

School Heads' Micro Politics Abilities, Shared Leadership, Capacity Building Skills and School Performance

Rob H. Masalon

Geraldine D. Rodriguez, EdD

Johnny S. Bantulo, EdD

Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Colleges, Graduate School

General Santos City, Philippines

Abstract: This prediction correlation study determined the significant relationship between micropolitics abilities, shared leadership skills, school capacity building skills, and performance of school heads of Alabel 4 District, Alabel, Sarangani Province during the school year 2020-2021. Data were gathered through survey questionnaires from 13 school heads and 125 teachers- respondents chosen via stratified proportional sampling. Slovin's formula was employed to determine the sample size. Data were treated with weighted average mean and Multiple Regression Analysis. Significant relationships were found between micropolitics abilities, shared leadership skills, school capacity building skills and the performance of school heads. School heads have a high level of micropolitics abilities, shared leadership skills, school capacity building skills. They have a very satisfactory level of performance.

Keywords: *educational management, school head, micro politics, shared leadership, capacity, building skills, school performance, Philippines*

1. INTRODUCTION

Great leaders make outstanding schools. The most successful leaders create a school climate of high achievement and continuous improvement, give teachers a voice in decision-making, use data to drive curriculum and instruction, and assure students and parents that everyone focuses on student success. According to DepEd Order No. 42 s. 2017, school heads play a crucial role in ensuring an enabling and supportive environment for effective teaching and learning. Teacher quality is vital in raising learner achievement. However, teachers alone cannot bring substantive changes without effective and shared leadership from the school heads. The quality of the system of education in the Philippines depends on its teachers. The quality of teachers also depends on the skills of the school heads. Moreover, school leaders face the challenge of building capacity in schools that need attention and collaborative processes that should foster and develop to enable the schools to grow more vital

in achieving the vision and mission. Many schools are not in progress with the school heads' effort solely; they need the whole school system and the teachers to become change agents (Fullan, 2020). The changes brought about by various national and global frameworks such as globalization, ASEAN Integration, the K to 12 Basic Education, and the changing character of 21st-century learners necessitate a call for a study. This study refers to the different leadership skills, capacity-building skills, and micropolitics abilities to improve the school performance of the school heads. Alabel 4 District, as a newly-created district in Alabel, Sarangani Province, recognizes the importance of these skills and abilities and upholds that quality student learning is contingent upon quality teachers, whom quality school leaders support. In Alabel 4 District, 8 or 62% of the school heads got only better on their school performance. This study looked into the relationship between the school heads' micropolitics abilities, shared leadership skills,

school capacity building, and the school performance that they utilize.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study availed the prediction correlation design. It is the appropriate research method because the study's main objective is to determine whether there is a significant relationship among the school heads' micropolitics abilities, shared leadership, school capacity building skills, and school performance in Alabel 4 District, Municipality of Alabel. Since the primary purpose of this research is to investigate whether there is any correlation between the levels of school heads' micropolitics abilities, shared leadership, school capacity building skills, and school performance, the researcher employed a quantitative approach. This research defines the research questions based on trends in the field of the research site. Creswell (2012, p.13) describes and uses the quantitative approach if the researcher wants to identify a research problem based on trends in the field or on the need to explain why something occurs. Creswell further said that describing a movement means that a study can answer the research problem best. The researcher sought to establish the overall tendency of responses from individuals and noted how this tendency varies among people. From the elaboration above, it is evident that the study employed a quantitative approach. This study was conducted in Alabel 4 District, in the Municipality of Alabel, Province of Sarangani. Alabel 4 District is the former Alabel West District and was created last October 15, 2018. The new district comprises of schools located in Barangay Alegria and Barangay Datal Anggas. The schools are Alegria Central Elementary School, Alegria National High School, Pongoleel Integrated School, Pait Integrated School, Talifara Elementary School, Tagaytay Integrated School, Salimama Integrated School, Glamang Elementary School, Datal Anggas Integrated School, Ulo Tubay Elementary School, Ulo Latian Elementary School, Dalid Elementary School, Tinungkaan Primary School and the newly-opened school, Kisoy National High School. The respondents of the study were the public-school teachers and school heads of Alabel 4 District in the Municipality of Alabel, Sarangani Province. Slovin's formula was applied to calculate the desired sample size. Using Slovin's recipe, the researcher can identify the sample size from the population with a desired degree and accuracy (Ellen, 2017). Out of 183 public school teachers, the sample size was one hundred twenty-five (125) and

then stratified proportional sampling was applied. For school heads, thirteen (13) of them were the respondents of this study. The required sample size was determined using Slovin's (1960) formula as follows:

Hence, n = sample size, N = population size
 e = desired margin of error (.05)

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Table 1
Distribution of Respondents

Schools	Population Size Teacher	Proportionate Sample Size-Teacher	Population Size School Head
1. Alegria NHS	35	24	1
2. Alegria CES	33	22	1
3. Pait IS	15	10	1
4. Pongoleel IS	16	11	1
5. Talifara ES	4	3	1
6. Tagaytay IS	18	12	1
7. Salimama IS	12	8	1
8. Glamang ES	5	4	1
9. Datal Anggas IS	32	22	1
10. Ulo Tubay ES	2	1	1
11. Ulo Latian ES	3	2	1
12. Dalid ES	5	4	1
13. Tinungkaan PS	3	2	1
Total	183	125	13

The respondents were the 125 public school teachers and their school heads of Alabel 4 District. It used stratified proportional sampling to determine the sample size. It applied lottery to make the selection of the samples scientific in each school. The research instrument used to gather the data was a survey questionnaire containing three major categories: micropolitics abilities, shared leadership skills of school heads, and capacity-building skills.

Questionnaire on School Heads' Micropolitics

A questionnaire was used to determine the level of micropolitics abilities manifested by the school heads. It was adapted and modified from the study of Cermino (2007). There were twenty-five (25) items listed, and the respondents chose from the options provided: 5 for Very High; which means that school heads impose power or authority manifested at all times, 4 for high; 3 for moderate; 2 for low; and 1 for very low which means that power or authority is never manifested by the school head. Teachers rated the questionnaire. This instrument consists of 5 components, of which every element has five items. The teachers were instructed and guided to check the box according to the column

appropriate to their choice, and no items should be left unanswered.

Questionnaire on School Heads' Shared Leadership

This instrument was designed to gather data regarding the shared leadership of the respondents. It has four components with five items in each element. It was adapted and modified from the study of Cermino (2007). There were twenty (20) items in listing, and in answering each item, the respondents were guided with the options that would determine the level of shared leadership manifested by the respondents. These options are: 5 for very high; which means that the shared leadership skill of school heads is manifested at all times; 4 for high, which means that the shared leadership skill of school heads is displayed oftentimes; 3 for moderate, which means that the shared leadership skill of the school heads is manifested sometimes; 2 for low which means that the shared leadership skill of the school heads is seldom manifested; and 1 for very low which means that shared leadership skill of school heads is never displayed. The teachers were instructed and guided to check the box according to the column appropriate to their choice, and no items should be left unanswered.

Questionnaire on School Capacity Building Skills

This instrument comprises items designed to describe if the level of capacity building of school heads is very highly effective or not practical. It has 20 items divided into four components which have five items on each element. It was adapted and modified from the study of Cermino (2007). As seen on the sample, the questionnaire consists of 4 components: individual teacher quality, professional learning community, program coherence, and technical resources. To answer the twenty (20) items, the respondents chose from the options provided with the choices of: 5 for Very High, which means that the school capacity building skill is manifested at all times; 4 for High, which implies that the school capacity building skill is oftentimes displayed; 3 for moderate which means that the school capacity building skill is moderately displayed 2 for low which means that the school capacity building skill is seldom displayed; and 1 for very low which means that the school capacity building skill is never displayed. The teachers were guided to check the box according to the column appropriate to

their choice, and no items should be left unanswered.

Office Performance Commitment and Review Form

This instrument was used to determine the school performance of the school heads. It is rated outstanding, very satisfactory, satisfactory, fair, and poor.

Table 2

Office Performance Commitment and Review Rating

Score	Range Interval	Adjectival Rating	Descriptive Meaning
5	4.500-5.000	Outstanding	The Performance of employees represents an extraordinary level of achievement regarding quality and time, technical skills and knowledge, ingenuity, creativity, and initiative. They should have demonstrated exceptional job mastery in all areas of responsibility and marked excellence in their achievement and contributions to the organizations.
4	3.500-4.499	Very Satisfactory	The Performance exceeded expectations and achieved all goals, objectives, and targets above established standards.
3	2.500-3.499	Satisfactory	The Employee's performance met the most critical annual goals and expectations regarding quality of work, efficiency, and timeliness.
2	1.500-2.499	Unsatisfactory	The Performance failed to meet one or more of the most goals and expectations.
1	1.000-1.499	Poor	The Performance was consistently below expectations and did not make reasonable progress toward critical goals. Their significant improvement needs in one or more areas.

The survey questionnaire underwent validation by the experts before the researcher used it to gather the responses of the study to ensure its validity and reliability. Expert validators were chosen based on their expertise about the topic and the research methodology of the study. The validators were professors of the Graduate School of Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Colleges. The expert validators validated it based on the following criteria: (1) clarity of direction of indicators; (2) presentation and organization of indicators; (3) suitability of indicators; (4) adequacy of indicators per category; (5) congruency to the purpose; (6) objectivity of the researcher; and (7) appropriateness of scale and evaluation rating system. The said questionnaire obtained a descriptive rating of excellent based on the numerical rating of 4.90. To ensure the reliability of the research instrument, the researcher administered it to fifty-one (51) public

school teachers of three (3) schools of Alabel 1 District, Division of Sarangani, namely: New Canaan Integrated School, Famorcan Elementary school and Banlibato Integrated School. The Reliability test used Cronbach's Alpha Analysis based on the Statistical Package for the Social Science Software. With this, the researcher can trust all the questions on micropolitics abilities, shared leadership skills of school heads, and capacity-building skills. To know the reliability of empirical measurements is with the help of the retest method, in which the same test is given to the same people after a period of time. It estimates the reliability of the test instrument by analyzing the consistency of the responses between the two tests. If the researcher gets similar results on the two administrations of the tool, then the reliability coefficient would be 1.00. The correlation of measurements across time would be much less than perfect due to various experiences and attitudes that the respondents have met from the first test. The retest method is a clear cut-way to determine reliability, but it can be costly and impractical. Researchers are often only capable of obtaining measurements at a single point or without the resources for multiple administrations. The Coefficient Alpha is a very beneficial tool in educational and social science research, because the instruments in these areas often ask the respondents to rate the degree to which they agree or disagree with a statement on a particular scale. It is an internal consistency index designed for use with tests containing items that have no correct answer.

Table 3

Cronbach's Alpha Internal Consistency

Cronbach's Alpha	Internal Consistency
$\alpha \geq 0.9$	Excellent
$0.9 > \alpha \geq 0.8$	Good
$0.8 > \alpha \geq 0.7$	Acceptable
$0.7 > \alpha \geq 0.6$	Questionable
$0.6 > \alpha \geq 0.5$	Poor
$0.5 > \alpha$	Unacceptable

It administers the retest method of the instrument to three different schools of Alabel 1 District, Division of Sarangani, namely New Canaan Integrated School, Famorcan Elementary School, and Banlibato Integrated School. Table 4 shows the result of Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Analysis based on Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) Software.

Table 4
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.915	.915	65

The results show that Cronbach's alpha is excellent for internal consistency: $\alpha = 0.915$. The researcher can trust that all survey questions reliably assess the same construct, level of micropolitics abilities, shared leadership skills of school heads, and capacity-building skills. In conducting this research, the researcher followed the following steps:

Procedure in asking permission to conduct the study. Upon the approval of the title and have found that the instruments are valid and reliable, the researcher sought authorization from the Schools Division Superintendent to conduct the study.

Procedure for Getting the Data. Upon its approval, the researcher personally administered the questionnaires and retrieved them immediately. He gave instructions on how to answer the instrument. The proponent assured that their answers on the questionnaires would be held confidential, and writing their names was optional. After completing the retrieval of the research instruments per school, the researcher tabulated the data. Tabulation is suitable according to the subproblem asked in chapter 1. Data were processed quantitatively to arrive at scientific analysis and interpretation of results. The researcher made sure that the data matrix based on dummy tables suggested by the statistician and adviser used to organize, summarize, and analyze the data on the variables (micropolitics, shared leadership, capacity building, and school performance) differ from one another. The researcher used statistical tools to treat the data gathered. The weighted mean was employed using the formula $\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ to answer the subproblems numbers 1 to 4.

Subproblems 1, 2, 3, and 4 asked for the level of school heads' micropolitics abilities, level of shared leadership skills, level of school capacity building, and school performance, respectively. It used multiple regression to treat subproblem number 5, which determines the significant relationship between school heads' micropolitics, shared leadership skills, level of school capacity building, and school performance. Allen (2017) cited that multiple regression is a statistical analysis procedure that

expands linear regression by including more than one independent variable in an equation to understand their association with a dependent

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The mixed results are presented on the tables on the level of school heads' micropolitics abilities, shared leadership skills, capacity building skills, and the school performance of public-school heads of Alabel District 4.

School Heads' Micropolitics Abilities

This study aimed to determine the level of micropolitics abilities of school heads in Alabel 4 District. As shown in Table 5, the teachers said that often their school heads could activate the potential of every teacher or staff to achieve the school's goal and often explain the school's vision, mission, and objectives. At all times, the school heads established order and consistency to attain harmony among teachers, served and resolved conflict in the school, and enriched better ways of leading to promote school reforms and improve teachers' performance. It means in power, the level of micropolitics abilities of school heads is high. The teachers also said that at all times, their school heads know how to direct and coordinate with the teachers in school and monitored teachers' performance capability. They often offer the best advices and suggestions to arrive at the best possible decisions to be followed in the school, demand attention in implementing the DepEd programs and allow information exchange between them and the teachers. It means the level of influence on micropolitics abilities of school heads is high. In authority, the school heads often assign work to every teacher according to his field of specialization, could make decisions and carry out actions for the good of the school, could select and recommend qualified teachers, could direct teachers in the overall operations of the school, and could gain the willingness and compliance of teachers to the rules and regulations of the school. In authority, the level of micropolitics abilities of the school heads is high. In conflict, the level of micropolitics abilities of school heads is high. Moreover, at all times, the school heads resolve teachers' disputes to ensure the best interest of the students and the school. Often, they monitored teachers' responses to potentially conflicting issues to ensure that all claims were heard and respected. They also provided opportunities for teachers to express opinions to conflicting issues, discuss with teachers and implement solutions to address potentially

variable. Multiple regression is one of several extensions of linear regression and is part of the general linear model statistical family.

conflicting issues, and create processes to resolve teachers' problems or areas of conflict within the school. Furthermore, the school heads established a collaborative work environment that promotes cohesion and cooperation among teachers. Often, they used the teachers' team to make decisions and provided opportunities to develop school policies. They also monitored the implementation and responses to school policies, provided feedback to the teachers for their considerations, forged partnerships with various stakeholders' resources generation and mobilization with teachers, and facilitated the teachers' and other stakeholders' voices to make decisions about school policies. In conflict, the level of micropolitics abilities of the school heads is high. In summary, the average mean on the level of micropolitics abilities of the school heads is 4.36. The result means that the level of micropolitics abilities of the school heads is high.

Table 5
SCHOOL HEADS' MICROPOLITICS ABILITIES

A. Power	Mean	Description	Interpretation
1.)The school head can activate the potential of every teacher or staff to achieve the school's goal.	4.10	Often	High
2.)The school head establishes order and consistency to attain harmony among teachers.	4.50	All times	Very High
3.)The school head serves and resolves conflicts in the school.	4.53	All times	Very High
4.)The school head explains clearly the vision, mission, and goals of the school and how they can be implemented effectively.	4.11	Often	High
5.)The school head enriches better ways of leading to promote school reform and to improve teachers' performance.	4.58	All times	Very High
Mean	4.36	Often	High
B. Influence			
6.)The school head can offer the best advice and suggestions to arrive at the best possible decisions to be followed.	4.20	Often	High
7.)The school head knows how to direct and coordinate teachers in school.	4.63	All times	Very High
8.)The school head	4.52	All times	Very High

monitors teachers' performance capability.			
9.)The school head has the ability to demand attention in the implementation of the DepEd programs.	4.25	Often	High
10.)The school head allows information exchange between him and the teachers.	4.17	Often	High
Mean	4.35	Often	High
C. Authority			
11.)The school head can assign work to every teacher according to his field of specialization.	4.37	Often	High
12.)The school head can make decisions and carry out actions for the good of the school.	4.33	Often	High
13.)The school can select and recommend qualified teachers.	4.34	Often	High
14.)The school head can direct teachers in the overall operations of the school.	4.36	Often	High
15.)The school head can gain the willingness and compliance of teachers to the rules and regulations of the school.	4.40	Often	High
Mean	4.36	Often	High
D. Conflict			
16.)The school head monitors teachers' responses to potentially conflicting issues to ensure that all interests are heard and respected.	4.33	Often	High
17.)The school head resolves teachers' conflicts to ensure the best interest of students and the school.	4.56	All times	Very High
18.)The school head provides opportunities for teachers to express opinions on conflicting issues.	4.25	Often	High
19.)The school head discusses with teachers and implements solutions to address potentially conflicting issues.	4.30	Often	High
20.)The school head creates processes to resolve problems of teachers or areas of conflict within the school.	4.35	Often	High
Mean	4.36	Often	High
E. Collaboration			
21.)The school head uses the teachers' team to make decisions and provides opportunities for them to be involved in developing school policies.	4.37	Often	High
22.)The school head	4.57	All times	Very High

establishes a collaborative work environment that promotes cohesion and cooperation among teachers.			
23.)The school head monitors the implementation and responses to school policies and provides feedback to the teachers for their considerations.	4.30	Often	High
24.)The school head forges a partnership with various stakeholders, resources generation, and mobilization with teachers.	4.22	Often	High
25.)The school head facilitates the teachers' and other stakeholders' voices to make decisions about school policies.	4.37	Often	High
Mean	4.37	Often	High
Average Mean	4.36	Often	High

School Heads' Shared Leadership Skills

This study aimed to determine the level of shared leadership skills of the school heads in Alabel 4 District. As shown in Table 6, the school heads, at all times shared to the teachers in planning on how the work gets done in school and organize school committees to decide how teachers work in school. School heads often organize tasks for the teachers so that the work flows more smoothly in the school, conduct sessions to the teachers about the Vision, Mission and Goals of the school, and provide helpful inputs about the teachers' work-related plans. The mean of 4.38 means that the school heads' shared leadership skills are high in planning and organizing. In problem-solving, the school heads and the teachers at all times diagnose the issues quickly in school. They find and make actions to the solutions of the problems that affect their performance in school, create and innovate what the school needs to meet in school, and manage changes to address priority concerns of the school. Often, the school head and the teacher decide the best course of action when a problem arises in school. The mean of 4.62 signifies that the school heads' shared leadership skills in Alabel 4 are very high. Furthermore, in support and consideration, the school heads often provide support to teachers who needed help, show patience toward other teachers, and listen to complaints and problems of other teachers. At all times, the school heads encourage the teachers to give their best for the learners and treat each other with courtesy and equality.

Moreover, in development and mentoring, the school heads often help in developing the teachers' skills, share in exchanging career-related advice among the teachers, show a positive role model to new teachers, share in helping out with another teacher in learning a new skill, and instruct poor-performing teachers on how to improve their work. The mean of 4.21 means that in development and mentoring, the shared leadership skills are high. In summary, the average mean of the level of shared leadership skills of the school heads is 4.40, which means their level of shared leadership skills is high. Elmore and Pons (2020) supported these findings that sharing leadership skills may have its most significant impact by decreasing teacher isolation and increasing commitment to the school's common good. He defined shared leadership broadly to denote teachers influence over, and their entry in school-wide decisions with school heads. This view of shared leadership denotes an emerging consensus among scholars about the people concerned with enactments of leadership roles; it also distinguishes our approach from scholars who blend the concept of shared leadership with instructional leadership. Furr and Leithwood (2017) also supported that shared leadership skills helped the school heads, teachers, learners, and stakeholders solve the problems and improve functions. As the school heads set the direction, goals and objectives of the school, they ensure that these are understood and embraced by all the stakeholders. Shared leadership skills of school heads should be coupled with knowledge, skills, and attitudes in providing technical assistance on instruction that relates much to curriculum, practice, and performance. They also create a learner-centered environment that ensures access to inclusive, excellent, relevant and liberating education.

Table 6

SCHOOL HEADS' SHARED LEADERSHIP SKILLS

A. Planning and Organizing	Mean	Description	Interpretation
1.)The school head shares in planning with the teachers on how the work gets done in school.	4.61	All times	Very High
2.)The school head leads in organizing tasks for the teachers so that works flow more smoothly in school.	4.33	Often	High
3.)The school head conducts sessions in VMG of the school for the teachers.	4.12	Often	High

4.)The school head shares in providing helpful inputs about teachers' work-related plans.	4.08	Often	High
5.)The school head organizes school committees to decide how to go about the teachers' work in school.	4.78	All times	Very High
Mean	4.38	Oftentimes	High
A. Problem Solving			
6.)The school head, together with the teachers, diagnoses the problems quickly in school.	4.55	All times	Very High
7.)Together with the teachers, the school head decides the best course of action when a problem arises in school.	4.36	Often	High
8.)Together with the teachers, the school head finds and makes an action to solve the problems that affect their performance in school.	4.88	All times	Very High
9.)Together with the teachers, the school head creates and innovates what the school needs to meet.	4.67	All times	Very High
10.)Together with the teachers, the school head manages changes to address the priority concerns of the school.	4.64	All times	Very High
Mean	4.62	All times	Very High
B. Support and Consideration			
11.)The school head provides support to teachers who need help.	4.32	Often	High
12.)The school head shows patience toward other teachers.	4.21	Often	High
13.)The school head encourages teachers to give their best for the pupils.	4.66	All times	Very High
14.)The school head listens to complaints and problems of other teachers	4.20	Often	High
15.)The school head treat each other with courtesy and equality.	4.55	All times	Very High
Mean	4.39	Often	High
D. Development and Mentoring			
		Often	

16.)The school head helps in developing the teachers' skills.	4.09	Often	High
17.)The school head shares in exchanging career-related advice among teachers.	4.35	Often	High
18.)The school head shows a positive role model to new teachers.	4.20	Often	High
19.)The school head shares in helping out with another teacher in learning a new skill	4.08	Often	High
20.)The school head instructs poor-performing teachers on how to improve their work.	4.34	Often	High
Mean	4.21	Often	High
Grand Mean	4.40	Often	High

School Capacity Building Skills

This study aimed to determine the level of school capacity-building skills in Alabel 4 District. As shown in Table 7, in quality of individual teachers, they often write and speak logically and understandably using appropriate grammar and sentence structure, recognize signs of learners' difficulty with the reading and computational processes, and apply proper measures to improve them, use and integrate suitable technology in teaching and learning processes and in managing, evaluating, and improving instruction, collaborate with their pupils' families to increase achievement and use evaluation and other distinguishing approaches to give support to the continuous improvement and acquiring of knowledge and understanding of the learner. The mean of 4.32 means that the capacity building of the school in quality of individual teachers is often manifested, and the level of capacity building of a school in Alabel 4 District is high. Moreover, in the professional learning community, they take responsibility for their professional learning at all times. Often, they learn together with colleagues, engage in team teaching, use performance management to enhance professional education, and experiment and innovate their work in school. The mean of 4.20 means that the school capacity building is often manifested in the professional learning community, and the level of school capacity building is high. Furthermore, in program coherence, the respondents said that effectively, the school management makes a follow up once they start a new program to make sure that it is working; many special programs are helpful in the enrichment of pupils'

talents, and skills in school, curriculum instruction, and learning materials are well-coordinated across the different grade levels of the school. Effectively, the school management has various minimal programs to keep track on them. There is an agreement in curriculum, instruction, and learning materials among teachers in the same grade level. The mean of 4.47 means that the school capacity building of Alabel 4 District is highly effective, and the level of school capacity building is high. Lastly, in technical resources, the respondents said that the school's curriculum often reflects the essential knowledge, skills, and attitudes that their pupils need to be well-prepared for future learning in the world of work. The curriculum anticipates the plans for future needs by reflecting the process and developments in society, such as trends in employment, globalization, and advances in technology. All pupils have the opportunities to use a variety of technologies to support their work on authentic tasks. All technologies are in operable condition and are being used effectively and to the maximum extent. Often, every teacher has allotted time throughout the school year for professional development relating to technology and its integration into the classroom. The mean of 4.17 means that the school's capacity building of Alabel 4 District is often manifested; hence, its capacity building is high. In summary, the average mean of 4.44 signifies that the level of schools' capacity building of Alabel 4 District is high. Ball (2015), Betchell (2015), Burman and Lance (2018) support the findings. They said that the schools need quality teachers who are responsive to the social, cultural, and economic changes affecting students' performance. School heads are responsible for capacitating and strengthening the teacher workforce to promote productive public-school education results. Ford and Parsons (2016) also said that meeting the needs of all students, teachers' expectations are visible. They move them toward the fulfillment of their capability even as they oblige the learners for the highest performance on high-stakes tests that are the primary measure of school success. Technology can assist with some expectations and make teachers and their students more successful. Steiner and Supovitz (2016) stated that the school's capacity-building focuses on learning and teaching; using data to help guide improvement efforts; high-quality professional development embedded within professional learning communities; leadership and community involvement; and external support. They added that building capacity in school also

involves building a well-functioning team of people who work and learn together. The development of a collaborative team supports a particular kind of communication that blends advocacy and inquiry. This kind of communication allows the individuals to engage in collective inquiry and develop a shared understanding about purposes, values, and commitments to generate new directions for professional practice within the school. DepEd Order number 4 series of 2020 also states that the capacity building skills of school heads help in the engagement of the stakeholders in initiatives towards the improvement of school communities. School heads as the main implementer in the schools must be responsible and accountable for inculcating a deeper understanding of the vision, mission and core values of the school to relevant entities.

Table 7
SCHOOL CAPACITY BUILDING SKILLS

A. Quality of Individual Teacher	Mean	Description	Interpretation
1.)The teacher can write and speak logically and understandably using appropriate grammar and sentence structure.	4.35	Agree	High
2.)The teacher can recognize signs of pupils' difficulty with the reading and computational processes and apply appropriate measures to improve them.	4.37	Agree	High
3.)The teacher can use and integrate appropriate technology in teaching and learning processes and manage, evaluate, and improve instruction.	4.35	Agree	High
4.)The teacher can collaborate with pupils' families to increase achievement.	4.36	Agree	High
5.)The teacher can use assessment and other diagnostic strategies to assist the learner's continuous development and acquisition of knowledge and understanding.	4.30	Agree	High
Mean	4.34	Agree	High
B. Professional Learning Community			
6.)The teacher can learn together with colleagues.	4.49	Agree	High
7.)The teacher can take responsibility for professional learning.	4.48	Strongly Agree	Very High
8.)The teacher can engage in team teaching.	4.47	Agree	High
9.)The teacher can use performance management to enhance professional learning.	4.49	Agree	High

10.)The teacher can experiment and innovate work in school.	4.47	Agree	High
Mean	4.48	Agree	High
C. Program Coherence			
11.)The school management makes a follow-up once we start a new program to ensure it is working.	4.43	Agree	High
12.)The school management has different minimal programs that the teacher can keep track of them.	4.58	Strongly Agree	Very High
13.)Many special programs are helpful in the enrichment of pupils' talents and skills in school.	4.32	Agree	High
14.)Curriculum instruction and learning materials are well-coordinated across the different grade levels of the school.	4.45	Agree	High
15.)There is an agreement in curriculum, instruction, and learning materials among teachers in the same grade level.	4.55	All times	Very High
Mean	4.47	Agree	High
D. Technical Resources			
16.)The school's curriculum reflects the essential knowledge, skills, and attitudes that our pupils need to be well-prepared for future learning in the world of work.	4.43	Agree	High
17.)The curriculum anticipates the plans for future needs by considering the changes and developments in society, such as trends in employment, globalization, and advances in technology.	4.47	Agree	High
18.)All pupils have the opportunities to use a variety of technologies to support their work on authentic tasks.	4.49	Agree	High
19.)All technology is in reasonable condition and is being used effectively and to the maximum extent possible.	4.48	Agree	High
20.)Every teacher has allotted time throughout the school year for professional development relating to technology and its integration into the classroom.	4.47	Agree	High
Mean	4.47	Agree	High
Average Mean	4.44	Agree	High

School Performance Level of School Heads

This study also determined the level of school performance of the school heads in Alabel 4 district. Table 8 shows the result based on their office performance commitment and review (OPCR) rating. As shown in Table 6, in key result areas of instructional leadership, they have a very satisfactory grade in accounting for learning outcomes of schools/centers vis-à-vis

goals and targets, providing coaching/mentoring. However, they have an outstanding level in performing instructional supervision to achieve daily learning outcomes. In the second key result area, in the learning environment, they have a very satisfactory level in providing a safe and child-friendly learning environment for learners and practicing fair teaching loads. They observe the teacher-learner ratio to improve teaching-learning performance, practice equitable teaching loads, and keep the teacher-learner balance. Furthermore, human resource management and development are the third key result areas. The school heads have a very satisfactory level in sustaining the conduct of NCBTS TSNA, analyzing the result and designing/implementing, conducting intervention programs to address development needs of the personnel, recommending and facilitating the hiring/promotion/ approved ERF/reclassification of teachers and personnel, providing technical assistance to teachers on matters about the enhancement of classroom management, skills, and instructional competence and non-teaching personnel for support services within the RPMS cycle. At the same time, attending to relevant training/ seminars/and workshops for school heads/school administrators and sending teachers to appropriate training/workshops, they have an outstanding level in organizing and conducting In-Service training. Moreover, parents' involvement and community partnership as the fourth key result areas show that the school heads have a satisfactory grade in generating resources. They have an outstanding level in establishing school, family, and community partnerships for school performance. A few of these are school improvement/ facilities/ equipment from stakeholders and donors within the school year, awarding and recognizing benevolent stakeholders at the end of the school year, and meeting parents and stakeholders regularly to inform about school accomplishment and students' progress. Moreover, school leadership management and operations as the last key result areas show that the school heads have a very satisfactory performance in initiating and in placing the School Improvement Plan. The plan was developed collaboratively by the school's stakeholders and the community, organizing or implementing clear structures and work arrangements that promote shared leadership and governance. It defines the various stakeholders' roles and responsibilities and performs school leadership, management, and operations functions. In summary, the average

mean on the level of school performance of the school heads based on their office performance commitment and review form is 4.38, which describes as a very satisfactory level. It means that their performances exceeded the expectations, and they achieved all goals, objectives, and targets above the established standards. They consistently exhibit mastery in their application of the authority, responsibility, and accountability expected of them as described in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. They model the highest standards of practice in performing their functions as instructional leaders and administrative managers. They empower the wider school community in the implementation of school policies, programs, projects, and activities.

Table 8
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOL HEADS IN LABEL 4
DISTRICT SCHOOL YEAR 2020-2021

Key Result Areas	Objectives	Mean	Adjectival Rating
Instructional Leadership (20%)	a. Accounted for learning outcomes of schools/centers vis-à-vis goals and targets	4.35	Very Satisfactory
	b. Performed instructional supervision to achieve daily learning outcomes.	4.80	Outstanding
	c. Managed the processes and procedures in monitoring student achievement	4.32	Very Satisfactory
	d. Provided coaching/mentoring to improve teaching-learning performance	4.09	Very Satisfactory
Learning Environment (20%)	a. Provided a safe and child-friendly learning environment for learners	4.36	Very Satisfactory
	b. Practiced equitable distribution of teaching loads and observed teacher-learner ratio.	4.08	Very Satisfactory
Human Resource Management and Development (20%)	a. Sustained the conduct of NCBTS TSNA, analyzed result and designed/implemented	4.31	Very Satisfactory
	b. Conducted intervention program to address development needs of personnel	4.12	Very Satisfactory
	c. Organized/conducted In-Service training	4.96	Outstanding
	d. Recommended and facilitated the hiring/promotion/ approved ERF/reclassification of teachers and personnel	4.20	Very Satisfactory
	e. Provided technical assistance to teachers on matters pertaining to the enhancement of classroom management, skills, and instructional competence and to non-teaching personnel for support services within the RPMS cycle	4.67	Outstanding
	f. Attended relevant training/seminars/and workshops for school heads/school administrators and sent teachers to relevant training/workshops for teachers	4.32	Very Satisfactory
Parents Involvement and	a. Established school, family, and community partnership for school performance	4.53	Outstanding
	b. Generated resources for school improvement/facilities/equipment from stakeholders and donors within the school year	4.21	Very Satisfactory

Community Partnership (20%)	c. Awarded and recognized benevolent stakeholders at the end of the school year	4.16	Very Satisfactory
	d. Meet parents and stakeholders regularly to inform them about school accomplishments and students' progress.	4.37	Very Satisfactory
School Leadership Management and Operations (20%)	a. Initiated and has in placed School Improvement Plan developed collaboratively by the stakeholders of the school and the community	4.43	Very Satisfactory
	b. Organized/implemented clear structures and work arrangements that promote shared leadership and governance.	4.45	Very Satisfactory
	c. Performed school leadership, management, and operations functions	4.47	Very Satisfactory
Over-all Mean		4.38	Very Satisfactory

Relationship between Micropolitics Abilities as Predictors of School Performance of School Heads

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine whether the school heads' micropolitics abilities are significantly related as predictors of their performance. Table 9 shows the result. In table 9, multiple linear regression analysis shows a **significant** relationship between the school heads' micropolitics abilities and their school performance. This is shown by the F-value of 9880, whose sig F=.000, since sig F < .05, the relationship is significant. The value of R-square is 0.999, which implies that 99.9 percent of the variation in performance of the school heads is due to their micropolitics abilities, particularly power, influence, authority, conflict, and collaboration. Specifically, power has a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (c=.0257, p=.007) since p<.05. School heads who enrich better ways of promoting school reform and improve teachers' performance tend to obtain higher school performance. Moreover, influence has also a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (c= .3531, p=.006) since p<.05. It means that school heads have the power to influence others to perform better in their workplace. In addition, the authority has a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (c= .410, p=.007). since p<.05. This means that the school heads can make decisions and carry out actions for the school to perform better. The conflict has also a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (c= .396, p=.003). It means that the school heads resolve teachers' disputes to ensure the best interest of students, and the school tends to have a higher performance. Lastly, collaboration has a **significant** relationship to the performance of

the school heads (c= -.1593, p= .027). This means that the school heads that establish a collaborative work environment that promotes cohesion and cooperation among the teachers who have an outstanding performance. This result leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between the school heads' micropolitics abilities as predictors of their school performance.

Table 9
Relationship between School Heads' Micropolitics Abilities and School Performance

Micropolitics Abilities	School Performance			
	Coefficients	t-value	p-value	Remarks
1. Power	0.0257	0.239	.007	Significant
2. Influence	0.3531	3.82	.006	Significant
3. Authority	0.4102	3.76	.007	Significant
4. Conflict	.03965	4.21	.003	Significant
5. Collaboration	-0.01593	-2.78	.02	Significant
Multiple R: 0.99 R-square: 0.99 F-value: 9880 Observations: 13			Sig F: .000	

Relationship between Shared Leadership Skills as Predictors of School Performance of School Heads

To determine whether the school heads' shared leadership skills are significantly related as predictors of their performance, multiple linear regression analysis was used. Table 10 shows the results. In table 10, multiple linear regression analysis shows that there is a **significant** relationship between the school heads' shared leadership skills and their school performance. This is shown by the F-value of 2209, whose sig F=.000, since sig F<.05, the relationship is significant. The value of R-square that is 0.9990, implies that 99.90 percent of the variation in performance of the school heads is due to their shared leadership skills, particularly planning and organizing, problem-solving, support and consideration, and development and mentoring. Specifically, planning and organizing have a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (beta=.386, p=.013) since p<.05. This means that school heads who share plans with the teachers on how the work gets done in school tend to obtain a higher school performance. Moreover, problem-solving has also a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (beta= .595, p= .003). This means that school heads who decide the best course of action when a problem arises in school perform better in their school. In addition, support and consideration have a

significant relationship to the performance of the school heads (beta= .044, p= .005). This means that the school heads who provide support and consideration to teachers who need help tend to perform better. Lastly, development and mentoring have a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (beta= .028, p= .004). This means that the school heads who help develop and mentor the teachers' skills tend to have the best school performance. This result leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between the school heads' shared leadership skills as predictors of their school performance.

Table 10
Relationship between School Heads' Shared Leadership Skills and their Performance

Shared Leadership Skills	School Performance			
	Coefficients	t-value	p-value	Remarks
1. Planning and Organizing	.386	3.159	.013	Significant
2. Problem Solving	.595	4.124	.003	Significant
3. Support and Consideration	.044	.5909	.005	Significant
4. Development and Mentoring	.028	0.785	.004	Significant
Multiple R: 0.9995 R-square: .9990 F-value: 2209				Sig F: .000

Relationship between School Capacity Building as Predictors of School Performance of School Heads

To determine whether the school capacity building is significantly related as a predictor of school performance, multiple linear regression analysis was used. Table 11 also shows the results. In table 11, multiple linear regression analysis shows that there is a **significant** relationship between the school capacity building and school performance. This is shown by the F-value of 19.25, whose sig F=.000, since sig F<.05, the relationship is significant. The value of R-square is 0.9058, which implies that 90.58 percent of the variation in performance of the school heads is due to the school capacity building, particularly, quality of individual teachers, professional learning community, program coherence, and technical resources. The quality of individual teachers has a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (beta=.454, p=.043) since p<.05. This means that teachers' quality teaching that has a measurable impact on students' outcomes tends to obtain a higher school performance. Moreover, the professional

learning community has a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (beta= .105, p= .008). This means that schools with teachers who are engaged in team teaching and use performance management to enhance professional learning perform better. In addition, program coherence has a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (beta= .083, p= .008). This means that if the school's curriculum instruction and learning materials are well-coordinated across the different grade levels of the school, the school heads tend to perform better. Lastly, technical resources have a **significant** relationship to the performance of the school heads (beta= .4652, p= .001). This means that the school curriculum anticipates the plans for the future needs by considering the changes and developments in the society, such as trends in employment, globalization, and advances in technology tend to have the best school performance. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between the school capacity-building as predictors of school performance. This result leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Coppola and John (2016) said that teachers' pedagogical knowledge and skill determine technology's effect on students' access to knowledge. Technology provides teachers with well-developed working theories of student learning to extend the reach and power of these theories; technology enables mediocrity.

Table 11
Relationship between School Capacity Building and School Performance Proposed Training Design

School Capacity Building	School Performance			
	Coefficients	t-value	p-value	Remarks
1. Quality of Individual Teacher	.454	1.93	.043	Significant
2. Professional Learning Community	.105	0.21	.008	Significant
3. Program Coherence	.083	.171	.008	Significant
4. Technical Resources	.465	1.632	.014	Significant
Multiple R: 0.9517 R-square: .9058 F-value: 19.25				Sig F: .000

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were made: [1] The level of the

school heads' micropolitics abilities is high, which means that they have high abilities in imposing power, influence, authority, conflict, and collaboration to teachers, stakeholders, and the school. [2] The level of the school heads' shared leadership skills is high, which means that they have high shared leadership skills in planning and organizing, problem-solving, support and consideration, and development and mentoring.[3] The level of the school's capacity-building skills is high, which means that the school has a high capacity building in terms of quality of individual teachers, professional learning community, program coherence, and technical resources.[4] The level of the school performance of the school heads is described as very satisfactory. It means that their performances exceeded to the expectations and they achieved all goals, objectives, and targets above the established standards. They have demonstrated job mastery in all areas of responsibility to their achievements and contributions to the organizations. They focus on work efforts towards achieving the vision, mission, values, and strategic priorities. [5] School heads with a high level of micropolitics abilities, shared leadership skills, and school capacity-building skills have a better result in their office performance commitment and review rating. It means that the school heads have developed their utmost potentials based on their knowledge, skills, attitudes and enhance their skills to perform better in the department towards achieving higher learning outcomes.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were given: [1] The school heads need more advanced training on influencing or inspiring teachers to follow orders and impose power. [2] Encourage school heads to attend shared leadership seminars, workshops, and team-buildings to uplift team building and collaboration. [3] Inspire school heads to participate in division/district/school capacity building and activities to be informed and oriented about the teachers' induction program to have quality teachers, professional learning community, programs and projects of the school, and the new trends about technology. [4] Motivate school heads to pursue post-graduate and graduate studies to level up their educational attainment and professional growth. [5] The office/division/school may develop programs and interventions to address school

heads who need technical assistance like instructional supervision and school leadership. [6] The department/division/school may conduct regular monitoring and evaluation on the practice of using competency-based standards for assessing school heads' performance, determining school heads' development needs and priorities, selecting new school heads for, and promoting school heads. [7] Further studies on the relationship of levels of school heads' micropolitics abilities, shared leadership skills, school capacity building, and performance of the school heads may be conducted.

REFERENCES

- [1] Allen, K. (2017). *The micropolitics in school settings: From control to Empowerment*. Wiltshire, CA: Redwood Books, Exchange and power in social Life. New York.
- [2] Achinstein, B. (2015). *Conflict amid community: The micropolitics of teacher collaboration*. Teachers College Record, 104(3), 421–455.
- [3] Andre R. & Knapp M. (2018). *Leading for technical learning: Reflective tools for schools district leaders seattle*: WA, Center for Study and Policy.
- [4] Argyris, C., & Smith R. (2015). *A life full of learning*. Organization Studies, v 24 p 1178, Sage Publication, Inc. United States of America.
- [5] Aron Y., & Goldman, P. (2018). *Management: Leadership and Theory, Barrons Educational Series Inc*. Hauppauge, New York, 4th English edition ISBN 0-7641-3931-1
- [6] Bacharach, S. (2015). *Organizational politics in schools: Micro; macro and logics of action*. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29(4), 423 – 452
- [7] Ball, S. (2015). *The micro-politics of the school: Towards a theory of school organization*. London: Methuen & Co.
- [8] Ball P., & O' Donnel, J. (2020). *Managers and Leaders: School Capacity building of school heads*, Harvard Business School Press 56(3)
- [9] Bechtell, L. (2015). *The micropolitics of school: Towards a Theory of Organization Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass

- [10] Bello-Osagie, K., & Olugbamila, A. (2016). *Events that shaped education in 2014*. The Nation Newspaper, p. B2.
- [11] Bens W., & Powell, D. (2017). *Leadership emergence in autonomous work Teams: Antecedents Outcomes*, Personal Psychology, 52
- [12] Bjork, L. G., & Blase, J. (2015). *The micropolitics of school district decentralization*. Educational Assessment, Evaluation & Accountability, 21, 195 – 208
- [13] Blase, J. (2015). *The micropolitics of instructional supervision: A call for research*. Educational Administration Quarterly, 38, 6-44
- [14] Blau, P.M. (2015). *The micropolitics of leadership: From control to Empowerment*. Wiltshire, CA: Redwood Books, Exchange and power in social Life. New York: John Wiley
- [15] Boreen, J., & Evans P. (2020). *Mentoring beginning teachers: guiding, reflecting, coaching*. York Maine, Stenhouse Publishers
- [16] Burman, J., & Lance W. (2018). *Pattern and variable approaches in leadership emergence and effectiveness*, Journal of Applied Psychology, 92, 347-355
- [17] Cermino, R. (2007). *Micropolitics, shared Leadership and capacity building skills of school heads in Region XI*. A Dissertation. University of Mindanao.
- [18] Chen, H. J. (2015). *Micropolitics of the staff meeting in a Taiwanese primary school*. Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 35.
- [19] Colegio, L. (2018). *School micropolitics: Understanding and preparing for common Micropolitical challenges that novice principals encounter in K-12 schools*. A Dissertation: Texas State University, USA
- [20] Coppola, E.M., & John P. (2016). *Powering up: Learning to teach well with technology*, New York: Teachers College Press, p56
- [21] Covey, F. (2019). *Instructional capacity and high performance schools, educational research*, St. Vincent Publishing: USA, p 24(9)
- [22] Crane, J. (2017). *Shared leadership skills of school heads: Implication to supervisory practices*. Mentors College Press: USA, p 43(6)
- [23] