement when grouped by age, sex, or tenure, as all p-values exceeded 0.05. However, a significant difference was found based on highest educational attainment (p = 0.011), with school heads holding higher degrees showing greater accountability. This suggests that while demographic factors do not influence accountability, higher educational attainment enhances school heads' ability to manage procurement processes more effectively.

It can be observed that the performance of younger school heads in terms of accountability in procurement is comparable to that of their older counterparts. Similarly, no significant differences were found in the performance of school heads based on sex, whether male or female, or their tenure as school heads, whether shorter or longer. However, a significant difference was noted based on educational attainment, with those having higher educational qualifications performing better. The younger age of school heads does not imply an inability to manage schools, particularly in handling financial resources. As noted by Cañete (2019), age does not determine a school head's level of competence in educational management.

Conclusions

The study revealed that most respondents were older, highly educated female school heads with long service experience, demonstrating a very high level of preparedness, a very great extent of compliance, and a very high level of accountability in fiscal management. Findings showed variations based on demographics: older and longer-tenured heads excelled in procurement, budget allocation, and planning, while younger and less experienced ones lagged; females generally outperformed males in procurement and allocation, though males did better in planning; and those with higher qualifications consistently performed better across fiscal areas. Despite these differences, no significant variations were found in preparedness or accountability based on age, sex, or tenure, but significant differences emerged in compliance and accountability when analyzed by educational attainment, highlighting the influence of higher qualifications in strengthening fiscal competence. Overall, advanced education and extended experience enhanced financial leadership, accountability, and compliance, ensuring ethical and effective resource management crucial for school improvement. The study recommends providing additional training for less qualified or newer heads, implementing mentorship programs to support knowledge transfer, and developing targeted initiatives to strengthen accountability and compliance among those with lower academic qualifications.

Acknowledgment

The researcher humbly acknowledges the Almighty God for providing the strength, guidance, and resources essential to the success of this study. Deep gratitude is also extended to the academic leaders, advisers, panel members, and statistician whose expertise, encouragement, and valuable insights greatly contributed to the refinement and completion of this research. Appreciation is further given to the school heads and assistant school heads for their cooperation, as well as to the researcher's family and friends for their unwavering financial, moral, and emotional support. With sincere thankfulness, the researcher recognizes the collective efforts and contributions that made this study possible.

References

Adedoyin, O. B. & Soykan, E. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities. Interactive Learning Environments, 1-13.

Alvarez, B. G. C. & Patane, J. D. (2024). Perceived Level of school heads' Competence in Financial Management Practices. Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 2(7), 48-70. https:tinyurl.com/2pyyuhhz

Amos, O., Ephrahem, G., & Bhoke-Africanus, A. (2021). Effectiveness of School Heads' Financial Management Skills in Provision of Quality Education in secondary School. Journal of Education, Society and Behavioral Science, 34(2), 20-28. https://rb.gy/9k4f1a

Bacatan, J. (2023). The What and Why of Financial Management in Education. ResearchGate. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/jpaqwl.

Bautista, M. (2025). School Heads' Practices and Skills in Financial Management in Relation to Teachers' Performance. International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability and Excellence (IMJRISE) Vol. 2, Issue no.6 p. 49.

Bhandari, P. (2022). Ethical considerations in research | Types & Examples. Scribbr. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/8q7vig

Bos, J. (2020). Confidentiality. Research Ethics for Students in the Social Sciences. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/zymqqe

Cañete, E. (2019). Competency level of secondary school administrators and their administrative performance: Basis for a training in school management: (Unpublished master's thesis). Foundation University, Dumaguete City.

Castillo, L. C., & Gabriel, A. G. (2020). Transparency and accountability in the Philippine local government. In: Farazmand A. (eds) Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance. Springer, Cham. https://rb.gy/0cvybo

Dabon, A. F. (2021). "Efficiency of Public School Heads in Managing School Finances in the Context of a Developing Country," International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP), Volume 4, Issue 2, pp. 16-21, 2021.

Dwangu, A. M. & Mahlangu, V.P. (2021). "Accountability in the Financial Management Practices of School Principals," International Journal of Educational Management, Vol. 35 No. 7, pp.1504-1524. https://rb.gy/vtwbih

D'cruz, C. (2021). Risk and Compliance: Role of the Principal or the Deputy Principal. Ideagen School Governance. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/rdgdyy

Enriquez, J. A. M. (2022). School Leader as Fiscal Manager. Depedbataan.comPublications. Retrieved from: https://depedbataan.com

Espiritu, R. (2020). Financial Management of School Heads in Selected Pubic Elementary Schools in DepEd Region III, Philippines. https://rb.gy/m6mv8o

Frost, J. (2019). How to Calculate a Percentage. Statistics By Jim. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/p4yupg

Fullerton, G. (2022). What Is Budget Allocation and How to allocate Budget Correctly. https://www.mosaic.tech/post/budget-allocation

Gaspar, M. et al. (2022). Transparency and Accountability of Managing School Financial Resources. Journal of Public Administration and Governance, 12(2). https://rb.gy/otkar5

Galigao, R., Lakandula, I., Pilapil, F., & Queniahan M. (2019). Linking the Leve lof School Financial Management Among School Heads: A Case Study in Mandaue District, Cebu, Philippines. International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology, 8(7). https://rb.gy/3zbffx

Gillis, A. (2023). Tech Target Network. What is compliance? Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/8dfuyq

Hassan, M. (2024). Validity – Types, Examples and Guide. Strategies, Process & Techniques utelized in the collection of data. Retrieved from https://rb.gy/ao8eif

Kanyanzii, E. A, Ombuki, P. C. & Kalii, F. (2019). Influence of Financial Management Practices on the Financial Performance of Public Secondary Schools in Kathiani Subcounty, Kenya. IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance, 10 (2), 57-70.

Kenno, S., Lau, M., & Boles, B. (2021). Budgeting strategic planning, and institutional diversity in higher education. Studies in Higher Education.

Kenton, W. (2024). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Explanation, Formula, and Applications. Investopedia. Retrieved from: https://www.investpedia.com/terms/a/anova.asp

Kenton, W. (2024). Understanding Accountability. Investopedia. Retrieved from: https://shorturl.at/5GLNy

Lapuz, M. L. & Pecajas, E. S. (2022). School Heads' Authority, Accountability, and Empowerment as Functions of School. International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences, 9(3), 69-83. https://tinyurl.com/4jt6at92

Manning, L. (2023). Financial Plans: Meaning, Purpose, and Key Components. Investopedia. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/5mcbbo

McElrath, K. & Martin, M. (2021). United States Census Bureau. Educational Attainment. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/n95yez

Mcleod, S. (2023). P-Value And Statistical Significance: What It Is & Why It Matters. SimplyPsychology. Retrieved from: rb.gy/q4xvaf

Mihalicz, D. (2019). Effective Managers. What is Accountability? Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/tdo7h

Montacute, R. (2020). Social mobility and COVID-19: Implications of the COVID-19 crisis for educational inequality. https://rb.gy/ungcxa

Nelius, R., & Onyango, D. (2022). Challenges Facing School Heads in Controlling Finaces in Bukombre District Public Secondary Schools, Tanzania. East African Journal of Management and Business Studies 2(1), 1-6. Doi: https://bitly.ws/3fPTv

Newman, M. (2023). Medical News Today. Sex and gender: What is the difference? Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/nnyiug

Nicolas, A. (2023). Reliability and Validity – Definitions, Types & Examples. RESEARCH PROSPECT. Retrieved from: https://www.researchprospect.com

Nugroho, K. J. et al. (2022). The School Principles' Accountability in Management of Education Financing. Al-Ishla: Jurnal Pendidikan, Vo. 14, B (September 2022):3173-3185.

Nyakanyanga, W. (2019). Financial Management Challenges. https://bitly.ws/3eXZh

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2017). Trust and Public Policy How Better Governance Can Help Build Public Trust (1 ed.). Paris: OECD Publishing

Ramirez, M. E. & Amporin, M. L. (2019). Compliance of Public Elementary School on the Financial Management Role in the School-Based Management in Taal District, Division of Batangas. Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts, Vol. 3 No. 2B.

Rose, M. (2021). Job Description-Assistant Principal. Cincinnati Classical Academy. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/egenfq

Rupia, C. & Musa, M. C. (2022). Preparedness of School Heads to Manage Financial Resource in Public Secondary Schools in Kwimba District, Mwanza Region, Tanzania. Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education, 6(3), 201-208.

Ryckman, M. L. (2019). Chron. What Is a Budgetary Allocation? Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/l6sq28

Sagucom, V. A., Lumapenet, H. T., & Mamurao, R. S. (2022). Leadership and Fiscal Management Skills of School Principals. https://rb.gy/5ayvOz

Sanghi, S. (2022). Springer Link. Age, ageing, and the law. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/oruk5b

Schleicher, A. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 on education. Insights from Education at a Glance. OED. https://rb.gy/thqx57

Sharma, S. (2019). Descriptive Statistics. Research Gate. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/8l6ovs

Spacey, J. (2023). Simplicable. 15 Examples of Fiscal Maagement. https://simplicable.com/economics/fiscal-management

Trochim, W. M. K. (2023). Research methods knowledge base: Ethics in research. Conjointly. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/os4k4c

Valencia, E. (2022). The Relationship Between Length of Principal Tenure and Student Achievement in Central Arkansas Elementary Schools. ATV Theses and Dissertations. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/abqapu

Wadasen, R. P. (2024). Financial management challenges and best practices of school heads. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research. Retrieved from: https://www.ijfmr.com

Wanjala, J., Wamocha, L. & Sang, F. (2020). Effect of Principals' Financial Management practices on academic achievement in Public secondary schools in Bungoma East sub-country, Kenya. British Journal of Education 8, (9), 13-27.

Yasin, H. & Mokhtar M. (2024). Practices of Accountability and Transparency in Financial Management among Secondary School Principals. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences. Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/fw02xw

Yizengaw, J. Y., Agegnehu, M. A., & Ehmke, T. (2021). Practices and challenges of school financial resource management implementation in Bahir Dar City administration of Ethiopia: A comparative study between government and private secondary schools. Retrieved from: https://bitly.ws/sfoPr

Zaiontz, C. (2024). Cronbach's Alpha. Real Statistics Using Excel. Retrieved from: https://real-statistics.com

Zhu, E. (2023). What Is a Financial Olan and How Do You Build One? Retrieved from: https://rb.gy/c9mez6