Innovations

Influence of School-Based Management towards School Effectiveness in the Schools Division of Samar, Philippines

Leobert T. Mante
ORCID: 0000-0003-2850-3550
Northwest Samar State University

Corresponding author: **Leobert T. Mante**

Abstract:

In recent years, there has been an increasing international movement towards decentralization, delegation and greater autonomy for schools in the public education sector with the aim of enhancing the international standard of education. This survey explored the contrasting viewpoints of teachers and school heads on school autonomy and school effectiveness as affective outcomes. Respondents came from three autonomous and non-autonomous schools in the Division of Samar, Philippines. It was revealed that the drive towards greater autonomy for schools is a real movement in today's education. Schools who have been delegated greater powers to take internal decisions, which traditionally required approval by the Department of Education, school staff are viewed as having greater control in decision-making with regard to internal school assessment, institutional staff development, school curriculum design, than schools who have not been allowed to do so. Although earlier research indicated that Autonomous Schools are more successful than non-autonomous Schools, the present study suggests that this hypothesis should be met with caution, as only 4 per cent of the variance could be explained by variables (SBMs) in the present study. Further analysis would be required, considering the scale of the sample used here, if we are to articulate some hypothesis on the relationship between school autonomy and school performance.

Keywords: 1.*Education, 2.School-Based Management, 3.Effectiveness, 4.Survey, 5.Philippines*

I. Introduction

In recent years, there has been an increasing international movement towards decentralization, delegation and greater autonomy for schools in the public education sector with the aim of enhancing the international standard of education (Keddie et al., 2020; Levacic & Glover 2020). Reasons for increased school supervision are echoes and updates to similar comments directed at all of the smallest institutions of society (McCormack et al., 2020). Get the information on how to manage the operation down to those who truly value what needs to be done. Current concerns for improvements in school administration and management are all directed in this direction, even though they operate under several names. Such policy reform is regarded as the School-Based Management Reform of the Department of Education (Maca, 2019) local management of schools of Divisions (Owan & Ekpe 2019), self-managing schools and devolution in Districts (Keddie & Holloway 2019; Seedaeng & Rattanasiraprapha 2019) and the autonomous school (Kim et al., 2019).

Irrespective of the label attached, the terms are intended to characterize, a method of education that strengthens the autonomy of participants at the site level by providing favourable conditions for engagement, increased creativity, transparency, and continuous professional development. Via the decentralization of authority from central offices and involvement in decision-making, school management duties are specified according to the characteristics and needs of the school and thus the school representatives have a much greater autonomy and responsibility for decision-making on school curriculum, staff growth and distribution of resources (Forsey, 2020).

The reasoning for this new method is many and convincing in its justification, at least if the concepts alluded to above are acknowledged (Noe et al., 2017). The political rationale for decentralization is that the closer the school government is to its clients, the more likely it is to adapt to their demands and desires. The premise here is that customer satisfaction with government facilities is an essential and desirableobjective. The economic case for decentralization is that localized units promote the requisite competitiveness in sheltered monopolies and in addition to contributing productivity and effectiveness to the other worthy aim of public sector responsiveness, are more likely to deliver services in accordance with the priorities (needs and desires) of local, more homogeneous classes of consumers/citizens. The contention of the education sector for decentralization is that bureaucratic oversight of schools is incompatible with the professional autonomy of teachers and is actually counterproductive to the morale of teachers and to improve and enhance the sense of responsibility and professional competence of teachers (Orazbayeva,2016). Another statement that has recently emerged in the literature is the managerial argument that is based on the mechanistic and organic types of organizations described by Ababneh (2016). Some researchers (Patterson-Davis, 2020; Etemad, 2020) claim that schools that use dynamic and ambiguous technology need an organic type of management that promotes constructive modes of administrative leadership, participatory types of organizational decision-making, development of teacher authority, and increased coordination (Zhang, 2020).

Structural changes in the management and governance of publicly funded schools are being implemented, in a variety of ways and by a variety of means, in order to deliver the advantages of better schooling to the children covered by such schools. In the restructuring process, schools with an increasing degree of autonomy are required to reflect the expanded participation and engagement of all those interested in the school: parents, staff, principals, and students (Childs-Fegredo et al., 2020); a more diverse curriculum (Starks 2020), expanded neighborhoodunderstanding of school programs (Candipan, 2020) and most notably, better school results (McPherson 2020).

a. Are autonomous schools more efficient?

