



RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PREPONDERANT INFLUENCE OF SCHOOL HEADS AND SCHOOL INTERPERSONAL DYNAMICS

REY R. AMATOSA, LPT, MAED

Teacher I

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the relationship between preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics. This study utilized the non-experimental quantitative research design using descriptive technique involving teachers in Sarangani District of Davao Occidental Division, Philippines. The study was conducted on the second semester of School Year 2022-2023. Research instruments on preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics were used as source of data. Using mean and pearson-r as statistical tools to treat the data, the study showed the following results: the level of preponderant influence of school heads dynamics is very high, the level of school interpersonal dynamics is very high, there is a significance on the relationship between preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics.

Keywords: *Preponderant Influence of School Heads and School Interpersonal Dynamics, School Administration and Supervision, Quantitative Research, Philippines*

1. INTRODUCTION

A toxic school culture is one in which instructors lack the freedom to make decisions that are best for them and the entire school community, and there is a high degree of stress and anxiety. Students may feel uneasy, perplexed, unsupported, and scared to make mistakes in poor learning situations. Students are not compelled by this setting to become more resilient or to work harder. Instead, they are more likely to pass judgment on the course or themselves, lose motivation, or even give up (Yousef, 2016).

In the Philippines, some schools are in a toxic school environment, where teacher relations are often in conflict and the teachers do not believe in the ability of other teachers and a generally in the negative attitude. Many of schools today have factions and teachers have problems on work relations with other teachers. In one of the schools in the Philippines, problems on school interpersonal dynamics are highly evident in the conflict among school heads and teachers (Bueno, 2019).

In a desirable school interpersonal dynamic, the preponderant influence of school heads plays an indispensable role in effectiveness of the institution, right from the setting of goals to accomplishment of goals. In absence of leadership goal accomplishment and school effectiveness is never guaranteed. The role of principal is often crucial to their success. The principal is challenged to create the culture of quality that penetrates to the smallest elements, processes and the systems of an institution. It is common experience that under the same set of rules and regulations, with same set of teaching staff and students from similar background, an educational institution degenerates or maintains status quo, or rises to prominence with a change of principal (Monsanto, 2016).

The conceptual framework of the study is shown in Figure 1. The independent variable of this study is preponderant influence of school heads by Goldring, et al (2009) which indicators include the following: *high standards for student learning* which refers to principal's effort in achieving desirable learning outcome of the students; *rigorous curriculum* refers to the content or the competencies in the curriculum which are carefully chosen so for students' advancement.

Quality instruction refers to standardization of pedagogical practices of teachers that are designed to advance students; *culture of learning and professional behavior* refers to the school's learning environment that stimulates learning; *connections to external communities* refers to principal's strategies in strengthening school-community partnerships; and *performance accountability* refers to producing outstanding performance.

The dependent variable of this study is school interpersonal dynamics by Mitchell (2008) indicators are: *collaborative leadership* that refers to manifesting leadership by collaboration; *teacher collaboration* refers to teachers' participation in doing different instructional tasks with other teachers; *professional development* which refers to teachers participation in various trainings for professional growth; *collegial support* is the assistance extended by colleagues; *unity of purpose* which refers to the support to goals; *learning partnership* which refers to collaborative effort of planning activities for students to achieve optimum learning.

The study is anchored on Social exchange theory proposed by Homans (1958). One of the most well-known theoretical viewpoints in management as well as related disciplines like sociology and social psychology is social exchange theory. A relationship between two people is developed through a process of cost-benefit analysis, according to the social exchange hypothesis. In other words, it's a statistic created to assess the level of commitment made by a person in a person-to-person connection.

This study aimed to find out the significance of the relationship between the preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics.

This study is aimed to determine the relationship between the preponderant influence of the school heads to school interpersonal dynamics. For preponderant influence of school heads, it will cover only the indicators on standards for student learning, rigorous curriculum, quality instruction, culture of learning and professional behavior, connections to external communities, and performance accountability. For school interpersonal dynamics, collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, professional development, collegial support, unity of purpose, and learning partnership.

