

Systematic Review on Involved School Leaders in Governance and Curricula

¹**Dr. Regina P. Galigao**
Professor, Graduate School
Cebu Technological University,
Cebu City, Cebu

²**Helen J. Codeniera**
Instructress, Indiana Aerospace University
Basak, Lapu-Lapu City, Cebu

³**Eldino Dinoy**
Instructor, Cordova Public College
Cordova, Cebu

⁴**Carlo Niño A. Gerebese**
Teacher III, DepEd Cebu City Division
Day-as, Cebu City, Cebu

⁵**Louie G. Sanlad**
Teacher III, DepEd Mandaue City Division
Centro, Mandaue City, Cebu

⁶**Donna Mae D. Suraliza**
Teacher III, DepEd Cebu Province Division
Sudlon, Cebu City, Cebu

ABSTRACT

School leadership nowadays is confronted with ever-changing and fast-growing expectations of what schools should be able to achieve (Knapp & Hopmann, 2017). This research uses a mixed-method evaluation design. A data mining approach is used to determine the levels of school leader's governance. The sequence and composition of this paper are collaboratively discussed the previous reviews that have been conducted related to school leadership. In this paper, results of the reviewed paper have been presented and discussed. The researchers found out that most countries in the world have their commonalities in governance of the involvement school leaders in formulating the school budget, deciding on budget allocations within the school, establishing student assessment policies and determining course content. These school leaders are the principals and/or teachers and regional and/or national education authority, or school governing board. The distinct among the variables is choosing textbooks to be used because most school leaders involved in this variable are only the principals and/or teachers. It is recognized that teachers and school leaders ultimately work in their local context, even if set in a national or regional framework of governance for the education system.

Keywords: allocations, budget, curricula, governance, school leaders

I. INTRODUCTION

Educational leadership is the process of enlisting and guiding the talents and energies of teachers, pupils, and parents toward achieving common educational aims. Principals often regard teacher leaders as a source of extra help in a school that is strapped for human resources. As a result, many teacher leaders spend their time as apprentices or assistants in administration—supervising the cafeteria, subbing for absent staff, or overseeing the logistics of testing—rather than using their instructional

expertise to improve teaching at the school (Johnson, Susan Moore; Donaldson, Morgaen L., 2007).

Achieving high-level performance and organizational value from any department requires department members that have a combination of functional skills, knowledge, and expertise and department leadership that has strategic vision, cultural acuity, and moral fortitude. However, even if these elements are present, the potential for Procurement's contribution to the district's success cannot be fully realized without the inclusion of Procurement in the highest level of strategic planning and governance of the school (Council of the Great City Schools October 2018).

In terms of school leadership and management, the role of the principal as instructional leader is pivotal to overcoming the many existing problems, enhancing the school capacity, improving teachers' capabilities, and in providing a more conducive environment for teaching and learning. Effective principal leadership is also seen to improve his/ her relations with the teachers, and to strengthen the role of the local community in school improvement. In these areas, the role of principal as a mentor, and his/ her personal traits are found to assume a heightened importance.

In K-12 education, the identification, evaluation, and acquisition of educational technology products (herein referred to as procurement) are an essential but often highly difficult process. While the venture capital sector of educational technology, or ed-tech, products is flourishing, many providers perceive the procurement process to be a closed system of centralized power that presents many barriers to entry for smaller tech developers and start-ups. Further, procurement policies often vary at the macro (federal and state), meso (district), and micro (individual schools and teachers) levels, creating a "Wild West" of practices (Younie, 2006).

As a result of this quality deficit in education, demand has increased for the collection and use of more and better data to tackle corruption, bolster monitoring and accountability in service delivery, enable more sophisticated decision-making, and facilitate a focus on results and learning. Training good instructional leaders is the key to the whole educational process. Bureaucracy is a significant hurdle, and many educational programs are run without awareness of the necessary reforms to the educational system (Rizvi, 2010).