It is now generally assumed by researchers that school effectiveness is a multidimensional term (McDaniel & Einstein 2020; Broadbent 2020). Virtually any point, procedure or result variable can and has been used as a measure of effectiveness. The present research used four affective results as markers of school effectiveness: a teacher's sense of effectiveness, a teacher's sense of society, a teacher's dedication to school, and the degree to which teachers feel the school's achievement-oriented strategy (towards excellence).

Successful schooling evidently requires more than technically qualified teachers, a professionally acceptable program, and suitable facilities.Technical advances in teaching and curricula are important but are unlikely to help students unless accompanied by a supportive organizational framework and culture (Twining et al., 2020; Wang, 2020).

Many aspects of school organization have been suggested, which synthesize school-based administration or basic transformation under the label of 'school autonomy.' Irrespective of the name, the measure refers to a policy or ideology implemented by schools aimed at improving educational quality by increasing the autonomy of school personnel in the decision-making of school sites. It also applies to dimensions such as collegiality of teachers, personnel growth and responsibility to students and parents (Scharf, 2020). For some time now the transformation revolution in company and industry has acknowledged that it is important to increase the engagement and happiness of staff when employees and supervisors have more authority and collegiality in their jobs (Abun et al., 2020). The few education-related research on this topic have attempted to create connections between facets of school-based management and school efficiency in terms of either the affective outcomes (School environment, sense of culture, sense of self-efficacy, morality) or cognitive results (student achievement) (Shen et al.,2020). In 1993, Simkins released a study of studies undertaken in England and Wales and found that there was no evidence that SBM was linked to school effectiveness (Simkins, as cited in Nir & Miran 2006; Iwashina, 2015).

In the other hand, research in the United States and Canada support the theory that the schools that adopted SBM have increased their overall efficacy. In his quest for what characterizes effective schools, Morrison (2019) concluded that good schools tend to be those that make it easy for workers to engage in instructional choices, and that open lines of contact between parents, teachers and students. Ingersoll et al., (2018) and Conser & Jones (2016) argued that more successful schools are those with a high degree of accountability and power to make staff decisions. In these classrooms, teachers have been motivated in several areas to contribute to curriculum creation, planning and decision-making. Using evidence from Teacher job satisfaction and student achievement Research, Banerjee et al., (2017) found that schools where teachers were able to exert greater control had a higher spiritual workforce, a teacher's sense of self-efficacy, and a teacher's sense of culture. A research by Wahlström & Sundberg (2017) sought to map the dynamic pattern of causal interactions within the school organization that give rise to teachers' sense of self-efficiency, and then looked at the impact of teacher effectiveness on teacher conduct and student achievement.

Dou, Devos, & Valcke (2017) offer further proof of the connection between the emotional aspects of school performance and the high degree of school autonomy. Bal-Taştan et al., (2018) indicated that while school-based management is implicitly related to student success and accomplishment (cognitive outcomes), it is specifically related to the confidence and happiness of school employees (affective outcomes).

b. What are the effects of SBM implementation?

Study performed in the early twenty first typically supports the conclusions of latest studies (Hernita & Arafat 2020; Frank, 2020). In a survey analyzing the attitudes of teachers towards SBM, Tshiunza (2018) observed that most teachers feel optimistic towards SBM. Although a significant proportion of the literature indicates a positive correlation between SBM and school effectiveness (either in cognitive or emotional aspects), the important question is how much SBM accounts for variation in all dimensions of school effectiveness relative to input variables such as school size, class size, or student teacher ratio . In fact, this topic was discussed in school efficacy research published in the early sixties up to early twenty first (Hilton 2019; Scheerens 2016).

Since then, very few studies have been performed on this topic (Asif et al., 2017; Akçayır & Akçayır 2017). However, looking at efficiency of national innovation systems in developing countries research (see Choi & Zo 2019; Hawkridge et al., 2016 for review indicates that most of these have concentrated on demographic factors (including student background) correlated with all dimensions of school effectiveness.

These demographic factors included: classroom size, 21 works, only 5 works confirming the impact; school size, 9 works, only 4 confirming the effect; teacher education, 26 works, only 12 confirming the effect; teacher experience 23 works, only 10 confirming the effect. Of the few experiments that concentrated on school configuration and administration as variables that describe school efficacy, 3 of these have reported results. Earlier research in Philippnes, which looked at the history of school effectiveness (cognitive aspects only) (Magulod 2017), showed that school size (Pañares & Cabangon 2016), class size (Moneve et al., 2020), proportion of poor students (Aragon 2017) and teacher characteristics (Fabelico & Afalla 2020) were strongly correlated with school effectiveness (cognitive dimensions). Nothing has been done to look at a history of school efficacy in its emotional aspects.