The study is implemented in some public schools in Davao Occidental Division within the second semester of the School Year 2022-2023.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed non-experimental quantitative research design utilizing correlational technique. A substantial proportion of quantitative educational research is non-experimental because many important variables of interest are not manipulable. Because non-experimental research is an important methodology employed by many researchers, it is essential to use a classification system of non-experimental methods highly descriptive of what we do, and which also allows us to communicate effectively in an interdisciplinary research environment.

Correlational research designs evaluate the nature and degree of association between two naturally occurring variables (Johnson, 2012). This study will find out the significance of the relationship between preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics.

The research sample included only those teachers who have permanent positions. They must also have teaching experience for the public school for at least five years. The substitute teachers and those holding Learning Support Aid positions are excluded in the sample of the research. Likewise, this study is conducted only in one district of Davao Occidental Division and at least have more than a hundred teachers as sample.

This study utilized purposive sampling in determining the sample of this study. Only those teachers who manifested their willingness to participate in the research were included in the study. These teachers signed the Informed Consent to show their voluntary participation in the study.

This study utilized adopted questionnaire. The indicators for preponderant influence of school heads were taken from Goldring, et al (2009) which indicators include the

following: high standards for student learning, rigorous curriculum, quality instruction, culture of learning and professional behavior, connections to external communities and performance accountability.

This five-point Likert Scale was used in determining the preponderant influence of school heads in this study.

The indicators of school interpersonal dynamics were taken from Mitchell (2008) which include collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, professional development, collegial support, unity of purpose, and learning partnership.

The five-point Likert Scale below was used in the assessment of school interpersonal dynamics.

The researcher simplified and contextualized the questionnaires without losing the original content. The first draft of the contextualized version of the instruments was submitted to the research adviser for comments and recommendations to improve its presentation. The final copies were submitted to the panel of experts for approval.

Final revision of questionnaire was made by incorporating the corrections, comments and suggestions given by the expert validators. The validators rated the survey questionnaires with a rating of 4.10 with a descriptive equivalent as good.

The following steps were undertaken in the gathering of data for this study. First the researcher asked permission from the Superintendent. After the request was granted, the researcher also sent a letter to the district supervisor indicating the intention to conduct the study in the district. The researcher attached the letter of approval from the division superintendent. The same letter of request was also sent to the school heads.

The school allowed the researcher to gather data for the research during the activity period in the afternoon. This was a big challenge for the researcher because the travel going to schools requires enough time. The need to orient the respondents on the nature of the study is also essential to ensure that they have understood the purpose of the research so that they will religiously respond to the questionnaire with the best of their ability.

As soon as the researcher got into the school, he went to the office of the school head and showed the letter of approval and endorsement from the superintendent and from the district supervisor. After which, the researcher met the teachers and the school head and gave them a brief orientation on how they will respond to the questions in the questionnaire. As soon as the respondents were able to complete answering the questionnaire, the researcher collected them and tallied the responses. Interpretation followed the statistician handed the data.

The following statistical tools were used in the analysis of data. Mean. This was used to determine the level of preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics. Pearson r. This was used to determine the significance of relationship between preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal (

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The standard deviation in the descriptive tables, Table 1 and Table 2, ranged from 0.30 to 0.40 which are less than 1.0 as the typical standard deviation for a 5-point Likert Scale. This means that the ratings in the accomplished questionnaires were close to the mean, indicating consistency of responses among the respondents (Wittink and Bayer, 1994).