This paper reviews the ongoing developments in societies and their provisions of education are reflected in the roles, recruitment and development of school leaders. The paper first examines the level of school leaders in terms of governance in curriculum, accountability and administration. Thus, the purpose of this study is to find out issues and determinants from the perspectives of diverse groups of educators and providers in selected countries using a mixed-method evaluation design.

II. OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this paper is to discover answers to questions through the application of scientific procedures. The main aim of research is to find out the truth which is hidden and which has not been discovered as yet. Specifically, this answers the following:

1. Who are the involved school leaders in governance as to:
 - 1.1. formulating the school budget, and
 - 1.2. deciding on budget allocations within the school?

2. Who are the involved school leaders in the curricula as to:
 - 2.1. establishing student assessment policies,
 - 2.2. choosing textbooks to be used, and
 - 2.3. determining course content?
3. Based on the findings, what are the recommendations to adequately address complex issues in school leadership governance and curricula?

III. DESIGN AND METHOD

This research uses a mixed-method evaluation design. A data mining approach is used to determine the levels of school leader's governance. The sequence and composition of this paper are collaboratively discussed the previous reviews that have been conducted related to school leadership. Also, this shows discussions on the data and synthesizes the commonalities and other alternative trends.

Moreover, this is descriptive in nature because it is used to obtain information concerning the current status of the problem to describe "what exists" with respect to variables or conditions in a situation. Also, the methods involved range from the data mining which describes the status quo, the correlation study which investigates the relationship between variables, to developmental studies which seek to determine changes over time.

IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA AND ANALYSIS

Countries, school systems and individual schools are experimenting with new approaches to management that seek to run schools in ways that are right for the 21st century. This section of the paper seeks to detail these approaches and a few of their implications for school leaders. It has also to point out that inconsistency within and between them creates its own pressures on countries and their leaders. A speculative attempt to map some of the implications of the different approaches to governance for the degree of involvement of school leaders by area of a school's operation in formulating the school budget can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. **Percentage of Involved School Leaders in Governance as to Formulation of the School Budget**

Country	Percentage (%)		
	1	2	3
Argentina	10	35	55
Australia	38	47	15
Canada	21	42	37
China	32	68	0
Greece	11	68	21
Russia	9	36	55
Singapore	22	59	19
United Kingdom	12	79	9
USA	6	71	23
Mean Percentage	17.89	56.11	26.00

Legend: 1 - Only "principals and/or teachers"

2 - Both "principals and/or teachers" and "regional and/or national education authority", or "school governing board"

3- Only “regional and/or national education authority”

As seen on Table 1, majority (56.11%) of the school leaders who are principals and/or teachers and regional and/or national education authority, or school governing board are involved in governance as to formulating the school budget. This is followed by the 26% of the school leaders who are only regional and/or national education authority. While only 17.89% of the school leaders who are principals and/or teachers are involved in governance as to formulating the school budget.

Involvement of school leaders in governance as to formulating the school budget implies that principals and/or teachers and regional and/or national education authority, or school governing board should continue to provide the majority of financial resources for schools, the responsibility for spending the funds is shared among an increasingly wide range of actors. That is why school systems have become more complex and characterized by multi-level governance; a growing set of actors including different levels of the school administration, schools themselves and private providers are involved in school funding.

This report seeks to assist governments in achieving their education policy objectives through the efficient and equitable use of financial resources. It provides a systematic analysis of school funding policies by looking into the organization of responsibilities for raising and spending school funds, the design of mechanisms to distribute funding to schools, the procedures for planning education budgets, and the practices for monitoring, evaluating and reporting how funding has been used (Boeskens, Lima and Nusche, 2016). With this, school systems have limited financial resources with which to pursue their objectives and the design of school funding policies plays a key role in ensuring that resources are directed to where they can make the most difference.

For instance, in many countries, the governance of school funding is characterized by increasing fiscal decentralization, considerable responsibility of schools over budgetary matters and growing public funding of private school providers. These developments generate new opportunities and challenges for school funding policies and need to be accompanied by adequate institutional arrangements. To support effective school funding and avoid adverse effects on equity in changing governance contexts, the chapter recommends that reforms should seek to: ensure that roles and responsibilities in decentralized funding systems are well aligned; provide the necessary conditions for effective budget management at the school level; and develop adequate regulatory frameworks for the public funding of private providers (OECD, 2015).

In particular, Philippine fund sources for education include the exit tax on college graduates, travel tax, fees for vehicle registration, allocation from the Philippine Amusement and Gaming Corporation (PAGCOR), and loans from government financial institutions such as the Social Security System (SSS), Government Service Insurance System (GSIS), Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP) and a consortium of banks, as well as donations, grants, and savings from operations. In accordance with the 1987 Constitution, the education sector captures the largest share of the national

government budget. The education sector's share has increased consistently from the period 1985 to 1997, from 11.4 percent to 17.4 percent.

With this, government should realign the functions of the Education Department at the national and sub-national levels in an effort to deconcentrate basic education management because it will broaden the roles of Local Government Units (LGUs), civil society, the community and the private sector in the delivery and management of basic education services. Government will also look at decentralizing tasks to LGUs, which will also involve building local government capabilities to conduct community-based education and training (Macasaet, 2018).

Table 2 shows that majority (52.11%) of the school leaders who are principals and/or teachers and regional and/or national education authority, or school governing board are involved in in deciding on budget allocations within the school. However, countries like Australia and Canada shows that most of the school leaders who are only principals and/or teachers involved in in deciding on budget allocations within the school. While 9.44% of the school leaders who are regional and/or national education authority are the least involved in deciding on budget allocations within the school.

Table 2. Percentage of Involved School Leaders in Governance in Deciding on Budget Allocations within the School

Country	Percentage (%)		
	1	2	3
Argentina	18	46	36
Australia	62	37	1
Canada	65	29	6
China	32	68	0
Greece	23	62	15
Russia	23	62	15
Singapore	40	57	3
United Kingdom	49	51	0
USA	30	61	9
Mean Percentage	26.00	52.56	9.44

It implies that schools seeking improved outcomes usually have one or more “champions for change” on the inside of the organization, and these leaders can often engage other staff to produce better results in the short term. If schools are going to build support for on-going success, they also need advocates for improved program outcomes outside the immediate organization—constituents who understand the mission of the school, who share the champions’ vision and passion for student success, and who have a personal stake in the performance of the school and its students (Mfum-Mensah & Friedson-Ridenour, 2014).

A number of qualitative research efforts indicate that the devolution of decision-making power to school and community does not automatically result in exercise of devolved power due to social structure, attitude and culture of individuals and organizations, and political intervention in community participation. Contextual understanding of participation is of primary

importance to clarify diversity in the results of community participation in school management in developing countries (Ogawa & Nishimura, 2015).

Thus, it is important to note that the types of participation vary depending on the purpose of participation and the actual power devolved to the community (Mfum-Mensah & Friedson-Ridenour, 2014; Phillips, 2013). The categories in which power is devolved include budgeting (i.e., budget formation and allocation), personnel management (i.e., appointment and dismissal), pedagogy and educational content (i.e., curriculum development, making of class schedules and school calendar and events, selection of textbooks, etc.), school infrastructure and maintenance (i.e., improvement of buildings and other infrastructure, procurement of textbooks and scholastic materials), and monitoring and evaluation (i.e., monitoring and evaluation of teachers' performance and students' learning achievement).

Table 3. Percentage of Involved School leaders in Establishing Student Assessment Policies in the Curricula

Country	Percentage (%)		
	1	2	3
Argentina	59	33	8
Australia	56	40	4
Canada	25	58	17
China	66	34	
Greece	29	10	61
Russia	17	73	10
Singapore	17	83	0
United Kingdom	62	38	0
USA	16	68	16
Mean Percentage	40.78	48.56	12.89

The data above show that not all school leaders from different countries who are principals and/or teachers and regional and/or national education authority, or school governing board only (48.56%) are involved in establishing student assessment policies in the curricula. Some are only principals and/or teachers like most school leaders in (China (62%), United Kingdom (62%), Argentina (59%), and Australia (56%). While the least (12.89%) involved in establishing student assessment policies in the curricula are school leaders in regional and/or national education authority.

Hence, each teacher ultimately decides how and what to teach in his or her classroom, but this decision is influenced by decisions at higher levels of the system. There is the effect of decisions made at the school level, which include the setting of expectations and sequences in certain content areas as well as the principal's, department chairs', or team leaders' explicit and implicit signals about teaching and learning priorities (Shen, J., Gerard, L., and Bowyer, J., 2010).

Leaders at the school level may also make decisions about the time and resources allocated to different subjects within guidelines and requirements set by the state, teacher hiring and assignments, the usage of science labs, and, in some cases, the presence of a school building's laboratory space in the first place. The school leaders' expectations, priorities,

and decisions establish a climate that encourages or discourages particular pedagogical approaches, collegial interactions, or in-service programs.

Furthermore, a school's degree of commitment to equity—to providing opportunities for all students to learn the same core content—can influence how students are scheduled into classes, which teachers are hired, how they are assigned to teach particular classes, and how instructional resources are identified and allocated (Lee, O., and Buxton, C., 2010).

In the Philippines, curriculum adjustments for the specific needs of multi-level, multi-age, multi-grade students, and school readiness teaching contexts are required. Guidelines are required for active learning and child-centered pedagogy, formative evaluation procedures, and student promotion policies. The selection of textbooks and supplementary reading materials (taking into consideration school context), guidelines for the use of language used in the classroom by students, and transition to the official media of instruction, must be initiated (Macasaet, 2018).

Table 4. Percentage of Involved School Leaders in Choosing Textbooks to be used

Country	Percentage (%)		
	1	2	3
Argentina	81	18	1
Australia	81	19	0
Canada	44	43	13
China	81	19	0
Greece	5	6	89
Russia	45	52	3
Singapore	26	72	2
United Kingdom	100	0	0
USA	25	60	15
Mean Percentage	52.22	32.11	13.67

It is very evident from the Table 4 above that majority (52.22%) of the school leaders who are principals and/or teachers are only involved in choosing textbooks to be used in school specifically United Kingdom (100%). While there are 32.11% are principals and/or teachers and regional and/or national education authority, or school governing board and none of them are in United Kingdom. There are 13.67 % regional and/or national education authority involved in choosing textbooks to be used in school excluding Australia, China and United Kingdom.

A key feature of effective teaching is the selection of instructional materials that meet the needs of students and fit the constraints of the teaching and learning environment. There are many pressures for educators to match the audiovisual stimuli of television, computers, and electronic games with which students are experienced. Textbooks are of great significance for teaching and learning. Teaching and learning are tasks carried out by teachers and students. Then they need to know what a good source is to carry out their activities satisfactorily. Thus, there must be appropriate and contextually determined criteria in selection and evaluation of the textbooks.

The findings of the research of Amerian (2014) on Textbook Selection, Evaluation, and Adaptation Procedures show that the factors influencing the process include teachers, learners and pedagogical principles. And the standards involved in this realm are either general or specific. The general standards have to do with the appearance and the price while the specific principles should satisfy the intended readers' needs and interests. The increased responsibilities and accountability of school leadership are creating the need for leadership distribution both within schools and across schools. While the principal's role remains very strong in the management of financial resources and personnel, varying degrees of responsibility are increasingly shared with other professionals within the school and with school board members.

However, while practitioners consider sharing of responsibilities vital for school leadership practice, these practices are rare, often remain unclear or those involved often do not get recognition for their tasks in some countries. In view of these conditions, it is important that both policy makers and the public recognize the need to broaden the concept of school leadership and take steps to adjust policy and working conditions accordingly (Beatriz Pont, 2008).

Table 5. Percentage of Involved School Leaders in Determining Course Content

Country	Percentage (%)		
	1	2	3
Argentina	19	49	32
Australia	36	48	16
Canada	19	49	32
China	54	43	3
Greece	2	3	95
Russia	19	64	17
Singapore	20	66	14
United Kingdom	83	14	3
USA	16	58	26
Mean Percentage	29.78	43.78	26.44

The data above on table 5 show that most of the school leaders (43.78%) involved in determining course content are principals and/or teachers and regional and/or national education authority, or school governing board. While 29.78% of them are principals and/or teachers and 26.44% are regional and/or national education authority school leaders who are involved in determining course content.

Interestingly, the results show that Greece and United Kingdom vary to each other as to determining the course content. Greece usually involves school leaders who are regional and/or national education authority while United Kingdom involves only principals and/or teachers in determining course content. This implies that there are some countries which are independent schools. In contrary, Philippine Governance of the education sector which has remained largely centralized since the American occupation of the early 1900s. The Education Department long had sole responsibility for

the formulation, planning, implementation, and coordination of all levels of formal and non-formal education in the Philippines. It supervised all education institutions, both public and private. The trifocalization of education management allowed the DepEd to narrow its focus and direct its attention toward basic (elementary and secondary) and non-formal education exclusively. This also enabled the Department to pursue its mission of establishing and maintaining "a system of free public education in the elementary and high school levels" as provided for by the 1987 Constitution.

V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, and RECOMMENDATIONS

This portion presents the summary of findings, conclusion and recommendation of the research. Table 6 below shows the summary of findings.

Table 6. Summary of Findings

Variables	%	School Leaders Involved
Formulating the school budget	56.11	Both "principals and/or teachers" and "regional and/or national education authority", or "school governing board"
Deciding on budget allocations within the school	52.56	Both "principals and/or teachers" and "regional and/or national education authority", or "school governing board"
Establishing student assessment policies	48.56	Both "principals and/or teachers" and "regional and/or national education authority", or "school governing board"
Choosing textbooks to be used	52.22	Only "principals and/or teachers"
Determining course content	43.78	Both "principals and/or teachers" and "regional and/or national education authority", or "school governing board"

Table 6 shows that majority of the school leaders who are principals and/or teachers and regional and/or national education authority, or school governing board are involved in formulating the school budget (56.11%), deciding on budget allocations within the school, establishing student assessment policies, and determining course content. While most school leaders who are principals and/or teachers are the only involved in choosing textbooks to be used (52.22%) excluded are the regional and/or national education authority, or school governing board.

However, in the Philippine education system, in choosing of books to be used, principal's and or teachers are not include except in the private schools because they have their own choice in choosing books. Observations, and perhaps others, should be considered as symptomatic of the absence of some aspects of leadership in school-community relations. This, in itself is a challenge. Educational leaders should know more about the community, including the extent of people's knowledge and understanding of the meaning and philosophy of education.

A majority of the Filipino people subscribe to the notion that education is just a matter of schooling. They fail to understand that education is a process that includes mental discipline, the cultivation of mental abilities, the

acquisition of skills and knowledge, and the development of attitudes. They fail to realize that education is one way of developing democratic values. The majority of the school people also are still of the belief that the schools are closed systems, with clearly defined rules governing their operation, thus perpetuating the "traditions" in the administration of schools.

However, with developments such as the establishment of school boards, direct support of public education through the additional tax on real property for the exclusive use of education and the concept of accountability. There is need to relate leadership in the school-community setting, perhaps in better ways than any yet attempted. There are many ways of relating leadership to the school-community setting and there are many ways of interpreting the role and functions of the schools to the people. These are responsibilities of school leaders in the area of public relations.

The centrality of teachers and school leaders to the learning process in schools is self-evident. However schools are organized, and whatever pedagogies may have been introduced, learners are ultimately dependent for their academic and social progress on the expertise, energy, inspiration and imagination of the adults to whom they are entrusted. Teachers generally are motivated by this privileged responsibility, but it is not an easy challenge. Societal and governmental expectations are demanding. They may reflect priorities, such as economic imperatives, that diverge from notions of a love of learning that teachers themselves might view as paramount. There may, too, be an awkward tension between the autonomy vested in teachers and school leaders, and the accountability that might reasonably be expected of them (Linse, 2017).

In conclusion, most countries in the world have their commonalities in governance of the involvement school leaders in formulating the school budget, deciding on budget allocations within the school, establishing student assessment policies and determining course content. These school leaders are the principals and/or teachers and regional and/or national education authority, or school governing board. The distinct among the variables is choosing textbooks to be used because most school leaders involved in this variable are only the principals and/or teachers. It is recognized that teachers and school leaders ultimately work in their local context, even if set in a national or regional framework of governance for the education system. Teachers and school leaders have a real and immediate setting for their work. All stakeholders are by definition important to the success of a school and should be enabled to share and implement progressive measures.

This report supports the study of Mariella Knapp and Stefan Hopmann (2017) on School Leadership as Gap Management: Curriculum Traditions, Changing Evaluation Parameters, and School Leadership Pathways. They found out that school leadership is an embedded activity, i.e. much depends on the underlying structure and culture of schooling. For instance, different traditions of defining schooling play a significant role in defining the role of school leaders. Therefore, it could be worthwhile to compare different traditions and current practices of defining school leadership with the traditions of conceptualizing the schooling within which they have evolved.

To adequately address complex issues in school leadership governance and curricula, this paper recommends the education sector of the government to move beyond temporary and isolated measures to a strategic

'whole school approach'. In a 'whole school approach', schools are seen as collaborative learning environments. The entire school community (school leaders, teaching and non-teaching staff, parents and families), together with external stakeholders, take responsibility to help all learners develop to the best of their abilities.

Then, school leaders and teachers should be acknowledged and respected for their expertise and their contribution to developing the education system at different levels. Through their own endeavors as learners, teachers and school leaders act as role models, adding to the development of the school as a learning organization.

Next, they should also be supported in their efforts to increase capacity to work across networks of schools and professionals. Involving teachers and school leaders in the design of new initiatives and reforms from the start will help improve the system and empower staff to engage in leadership, be innovative and take as well as manage risks.

Finally, systems should provide opportunities for school leaders and teachers to develop leadership competences that support them in strategic thinking and planning. Teachers and school leaders should be inspiring and be able to set priorities for self and others. They should be able, and enabled, to identify their own needs and opportunities for professional development, and to lead others in reflective practice as part of the process of change.

IJSER

VI. REFERENCES

- Albers, Mohrman & Lawler E., (1988) "Participative Managerial Behavior and Organizational Change", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 1 Issue: 1, pp.45-59. Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb025593>
- Atsebeha, A. (2016). Principals' Leadership Styles and Their Effects on Teachers' Performance in the Tigray Region Of Ethiopia. February 19, 2019. http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/23158/thesis_ayene_tamrat_atsebeha.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Aunga, D. & Masare, O., (2017). Effect of leadership styles on teacher's performance in primary schools of Arusha District Tanzania. Date Retrieved: February 19, 2019. <https://journalissues.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Aunga-and-Masare.pdf>
- Chemers, M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019. ISBN 978-0-8058-2679-1.
- Chen, Yi-Gean (2017) . Exploring Differences from Principals' Leaderships and Teachers' Teaching Performances in Public and Private Schools. February 19, 2019. <http://www.jimsjournal.org/8%20Yi-Gean%20Chen.pdf>
- Crosby, P., *Quality Management*(1992). Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019. <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a256399.pdf>
- Fullan (2001). *Building Leadership Capacity*. Date Retrieved: February 19, 2019. <http://www.mheducation.co.uk/openup/chapters/033521178X.pdf>
- Gordon, Jon 2017. *The Power of Positive Leadership: How and Why Positive Leaders Transform Teams and Organizations and Change the World*. Date Retrieved: February 18, 2019. <https://www.amazon.com/Power-Positive-Leadership-Transform-Organizations/dp/1119351979>
- Gyasi, R., (2016). The Effect of Leadership Styles on Learners' Performance. The Case of Asonomaso Nkwanta in the Kwabre District Assembly of Ashanti Region in Ghana. Date Retrieved: February 19, 2019. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1118870.pdf>
- Jago, 1982. *Concepts of Leadership*. Date Retrieved: February 19, 2019. <http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/leader/leadcon.html>
- Knapp & Hopmann (2017). *School Leadership as Gap Management: Curriculum Traditions, Changing Evaluation Parameters, and School Leadership Pathways*. . Date Retrieved: May 24, 2019. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-58650-2_6.
- Linda, L. (2003). *Building Leadership Capacity in Schools*. Date Retrieved: February 19, 2019. <https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=aUvI2waXuRMC&printsec=frontcover&dq=building+leadership+capacity+for+school+improvement+book&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiSmpWnsMfgAhXabSsKHSobChAQ6AEIKDAA#v=onepage&q=building%20leadership%20capacity%20for%20school%20improvement%20book&f=false>
- Linse (2017). *Interpreting and using student ratings data: Guidance for faculty serving as*

administrators and on evaluation committees. Date Retrieved: May 24, 2019.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191491X16300232>

Lynch, Matthew 2018 . Major Types of Educational Leadership.

Date Retrieved: February 18, 2019. <https://www.theedadvocate.org/4-major-types-of-educational-leadership/>

Martinelli, A. (2001). Management: General. Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/neuroscience/managerial-behavior>

Meador, Derrick (2019). The Essential Qualities of an Effective School Leader.

Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019. <https://www.thoughtco.com/how-school-administrator-can-be-effective-leader-3194569>

Miller, Paul W. (2018). The Nature of School Leadership Global Practice

Perspectives. Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019. <https://www.palgrave.com/gp/book/9783319701042>

Mulder, P. (2017). Deming's 14 points for Management. Retrieved [February 15,

2019] from ToolsHero: Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019. <https://www.toolshero.com/management/deming-14-points/>

Nancy J. Adler 2016. Want to Be an Outstanding Leader?. Date Retrieved:

February 15, 2019. <https://hbr.org/2016/01/want-to-be-an-outstanding-leader-keep-a-journal>

Obama, M., (2016). Principals' Leadership Style and Students' Academic

Performance in Public Secondary Schools. Date Retrieved: February 19, 2019.
<https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/RHSS/article/viewFile/30266/31081>

Omar, A. & Kavale, S., (2016). Effect of Leadership Style on School Performance of the Secondary Schools in Wadajir District, Mogadishu, Somalia.

Date Retrieved: February 19, 2019. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313445796_Effect_of_Leadership_Style_on_School_Performance_of_the_Secondary_Schools_in_Wadajir_District_Mogadishu_Somalia

Oracion, Carmela Canlas; (2014). Teacher leadership in public schools in the

Philippines. Doctoral thesis , UCL Institute of Education. Date Retrieved:
February 19, 2019. <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/10021652/>

Patel (2010). Behavioral Approach to Management. Date Retrieved:

February 15, 2019. <https://obssr.od.nih.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Social-and-Behavioral-Theories.pdf>

Pratap, A., (2017). Behavioral theories of leadership. Date Retrieved:

February 19, 2019. <https://www.cheshnotes.com/2016/12/behavioral-theories-of-leadership/>

Rachmah, N. & Putrawan, M., (2018). Teachers Leadership and Trust: Its Effect on

Teachers Performance. Date retrieved: February 19, 2019.
<http://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-0118/ijsrp-p7302.pdf>

Richards, Leigh, 2018. Factors Affecting Organizational Behavior. Date Retrieved:

February 15, 2019. <https://bizfluent.com/info-8131521-factors-affecting-organizational-behavior.html>

School-Based Management Grant. Date Retrieved: February 18, 2019.

http://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/DO_s2015_45-1.pdf

Sharma et al. (2013). Leadership Management: Principles, Models and Theories.

Date Retrieved: February 18, 2019. https://www.ripublication.com/gjmsv3n3spl_14.pdf

Shaw, D. (2017). Accomplished teaching: Using video recorded micro-teaching discourse to build candidate teaching competencies. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 28(2), 161–180. Date Retrieved: February 19, 2019. http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational_leadership/feb19/vol76/num05/The_Micro-Teaching_Advantage.aspx

Stringer, Patricia (2013). Capacity Building for School Improvement: Revisited. Date Retrieved: February 19, 2019. https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=N_bHBAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=building+leadership+capacity+for+school+improvement+book&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiSmpWnsMfgAhXabSsKHSobChAQ6AEIZDAJ#v=onepage&q=building%20leadership%20capacity%20for%20school%20improvement%20book&f=false

Vinkenburg, C., Koopman P., & Jansen P. (2012). Managerial Behavior and Decision Making; Personal and Situational Factors. Date Retrieved: February 19, 2019. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-015-9827-9_11

Vinkenburg, C., Koopman P., & Jansen P. (2012). Managerial Behavior and Decision Making; Personal and Situational Factors. Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-015-9827-9_11

Wallace (2012). The Effective Principal: Five Pivotal Practices that Shape Instructional Leadership. Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019. <https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/pages/the-effective-principal.aspx>

Whalen (1994). The existing barriers in implementing total quality management. Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019. <http://steconomiceuoradea.ro/anale/volume/2014/n1/138.pdf>

Yagci. C. & Uluoz, T. (2018). Leadership Styles of School Administrators and its Relation with the Mobbing Experience Levels of Social, Science and Mathematics Teachers. Date Retrieved: February 15, 2019. <http://www.ejmste.com/Leadership-Styles-of-School-Administrators-and-its-Relation-with-the-Mobbing-Experience,78061,0,2.html>

Yakowicz, Will (2014). Lessons from Leadership . Date Retrieved: February 18, 2019. <https://www.inc.com/will-yakowicz/7-leadership-lessons-from-late-warren-bennis.html>

Zairi and Matthew (1995). Management Innovations for Healthcare Organizations: Adopt, Abandon or Adapt? Date Retrieved: February 18, 2019. [https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=tpP4CgAAQBAJ&pg=PT431&lpg=PT431&dq=Zairi+and+Matthew+\(1995\)&source=bl&ots=d4ybyHD9-T&sig=ACfU3U1tWM0PIs9JJXV2Jj1Lhftvzv8MQ&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjjt_7d58TgAhUQQH0KHfGPCcwQ6AEwC3oEACQAQ#v=onepage&q=Zairi%20and%20Matthew%20\(1995\)&f=false](https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=tpP4CgAAQBAJ&pg=PT431&lpg=PT431&dq=Zairi+and+Matthew+(1995)&source=bl&ots=d4ybyHD9-T&sig=ACfU3U1tWM0PIs9JJXV2Jj1Lhftvzv8MQ&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjjt_7d58TgAhUQQH0KHfGPCcwQ6AEwC3oEACQAQ#v=onepage&q=Zairi%20and%20Matthew%20(1995)&f=false)