To sum up: many researchers in the area recorded the improvements they witnessed in classrooms and juxtaposed them against the context of historically non-decentralized schools. Põder (2017) argues that while the convincing rationale of decentralizing school operations has generated a surge of heightened hopes of a substantial increase in school performance, these improvements have in fact not materialized. Given the inconclusive existence of the study of the relationship between SBM and school efficacy, we would refrain from drawing any systematic conclusions here but will focus on both the reasoning and the prior observational studies to point out some of the relationships that would be expected.

Principals in Autonomous Schools (SBMs) are likely to see their school and themselves as having more say in school curriculum-based design and more control in internal school assessment, institutional personnel growth, and budget distribution than their counterparts. Teachers in self-governing schools are likely to see their schools and themselves as having greater influence in class decision-making, classroom decision-making and school curriculum planning than teachers in non-self-governing schools.

In addition, self-governing schools (those that have implemented SBM) will be required to differ from their peers in terms of the following effectiveness metrics (affective dimensions): performance, sense of dedication, sense of community and achievement orientation of students. The SBM factor is predicted to have a greater influence on the school's relational outcomes than the feedback (demographic factors.

The study described the situation of schools under autonomous status and how the restructuring contributed to their efficiency across all autonomous schools in the Province of Samar, Philippines. Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

- Do schools called "autonomous" vary in their decision-making mechanisms from schools that continue to work within the conventional centralized organizational structure?
- Are schools that have been restructured into school-based management (SBM) more successful (in terms of affective outcomes) than schools that appear to work under the conventional centralized organizational structure?

II. Methodology

This research study involved two main variableswhich was centered on the view of school autonomy and school effectiveness with five sub-variables namely, sense of dedication to school, sense of self-efficacy and inspiration, sense of civic mindedness, and goal oriented.

a. Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive research design, more specifically a survey research design that explores the contrasting viewpoints of teachers and school heads on school autonomy and school effectiveness as affective outcomes.

b. Participants and Sampling

The analysis here was based on the following samples: 6 public high schools (7 per cent of the high schools in the Division of Samar), chosen from a list of schools supplied by the Samar division office. Three of these were schools chosen at random from 76 schools in the Division (in this study they are termed "non-autonomous schools") through a DepEd Samar official website (Sta. Margarita National High School, San Jorge National Highschool, & Buenavista National High School). The other 3 schools were chosen since the Division of Samaronly has three autonomous schools namely Calbiga National Highschool, Clarencio Calagos Memorial School of Fisheries, and Quintin Quijano Sr. Agricultural School, which were exempted from external inspection and delegated the authority and responsibility for school policy, school curriculum design and school-based evaluation.

Background data on each school was supplied by the Division of Samar's official website. Ten (10) teachers from each school were chosen at random to complete two questionnaires: the Teacher View School Autonomy (Dou 2017) and the Perceived School Effectiveness in its four dimensions (Malinen & Savolainen, 2016).

c. Data Collection

The Teacher's View School Autonomy scale (Dou 2017) was validated for a sample of high school teachers. A factor analysis with varimax rotation was run on the data and yielded the following factors (factor loading up to 0.40). School based curriculum (factor loading=0.820) (α=0.79); Participation in decision making (factor loading=0.670); School based evaluation (factor loading=0.570) (α=0.68); Institutional staff development (factor loading=0.440) (α=0.66).

The Principal's View School Autonomy Scale (Dou, 2017) was validated for primary school principals. A factor analysis withyielded the following factors (factor loading up to 0.40). Institutional staff development (factor loading=0.820) (α=0.72). Principal as shaper of school policy (factor loading=0.650) (α=0.67).

The School Effectiveness Inventory (Chen, 2016) was validated among schoolteachers. The factor analysis with varimax rotation yielded the following factors (factor loading up to 0.40): Sense of efficacy (factor loading=0.790) (α=0.85); Sense of community (factor loading=0.686) (α=0.77); School commitment (factor loading=0.560) (α=0.75); Achievement orientation (factor loading=0.480) (α=0.71).

Questionnaires were distributed and collected by the researcher thru online platform (Google Forms). The principals of the 6 schools (3 autonomous and 3 non-autonomous) were asked to complete the Principal's Perceived School Autonomy questionnaire.

Data collected will undergo a series of data cleaning in preparation for analysis.

d. Data Analysis

The unit of analysis for the F tests and the discriminant analysis for the teacher level and the school level was chosen for the regression analysis since some of the background variables (ratio, size, and percentage of disadvantaged students) could only be analyzed at the school level (Panela, 2022a; Panela, 2022b). The data analysis was facilitated using Microsoft Excel and SPSS.

III. Results and Discussion

The following are the consolidated results from the survey conducted. Salient and pertinent findings were featured accordingly.

a. Perceived School Autonomy

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of principal and teacher perceived school autonomy for both type of schools – those defined as "autonomous schools" by the Department of Education and for "non-autonomous schools". One-way ANOVA were calculated after the means and deviations scores.

	Non-autonomous High School		Autonomous High School			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	F	p-value
Principal view of school autonomy	4.029	0.448	4.178	0.358	3.001	0.031*
Teacher view of school autonomy	4.512	0.383	4.586	0.459	1.324	0.000**

Legend:
ns – Not Significant at .05 level (p>.05)
*- significant at .05 level (p<.05
**-high significant at .01 level (p<.01

From Table 1 we see that the highest mean score of school autonomy view was found among schoolteachers working inautonomous schools (defined by the Department of Education) ($\bar{x}$=4.586, SD=0.459), while the lowest mean score of school autonomy view was obtained for teachers in non-autonomous schools ($\bar{x}$=4.512, SD=0.383).

Result of the study showed that there is a high significant difference in the teachers' perception of school autonomy reported by teachers in the autonomous and non-autonomous schools as manifested by the p-value that is lesser than the 0.01 level of significance.

Regarding school principal views on school autonomy, Table 1 indicates that the highest mean score was obtained among autonomous school principals ($\bar{x}$=4.178; SD=0.358), while the lowest mean score was found among principals at non-autonomous schools ($\bar{x}$=4.029, SD=0.448). An analysis of variance run upon the data revealed significant differences as established by the p-value that is lesser than the 0.05 level of significance.

The present study was aimed at answering two questions: (a) schools whose jurisdiction has been shifted from central offices ("autonomous schools" or school-based schools), different in terms of decision-

making trends and degree of teacher empowerment from non-autonomous schools known in the Department of Education centralized system as "conventional centralized Schools"); (b) autonomous schools are distinct in their success from their counterparts as they are considered to be successful in terms of the following indicators: sense of efficacy, sense of engagement, sense of group and focus towards school achievement.

The findings suggest that schools with powers assigned by the central government, whose employees treated them as independent, differ from their counterparts in the following processes: encouraged to take internal decisions on curriculum creation and assessment, staff development, the forming of school policies and the promotion of involvement. There were no variations between schools in the distribution of the budget. The results are consistent with what I found in the literature (McCormick & James2018; Holmes & McLean 2018) on the key features of autonomous schools.

Table 2 presents differences in school effectiveness as reported by teachers in autonomous schools and in non-autonomous schools. One-way ANOVA were calculated after the means and standard deviations scores.

	Non-autonomous High School		Autonomous High School			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	F	p-value
Sense of dedication to school	1.820	0.340	3.330	0.250	0.245	0.001**
Sense of self-efficacy and inspiration	2.250	0.220	3.000	0.210	0.117	0.001**
Sense of civic mindedness	2.810	0.130	3.090	0.210	0.025	0.01**
Goal Oriented	2.070	0.220	2.87	0.290	1.324	0.001**

Legend:
ns – Not Significant at .05 level (p>.05)
*- significant at .05 level (p<.05
**-highly significant at .01 level (p<.01

From Table 2 we see that according to the one-way analysis of variance, significant differences were obtained for all components of school effectiveness as reported by teachers in the autonomous and non-autonomous schools. About the factor “Sense of self-efficacy and inspiration”, the mean score for autonomousschools yielded $\bar{x}$=3.0, SD=0.21, and $\bar{x}$=2.25, SD=0.22 for non-autonomous schools. The analysis of variance revealed (P < 0.001). For the factor “Sense of dedication to school”, the mean score for autonomous schools was $\bar{x}$=3.33, SD=0.25, while the mean score for non-autonomous schools was $\bar{x}$=1.82; SD=0.34; (P < 0.001).

For the “Sense of civic mindedness” factor, the mean score for autonomous schools was $\bar{x}$=3.09, SD=0.21; and $\bar{x}$=2.81, SD=0.13 (F=25.26, P < 0.01), for non-autonomous schools. The results obtained for Goal Oriented showed a mean score of 2.87 and SD = 0.29 for autonomous schools, while for non-autonomous schools, the results showed a mean score of 2.07 and SD=0.22 respectively. The analysis of variance reveal F = 100.22, P < 0.001.

The discriminant coefficient showed the highest discriminant loading factor among school Sense of dedication to school, 1.36, and then in descending order: Sense of self-efficacy and inspiration; 0.18, Sense of civic mindedness; 0.17; Goal Oriented; 0.15.

From Table 2, we see that Autonomous Schools do also vary in their affective effects from their counterparts. Table 3 indicates the degree to which both of the demographic variables of the school (school size, teacher-student ratio, teacher formal education level, teacher seniority, proportion of marginalized students at school) as well as the school autonomy variable can explain the variances in school affective outcomes. For this function, a step-by-step regression analysis (School level) was used.

Table 3 indicates that in the present study, the best predictor of overall school efficiency (in its four dimensions) was the student teacher ratio: 16 per cent of the variance was explained by this variable, while teacher'sformal education explained 5 per cent of the variance, perceived school autonomy –4 percent of the variance, school size – 3 percent, teacher seniority – 1 percent of the variance and percentage of deprived student at school – 1 percent of the variance.

	Predicators	R2	R2 accumulated	Beta	P
1	Student teacher ratio	0.06	0.16	0.44	0.0001
2	Teacher years of experience in formal education	0.05	0.21	0.15	0.0001
3	Teacher view of school autonomy	0.04	0.25	0.33	0.0001
4	School size	0.03	0.28	-0.27	0.0001
5	Teacher seniority in teaching profession	0.01	0.29	-0.18	0.0001
6	Percentage of disadvantaged students at school	0.01	0.30	-0.11	0.0001

About the relationship between perceived school autonomy and school affective outcomes, the findings of all the analyses carried out in our research support the few current studies on this topic. In other words, our results are in line with the claims made by Dou et al., (2017); Maxwell & Riley(2017); Pitzer & Skinner (2017); Kim et al., (2016) and Machin & Sandi (2020) that autonomous schools are more effective than their non-autonomous counterparts in the following dimensions: (a) Sense of dedication to school: Teachers who have personal autonomy and are not under relentless external supervision develop a sense of confidence in their abilities to promote improvement in their pupils.; (b) Sense of self-efficacy and inspiration . Teachers who are interested in influencing education policies and who are not under relentless supervision feel more dedicated to school than their peers. (Zepeda, 2016); (c) sense of civic mindedness; That is, in an organic form of organization (SBM), where staff members encourage and assist each other to solve challenges, and where school work is team-based, we have a greater sense of community (Gibbs 2017) and (d) Goal oriented: This is because autonomous schools are supposed to perform well by central offices and parents (see also You & Morris 2016), while the presumed autonomous aspect accounts for just 4 per cent of overall performance.

Since Tobia et al. (2019) and Korthagen (2017), research on school efficacy has tried to be multi-dimensional in its research focus. Consistent with this pattern, the present research has taken the initiative of

evaluating demographic variables such as: student-teacher ratio, classroom size, formal education staff, seniority, and the proportion of marginalized students at school (at-risk students) to understand the association between school performance and perceived school autonomy.

The findings are in line with previous studies in developed countries(Wang 2018; Scheerens 2016) which shows that in most poor countries, school inputs such as teacher qualification, teacher seniority, pupil teaching ratio, school size and percentage of disadvantaged school students are the best variables to understand school effectiveness (both cognitive and affective); the strength of these factors to describe school success is stronger than institutional and organizational factors such as school autonomy.

The researches undertaken in under SBM (Yusuf et al., 2019) aimed to quantify the degree to which input variables and operational variables could describe school effectiveness (in its cognitive dimension only). The study found that school demographic variables have a greater influence on student performance than organizational variables, including the sense of autonomy. Our results confirm these reports of study, including though the efficacy of the school is measured using affective measures. The present study showed that demographic factors could explain 26 per cent of the variance in school affective outcomes, whereas school structure (viewed autonomous vs. non-autonomous) could explain just 4 per cent of the variance. This means that in Samar division, increased school efficiency, as seen by school employees, can be attained by enhancing school inputs, such as: student-teacher ratio, further employment of formally qualified teachers, after which structure can be considered.

IV. Conclusion and Recommendation

The present study reveals that the drive towards greater autonomy for schools is a real movement in today's education. Schools who have been delegated greater powers to take internal decisions, which traditionally required approval by the Department of Education., school staff are viewed as having greater control in decision-making with regard to internal school assessment, institutional staff development, school curriculum design, etc., than schools who have not been allowed to do so.

Although earlier research indicated that Autonomous Schools are more successful than non-autonomous Schools, the present study suggests that this hypothesis should be met with caution, as only 4 per cent of the variance could be explained by variables (SBMs) in the present study. Further analysis would be required, considering the scale of the sample used here, if we are to articulate some hypothesis on the relationship between school autonomy and school performance.

V. Bibliography

1. *Ababneh, O. M. A. (2020). The impact of organizational culture archetypes on quality performance and total quality management: the role of employee engagement and individual values. International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management.*
2. *Abun, D., Basilio, G. J. Q., Magallanes, T., Quadra, M. B., & Encarnacion, M. J. (2020). Transformational leadership style of Supervisors/Heads as Perceived by the Employees and the attitude of employees toward the School. Technium Social Sciences Journal, 13, 357-375.*

3. *Akçayır, M., & Akçayır, G. (2017). Advantages and challenges associated with augmented reality for education: A systematic review of the literature. Educational Research Review, 20, 1-11.*
4. *Aragon Jr, R. A. (2017). Implementation Practices of the Philippine Magna Carta for Persons with Disability. Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education, 6(2), 6-2.*
5. *Asif, R., Merceron, A., Ali, S. A., & Haider, N. G. (2017). Analyzing undergraduate students' performance using educational data mining. Computers & Education, 113, 177-194.*
6. *Bal-Taştan, S., Davoudi, S. M. M., Masalimova, A. R., Bersanov, A. S., Kurbanov, R. A., Boiarchuk, A. V., & Pavlushin, A. A. (2018). The impacts of teacher's efficacy and motivation on student's academic achievement in science education among secondary and high school students. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 14(6), 2353-2366.*
7. *Banerjee, N., Stearns, E., Moller, S., & Mickelson, R. A. (2017). Teacher job satisfaction and student achievement: The roles of teacher professional community and teacher collaboration in schools. American Journal of Education, 123(2), 000-000.*
8. *Broadbent, J., Panadero, E., Lodge, J. M., & de Barba, P. (2020). Technologies to Enhance Self-Regulated Learning in Online and Computer-Mediated Learning Environments. In Handbook of Research in Educational Communications and Technology (pp. 37-52). Springer, Cham.*
9. *Candipan, J. (2020). Choosing Schools in Changing Places: Examining SchoolEnrollment in Gentrifying Neighborhoods. Sociology of Education, 0038040720910128.*
10. *Chen, J. (2016). Understanding teacher emotions: The development of a teacher emotion inventory. Teaching and Teacher Education, 55, 68-77.*
11. *Childs-Fegredo, J., Burn, A. M., Duschinsky, R., Humphrey, A., Ford, T., Jones, P. B., & Howarth, E. (2020). Acceptability and feasibility of early identification of mental health difficulties in primary schools: a qualitative exploration of UK school staff and parents' perceptions. School Mental Health, 1-17.*
12. *Choi, H., & Zo, H. (2019). Assessing the efficiency of national innovation systems in developing countries. Science and Public Policy, 46(4), 530-540.*
13. *Cosner, S., & Jones, M. F. (2016). Leading school-wide improvement in low-performing schools facing conditions of accountability. Journal of Educational Administration.*
14. *Dou, D., Devos, G., & Valcke, M. (2017). The relationships between school autonomy gap, principal leadership, teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 45(6), 959-977.*
15. *Dou, D., Devos, G., & Valcke, M. (2017). The relationships between school autonomy gap, principal leadership, teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 45(6), 959-977.*
16. *Etemad, H. (2020). Through the Eyes of a Consultant: Leadership Succession Planning in an International School Setting.*
17. *Fabelico, F., & Afalla, B. (2020). Perseverance and Passion in the Teaching Profession: Teachers' Grit, Self-Efficacy, Burnout, and Performance. Journal of Critical Reviews.*
18. *Forsey, M. (2020). Practicing autonomy in a local eduscape: schools, families and educational choice. Comparative Education, 1-18.*
19. *Frank, J. L. (2020). School-Based Practices for the 21st Century: Noncognitive Factors in Student Learning and Psychosocial Outcomes. Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 7(1), 44-51.*
20. *Gibbs, M. D. (2017). The Relationship Between Leadership, Communication, Engagement and Effective Performance in Secondary Schools (Doctoral dissertation, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University).*
21. *Hawkridge, D., Jaworski, J., & McMahon, H. (2016). Computers in third-world schools: Examples, experience and issues. Springer.*

22. *Hernita, R., & Arafat, Y. (2020). The Effect of Work Motivation, School Culture and School Based Management on Teacher's Performance. Electronic Research Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 2, 188-202.*
23. *Hilton, J. (2019). Open educational resources, student efficacy, and user perceptions: a synthesis of research published between 2015 and 2018. Educational Technology Research and Development, 1-24.*
24. *Ingersoll, R. M., Sirinides, P., & Dougherty, P. (2018). Leadership Matters: Teachers' Roles in School Decision Making and School Performance. American Educator, 42(1), 13.*
25. *Iwashina, Masako. "School Improvement Planning and Effective Intervention from District Education Bureau in Laos—to Become Learning Communities." Journal of International Development Studies 24, no. 1 (2015): 47-59.*
26. *Keddie, A., & Holloway, J. (2019). School autonomy, school accountability and social justice: stories from two Australian school principals. School Leadership & Management, 1-15.*
27. *Keddie, A., Claire MacDonald, K., Blackmore, J., Eacott, S., Gobby, B., Mahoney, C., ... & Wilkinson, J. (2020). School autonomy, marketisation and social justice: the plight of principals and schools. Journal of Educational Administration and History, 1-16.*
28. *Kim, J., Field, T., & Hassel, B. C. (2019). Autonomous District Schools: A New Path to Growing High-Quality, Innovative Public Schools. Public Impact.*
29. *Kim, K. Y., Eisenberger, R., & Baik, K. (2016). Perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment: Moderating influence of perceived organizational competence. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37(4), 558-583.*
30. *Korthagen, F. (2017). Inconvenient truths about teacher learning: Towards professional development 3.0. Teachers and teaching, 23(4), 387-405.*
31. *Maca, M. N. A. (2019) School-based Management in the Philippines: Fostering Innovations in the Public Education System.RSU Research Journal, 2(1), 35-59*
32. *Machin, S., & Sandi, M. (2020). Autonomous schools and strategic pupil exclusion. The Economic Journal, 130(625), 125-159.*
33. *Magulod Jr, G. C. (2017). Factors of school effectiveness and performance of selected public and private elementary schools: Implications on educational planning in the Philippines. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 5(1), 73-83.*
34. *Malinen, O. P., & Savolainen, H. (2016). The effect of perceived school climate and teacher efficacy in behavior management on job satisfaction and burnout: A longitudinal study. Teaching and Teacher Education, 60, 144-152.*
35. *Maxwell, A., & Riley, P. (2017). Emotional demands, emotional labour and occupational outcomes in school principals: Modelling the relationships. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 45(3), 484-502.*
36. *McCormack, B., Baecher, L. H., & Cuenca, A. (2019). University-Based Teacher Supervisors: Their Voices, Their Dilemmas. Journal of Educational Supervision, 2(1), 22-37.*
37. *McDaniel, M. A., & Einstein, G. O. (2020). Training learning strategies to promote self-regulation and transfer: the knowledge, belief, commitment, and planning framework. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1745691620920723.*
38. *McPherson, C. (2020). 'It's just so much better than school': the redemptive qualities of further education and youth work for working-class young people in Edinburgh, Scotland. Journal of Youth Studies, 23(3), 307-322.*
39. *Moneva, J. C., Acibar, L. B., DepEd, C. C., & Monding, N. O. (2020). Class Size and Students' Anxiety in Oral Recitation. anxiety, 7(2).*
40. *Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. J., Morrison, J. R., & Kalman, H. K. (2019). Designing effective instruction. John Wiley & Sons.*

41. *Nir, A. E., & Miran, M. (2006). The equity consequences of school-based management. International Journal of Educational Management.*
42. *Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2017). Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.*
43. *Orazbayeva, K. O. (2016). Professional Competence of Teachers in the Age of Globalization. International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 11(9), 2659-2672.*
44. *Owan, V. J., & Ekpe, M. B. (2019). Disciplinary management in public primary schools and teachers' job effectiveness in Yakurr Local Government Area, Cross River State, Nigeria. World Journal of Vocational Education and Training, 1(1), 1-10.*
45. *Pañares, A. A., & Cabangon, M. G. S. (2016). Drama-in-schools in the Philippines. Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance, 21(1), 13-16.*
46. *Panela, T. L. (2022a). Teachers Tackling the Trials of Techno dependence (T4): How College Teachers Find Balance During Pandemic Transition. Innovations, 69.*
47. *Panela, T. L. (2022b). Nerfing and Navigating in the New Normal (N4): The Lived Experiences of Teachers Conducting Action Research During the Covid-19 Pandemic. Innovations, 69.*
48. *Patterson-Davis, L. M. (2020). Systemic Thinking in Educational Leadership: To What Extent Do Educational Leaders Demonstrate Systemic Thinking and Transformational Leadership Behaviors? (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University. Libraries).*
49. *Pitzer, J., & Skinner, E. (2017). Predictors of changes in students' motivational resilience over the school year: The roles of teacher support, self-appraisals, and emotional reactivity. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 41(1), 15-29.*
50. *Põder, K., Lauri, T., & Veski, A. (2017). Does school admission by Zoning affect educational inequality? A study of family background effect in Estonia, Finland, and Sweden. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 61(6), 668-688.*
51. *Scharf, M. (2020). Do Modern Orthodox Jewish Adolescents' Relationships with Parents, Teachers, and Gd Impact the Likelihood of Adopting a Growth Mindset? (Doctoral dissertation, New York, NY: Azrieli Graduate School of Jewish Education & Administration. Yeshiva University.).*
52. *Scheerens, J. (2016). Educational effectiveness and ineffectiveness. A critical review of the knowledge base, 389.*
53. *Scheerens, J. (2016). Theories on educational effectiveness and ineffectiveness. InEducational effectiveness and ineffectiveness (pp. 259-289). Springer, Dordrecht.*
54. *Seedaeng, W. & Rattanasiraprapha, N. (2019). School-Based Management of Huaykrajaopittyakom School Under the Secondary Educational Service Area Office 8.*
55. *Shen, J., Wu, H., Reeves, P., Zheng, Y., Ryan, L., & Anderson, D. (2020). The association between teacher leadership and student achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 100357.*
56. *Starks, D. (2020). Classroom to classroom: how many do you see? the lack of african american teachers in K-12 public schools and how to address this issue through diverse curriculum development in teacher education programs.*
57. *Tobia, V., Greco, A., Steca, P., & Marzocchi, G. M. (2019). Children's wellbeing at school: a multi-dimensional and multi-informant approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 20(3), 841-861.*
58. *Tshiunza, C. L. (2018). Theoretical Analysis on School-Based Management: Towards the Geographical Approach Analysis of the Reforms, Challenges and Perspectives. American Journal of Educational Science, 4(3), 41-56.*
59. *Twining, P., Butler, D., Fisser, P., Leahy, M., Shelton, C., Forget-Dubois, N., & Lacasse, M. (2020). Developing a quality curriculum in a technological era. Educational Technology Research and Development, 1-24.*

60. *Wahlström, N., & Sundberg, D. (Eds.). (2017). Transnational curriculum standards and classroom practices: The new meaning of teaching. Routledge.*
61. *Wang, F., Pollock, K. E., & Hauseman, C. (2018). School principals' job satisfaction: The effects of work intensification. Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 185, 73.*
62. *Wang, Y., & Lu, H. (2020). Validating items of different modalities to assess the educational technology competency of pre-service teachers. Computers & Education, 104081.*
63. *You, Y., & Morris, P. (2016). Imagining school autonomy in high-performing education systems: East Asia as a source of policy referencing in England. Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 46(6), 882-905.*
64. *Yusuf, H. A., Amzat, I. H., & Bint Saidin, K. (2019). The Mediating Effect of School-Based Management on School Climate, Bureaucracy and Effectiveness in Secondary School. Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management, 7(3), 19-42.*
65. *Zhang, F., Stritch, J. M., & Welch, E. W. (2020). Tension in democratic administration: Does managerial confidence in administrative capacity reduce citizen participation in organizational decision-making? Public Administration.*

Corresponding Email; ***leobert.mante@ssu.edu.ph***