Level of Preponderant Influence of School Heads in terms of High Standards for Student Learning

Presented in Table 1.1 is the level of preponderant influence of school heads in terms of high standards for student learning with a mean score of 4.38 or very high. To begin with, public school teachers perceived that their administrators manifested very highly in terms of high standards for student learning, which is evident in the administrators' efforts of promoting recognition and rewards for students who achieve high standards of academic learning, encouraging student to successfully achieve rigorous goals for student learning,

implementing activities and procedures to meet high standards for student learning, communicating with families and the community about goals for rigorous student learning and creating conditions that help faculty and students reach ambitious learning targets.

Such finding is corollary to the study of Hehir (2005), who quoted that establishing high standards lets everyone in the education system know what to aim for. It allows every student, every parent, and every teacher to share in common expectations of what students should know and be able to accomplish. Students will learn more when more is expected of them, in school and at home.

Additionally, several authors claimed to the same standpoint of Hehir (2005), adding that standards will help create coherence in educational practices by aligning teacher education, instructional materials, and assessment practices (Kelly, McCain, and Jukes, 2009; Martin, 2006; Mangan and Stephen, 2007).

Level of Preponderant Influence of School Heads in terms of Rigorous Curriculum

Presented in Table 1.2 is the level of preponderant influence of school heads in terms of rigorous curriculum with a mean score of 4.35 or very high. The result of this mean score is taken from the indicators which are as follow: supports participation in professional development that deepens teachers' understanding of a rigorous curriculum, communicates regularly with teachers about a rigorous curriculum, advocates rigorous curriculum that honors the diversity of students and their families, provides opportunities for teachers to work together to deliver a rigorous curriculum, uses disaggregated student achievement data to monitor the rigor of all curriculum programs.

More so, public school teachers rated their principals very high on the latter's efforts of establishing rigorous curriculum, which are manifested by a principal supporting participation in professional development that deepens teachers' understanding of a rigorous curriculum, communicating regularly with teachers about a rigorous curriculum, providing opportunities for teachers to work together to deliver a rigorous curriculum advocating rigorous curriculum that honors the diversity of students and their families and using disaggregated student achievement data to monitor the rigor of all curriculum programs. to reach their potential. In addition, the academic intensity of the student's high school curriculum still counts more than anything else in providing momentum toward completing a bachelor's degree. In parallel, exposure to a rigorous curriculum is a better predictor of academic success in college than such variables as the education level of parents, test scores, class rank, or family background. Offering rigorous and relevant curriculum and instruction includes high academic expectations, curriculum that connects to students' lives, cultures, and communities, career and technical education, partnerships with higher education, interdisciplinary courses, and project- and community-based learning (Haigh, 2005; Hyman and Hu, 2005; Lavoie, 2006).

Level of Preponderant Influence of School Heads in terms of Quality Instruction

Presented in Table 1.3 is the level of preponderant influence of school heads in terms of quality instruction with a mean score of 4.36 or very high. The mean score is taken from the indicators taken from the questionnaire which are the following: plans opportunities for teachers to improve their instruction through observing each other's instructional practices, coordinates efforts to improve instruction in all classes, supports teachers in protecting instructional time in their classes, communicates with faculty about removing barriers that prevent students from experiencing quality instruction, and advocates additional instructional opportunities for students most in need.

The result of this study is aligned with the statement of Allen, Witt and Wheelless, 2006; Morreale, Hugenberg and Worley, 2006; Hervey, (2006) who pointed out that the quality instruction elevates the importance of teacher quality. Similarly, various authors espoused agreement with the abovementioned context, furthering that to achieve quality instruction, teachers must know the content of what they are going to teach and know it well. Teachers should be experts if they are to impart their knowledge effectively to a broad range

of students with different ability levels and learning styles. Regardless of how and what to teach, teachers must have a full understanding of what it is that students are to learn.

Level of Preponderant Influence of School Heads in terms of Culture of Learning and Professional Behavior

Presented in Table 1.4 is the level of preponderant influence of school heads in terms of culture of learning and professional behavior with a mean score of 4.34 or very high.

The mean score was derived from the strands of the indicators which are the following: plans for a positive environment in which student learning is the central focus, implements a learning environment in which all students are known and cared for, encourages teachers to learn from their most effective colleagues advocates rules and consequences for behavior that are fair to all students, and communicates with parents about the aspects of a positive school culture.

The result of the study is akin to the study of Boote and Beile, 2005; Barth, 2006; Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006) who emphasized that collaborative learning can allow every student to feel like a contributor to the lesson and can spark a unified culture for learning. In addition, several authors also posited parallel ideas with the two authors, portending that principals creating a culture for learning can spark a greater appreciation for knowledge and motivate students to participate in the classroom and in extracurricular learning activities both inside and outside of school. Regularly including fun activities that introduce new ideas and fascinating facts during class can prompt students to think innovatively and explore their interests with greater fervor

Level of Preponderant Influence of School Heads in terms of Performance Accountability

Presented in Table 1.5 is the level of preponderant influence of school heads in terms of performance accountability with a mean score of 4.32 or very high. The mean score was derived from the strands of the indicators which are the following: develops a plan to hold teachers accountable for student academic and social learning, provides expertise to make decisions about holding students accountable for their learning, implements social and academic accountability equitably for all students, advocates that the faculty is accountable for meeting the needs of diverse students, and uses student achievement data to determine faculty accountability for student learning.

The result of this study is in consonance with the statement of (ellamy, Fulmer and Muth, 2007; Klinger, DeLuca and Miller, 2008; Reitzug, West and Angel, (2008) who stressed that in an equal length, principals were perceived by public school teachers to be very highly performing in terms of ensuring performance accountability. This can be felt by the teachers in the principal's acts of developing a plan to hold teachers accountable for student academic and social learning, implementing social and academic accountability equitably for all students, advocating that the faculty is accountable for meeting the needs of diverse students, using student achievement data to determine faculty accountability for student learning and providing expertise to make decisions about holding students accountable for their learning.

This is aligned with the position of Creighton (2007), who wrote that school principals are and must be held accountable for the success or failure of the campus's performance. If students do not meet academic standards, the fault rests on the principal. Unless principals are blatantly incompetent, they tend to remain in their jobs. Also, in addition to ensuring students' safety, principals are expected to improve student achievement as well, through their program and staffing decisions. Principals see to it that staff members receive adequate training in instructional strategies, and that their staff members are employing best teaching practices in their day-to-day teaching

Summary of the Level of Preponderant Influence of School Heads

Presented in Table 1.6 is the summary of the level of preponderant influence of school heads. Computations revealed an overall mean score of 4. 33, or very high rating,

indicating that the respondents highly agree on the extent of preponderant influence of school heads.

The mean score was derived from the mean scores of 4.41 or very high for high standards for student learning, quality instruction with a mean score of 4.36 or very high, rigorous curriculum with a mean score of 4.35 or very high, culture of learning and professional behavior with a mean score of 4.34 or very high, performance accountability with a mean score of 4.32 or very high.

Teachers perceived that their administrators have very high preponderant influence of school heads, which is manifested in the areas of high standards for student learning, quality instruction, culture of learning and professional behavior, rigorous curriculum, performance accountability, and connections to external communities. communicating with faculty about removing barriers that prevent students from experiencing quality instruction, coordinating efforts to improve instruction in all classes, supporting teachers in protecting instructional time in their classes, planning opportunities for teachers to improve their instruction through observing each other's instructional practices and advocating additional instructional opportunities for students most in need. This is parallel with the pronouncements of Donovan and Bransford (2005), who verbalized that to ensure that every student will acquire basic life skills, schools need to provide high quality instruction, balanced assessment and collaboration reflective of culturally responsive practices.

Level of School Interpersonal Dynamics in terms of Collaborative Leadership

Presented in Table 2.1 is the level of school interpersonal dynamics in terms of collaborative leadership with a mean score of 4.33 or very high. The mean score is taken from the strands of the indicator which are as follow: School principal values teachers' ideas, school principal trusts the professional judgments of teachers, school principal takes time to praise teachers that perform well, teachers are involved in the decision-making process, and leaders in our school facilitate teachers working together.

A very high rating was also seen on the teachers' collaborative leadership. This involves valuing other teachers' ideas, soliciting ideas from other teachers, involving other teachers in the decision-making process, taking time to praise other teachers that perform well and trusting the professional judgments of other teachers.

In a similar finding, Morehouse and Tranquilla (2005) averred that a collaborative school culture with shared leadership and professional networking holds the best prospects for the development of teacher' knowledge and beliefs. Teacher collaboration can be enhanced by learning about the concept of school culture, collecting data to assess your school culture, creating structures and opportunities for collaboration and rewarding teachers that collaborate. Likewise, collaborative leadership is vital for sustaining a healthy school culture because of the positive influence of distributed leadership among participants. Consensus and commitment to school vision were developed through leadership practices such as communication, leader credibility and the involvement of the school community in collaborative processes (Amatea and Clark, 2005; Dollarhide, Smith and Lemberger, 2007; Kirchner and Setchfield, 2005).

Level of School Interpersonal Dynamics in terms Teacher Collaboration

Presented in Table 2.2 is the level of school interpersonal dynamics in terms teacher collaboration with a mean score of 4. 23 or very high. The overall rating was taken from the strands of the indicators which are the following: teachers utilize professional networks to obtain information and resources for classroom instruction, teachers trust each other, teachers spend considerable time planning together, teachers' ideas are valued by other teachers, and teachers work cooperatively in groups.

Teacher collaboration was found to be very highly evident among public school teachers. This is seen by teachers valuing other teachers' ideas, utilizing professional networks to obtain information and resources for classroom instruction, working

cooperatively in groups, spending considerable time planning together, and trusting each other puts an indication of being high level.

This is corollary to the meta-analysis of Herrenkohl and Mertl (2007), who stated that teacher collaboration, in the sense that teachers collaborate, exchange ideas and develop tight collegial connections, is also one of the more important components of school culture, building professional communities and leading to school learning in the long run. Ideally, teachers throughout a school will work collectively and collaboratively, engaging in such activities as mutual classroom observations, lesson modeling, grade-level and team planning, and evaluation and assessment of teaching practices (Duckworth, 2005; Chan and Pang, 2006; Michaels, Shouse and Schweingruber, 2008).

Level of School Interpersonal Dynamics in terms Professional Development

Presented in Table 2.3 is the level of school interpersonal dynamics in terms professional development with a mean score of 4.28 or very high.

The rating was taken from the strands of the indicators which are the following: teachers regularly seek ideas from seminars and other colleagues, teachers take time to observe each other teaching, professional development is valued by the faculty, teachers are encouraged to attend in-service training, and teachers are required to conduct action research. Professional development among schools was also seen by public school teachers to be very highly evident, with the schools' efforts of encouraging teachers to attend in-service training, valuing professional development, regularly seeking ideas from seminars and other colleagues, taking time to observe each other teaching and being required to conduct action research.

This is of the same vein with the pronouncements of Strawhecker (2005) who affirmed that professional development is an important influence on teacher practice which has become an essential aspect of improved teaching. The result of professional development is that teachers are working together, which is considered an important characteristic of a successful school. With the same disposition, several authors espoused that facilitating student growth and development is the ultimate purpose of professional development.

Level of School Interpersonal Dynamics in terms Collegial Support

Presented in Table 2.4 is the level of school interpersonal dynamics in terms collegial support with an overall mean of 4.33 or very high. The overall rating was taken from the strands of the indicators which are the following: teachers support the mission of the school, teachers are willing to help out whenever there is a problem, teachers help each other in varied school activities, teachers extend assistance to other teachers in developing instructional materials, and teachers share each other's' learning material.

Among the six elements, teachers perceived that collegial support in their school is very high. They manifested that they always see in their school and its activities supporting the mission of the school, helping each other in varied school activities, sharing each other's learning material, willing to extend support whenever there is a problem and extending assistance to other teachers in developing instructional materials.

Level of School Interpersonal Dynamics in terms Unity of Purpose

Presented in Table 2.5 is the level of school interpersonal dynamics in terms unity of purpose with an overall mean of 4.33 or very high. the overall rating was taken from the strands of the indicators which are the following: teachers have opportunities for dialogue and planning, teachers and parents have common expectations for student, the school mission provides a clear sense of direction, teachers understand the mission of the school, and teachers are kept informed on current issues in the school.

The teachers perceived very highly on their school interpersonal dynamics This was indicative of the school's ability to perform very highly in the areas of collegial support, learning partnership, unity of purpose, collaborative leadership, professional development, and teacher collaboration.

Level of School Interpersonal Dynamics in terms Learning Partnership

Presented in Table 2.6 is the school interpersonal dynamics in terms learning partnership with an overall mean of 4.41 or very high. the overall rating was taken from the strands of the indicators which are the following: parents constantly attends homeroom meeting and support school activities that promote students' academic progress, teachers and parents communicate frequently about student's progress, parents help teachers develop a plan for school/community relations that revolves around the academic mission, teachers implement programs to help parents assist their children to be successful in school, and teachers and parents plan activities to engage families in student learning.

Also, learning partnership among schools was perceived by public school teachers to be very highly evident. This means that the school encourages and does activities which include constantly attending homeroom meeting and support school activities that promote students' academic progress together with the parents, communicating with the parents frequently about student's progress, developing a plan together with parents for school/community relations that revolves around the academic mission, assisting children's parents to be successful in school and planning activities to engage families in student learning together with parents.

Summary of Level of School Interpersonal Dynamics

Presented in Table 2.7 are the ratings of teachers on their school interpersonal dynamics. Computations revealed an overall mean score of 4.31 or very high. The overall mean score was taken from the indicators which have a very high rating which included learning partnership with a mean score of 4.41, unity of purpose had a mean score of 4.38 or very high, collegial support with a mean score of 4.35 or very high, professional development had a mean score of 4.28 or very high, collaborative leadership with a mean score of 4.25, and teacher collaboration with a mean score of 4.23 or very high.

This is analogous to the verbalizations of Hicks (2006), which delineated unity of purpose as a degree to which teachers collectively focus on the common visions and objectives of the school. The vision of the school should mirror the hope, benefit, needs, values, and dreams of all stakeholders and teachers realize, support, and execute their duties in harmony with the visions of the school. Unity of purpose provides the school with sense of direction and it is a key to success. It can be illustrated by school's approach to collaborative working condition and its stipulation of prospects for combined planning and teaching (Duschl and Heidi, 2007; Grierson and Woloshyn, 2005 Marshall and Rossman, 2011).

Correlation between Preponderant Influence of School Heads and School Interpersonal Dynamics

Displayed in Table 3 are the results of relationship between preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics. By doing an in- depth analysis, it could be gleaned that the overall mean scores of preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics revealed a computed r-value of 0.719 with a probability value of 0.000 which is significant at the 0.05 level. This implies that the higher the preponderant influence of school heads, the higher is the school interpersonal dynamics. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics was rejected.

Principal leadership and school culture are positive and significantly related, which implies that the higher the principal leadership, the higher is the school culture. This of the same core to the findings of Moos (2012) who averred that favorable leadership styles of principals positively influence school culture, but negatively-perceived leadership style thaws

school culture. A positive school culture is a result of a strong and encouraged interactions that teachers and administrators have with students that help them shape their attitudes and beliefs.

4. MAJOR FINDINGS

The level of preponderant influence of school heads has a mean score of 4.33 or very high and the level of school interpersonal dynamics obtained a mean score of 4.31 or very high. Based on the correlation analysis between preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics, it the computed r-value of 0.719 with a probability value of 0.000 which is significant at the 0.05 level.

5. CONCLUSION

With considerations on the findings of the study, conclusions are drawn in this section. The study found to exhibit a very high level of preponderant influence of school heads is very high. This means that the provisions relating to preponderant influence of school heads is embodied in the item is always manifested.

The study found to exhibit a very high level of school interpersonal dynamics. This indicates that the provisions relating to school interpersonal dynamics are embodied in the item is always manifested.

The results of the study also confirm that there is a significant relationship between preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics. This implies that the higher the preponderant influence of school heads, the higher is the school interpersonal dynamics. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between preponderant influence of school heads and school interpersonal dynamics was rejected.

The results of this study revealed that the preponderant influence of school heads is very high. The researcher recommends that the school head may continue to implement their leadership practices in order to maintain the very high level. Teachers may also study the school heads in terms of their leadership practices and may apply these practices in the organizations they are affiliated.

The results of this study revealed that the school interpersonal dynamics is very high. The researcher recommends that teachers and school heads may continue to implement their best practices in order to maintain the existing status of school culture. Teachers may also share their best school culture practices to other teachers in order to spread school culture practice in the region.

REFERENCES

- Abawi, L. A., Bauman-Buffone, C., Pineda-Báez, C., & Carter, S. (2018). The rhetoric and reality of leading the inclusive school: Socio-cultural reflections on lived experiences. *Education Sciences*, 8(2), 55.
- Adams, D., Yoon Mooi, A. N., & Muniandy, V. (2020). Principal leadership preparation towards high-performing school leadership in Malaysia. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 9(4), 425-439.
- Agustina, M., Kristiawan, M., & Tobar, T. (2021). The influence of principal's leadership and school's climate on the work productivity of vocational pharmacy teachers in Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Review*, 3(1), 63-76.
- Alazmi, A. A., & Al-Mahdy, Y. F. H. (2022). Principal authentic leadership and teacher engagement in Kuwait's educational reform context. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(3), 392-412.
- Anderson, M. (2017). Transformational leadership in education: A review of existing literature. *International Social Science Review*, 93(1), 1-13.

- Andriani, S., Kesumawati, N., & Kristiawan, M. (2018). The influence of the transformational leadership and work motivation on teachers performance. *International journal of scientific & technology research*, 7(7), 19-29.
- Apple, M. W. (Ed.). (2017). *Cultural and economic reproduction in education: Essays on class, ideology and the state* (Vol. 53). Routledge.
- Ardliana, B., Rusdarti, R., & Suminar, T. (2021). Effect of Principal Leadership, School Culture and Pedagogic Competence Through Work Motivation on Teachers Performance. *Educational Management*, 10(2), 273-283.
- Bagwell, J. L. (2019). Exploring the Leadership Practices of Elementary School Principals through a Distributed Leadership Framework: A Case Study. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 30, 83-103.
- Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2018). *Leverage leadership 2.0: A practical guide to building exceptional schools*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Barth, A., & Benoliel, P. (2019). School Religious-Cultural Attributes and School Principals' Leadership Styles in Israel. *Religious Education*, 114(4), 470-485
- Bartolome, M. T., Mamat, N., & Masnan, A. H. (2017). Parental Involvement in the Philippines: A Review of Literatures. *International Journal of Early Childhood Education and Care*, 6, 41-50.
- Beare, H., Caldwell, B. J., & Millikan, R. H. (2018). *Creating an excellent school: Some new management techniques*. Routledge.
- Berkovich, I. (2018). When the going gets tough: Schools in challenging circumstances and the effectiveness of principals' leadership styles. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 28(5), 348-364.
- Billingsley, B., McLeskey, J., & Crockett, J. B. (2018). Conceptualizing principal leadership for effective inclusive schools. In *Handbook of leadership and administration for special education* (pp. 306-332). Routledge.
- Bluestein, S., & Goldschmidt, P. (2021). Principal effects on academic progress over time and the potential effects of school context and principal leadership practices. *Journal of School Administration Research and Development*, 6(1), 12-23.
- Boudett, K. P., City, E. A., & Murnane, R. J. (Eds.). (2020). *Data wise, revised and expanded edition: A step-by-step guide to using assessment results to improve teaching and learning*. Harvard Education Press.
- Brooks, M. C., & Brooks, J. S. (2019). Culturally (ir) relevant school leadership: Ethno-religious conflict and school administration in the Philippines. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 22(1), 6-29
- Bueno, D. C. (2019). Twenty-first Century Instructional Leadership Skills vis-à-vis School Culture in the Division of Zambales, Philippines. In *Asian Conference on Multidisciplinary Research in Higher Education (ACMRHE 2015)*, Manila, Philippines.
- Bush, T., Abdul Hamid, S., Ng, A., & Kaparou, M. (2018). School leadership theories and the Malaysia education blueprint: Findings from a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(7), 1245-1265.
- Cansoy, R. (2019). The Relationship between School Principals' Leadership Behaviours and Teachers' Job Satisfaction: A Systematic Review. *International Education Studies*, 12(1), 37-52.
- Chandolia, E., & Anastasiou, S. (2020). Leadership and conflict management style are associated with the effectiveness of school conflict management in the Region of Epirus, NW Greece. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 10(1), 455-468.

- Clark, C., Dyson, A., & Millward, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Towards inclusive schools?* (Vol. 6). Routledge.
- Collie, R. J. (2021). COVID-19 and teachers' somatic burden, stress, and emotional exhaustion: Examining the role of principal leadership and workplace buoyancy. *Aera Open*, 7, 2332858420986187.
- Cuaresma-Escobar, K. J. (2021). Nailing the situational leadership theory by synthesizing the culture and nature of principals' leadership and roles in school. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 319-328.
- Dadds, M. (2020). *Passionate enquiry and school development: A story about teacher action research*. Routledge.
- Dash, S. S., & Vohra, N. (2019). The leadership of the school principal: Impact on teachers' job crafting, alienation and commitment. *Management Research Review*, 42(3), 352-369.
- Day, C., Sammons, P., & Gorgen, K. (2020). *Successful School Leadership*. Education development trust.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C., & Trueba, H. (2022). *Crossing cultural borders: Education for immigrant families in America* (Vol. 6). Taylor & Francis.
- Dernowska, U. (2017). Teacher and student perceptions of school climate. Some conclusions from school culture and climate research. *Journal of Modern science*, 32(1), 63-82.
- Donohoo, J., Hattie, J., & Eells, R. (2018). The power of collective efficacy. *Educational Leadership*, 75(6), 40-44.
- 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.
- Evans, K., & Furlong, A. (2019). Metaphors of youth transitions: niches, pathways, trajectories or navigations. In *Youth, citizenship and social change in a European context* (pp. 17-41). Routledge.
- Everhart, R. B. (2022). *Reading, writing and resistance: Adolescence and labor in a junior high school*. Taylor & Francis.
- Evertson, D. W. (2020). *The Influence of Principal Leadership on Teacher Collaboration: Does Effective Professional Development Mediate This Effect?* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln).
- Fatah, R. A., & Komariah, A. (2020, February). Principal Leadership for Private Schools Improvement in the Industrial Revolution Era 4.0. In *3rd International Conference on Research of Educational Administration and Management (ICREAM 2019)* (pp. 122-125). Atlantis Press.
- Fudiyah, U. N., & Harapan, E. (2021, July). Work Discipline and Principal Leadership in Influencing Teachers' Performance. In *International Conference on Education Universitas PGRI Palembang (INCoEPP 2021)* (pp. 839-843). Atlantis Press.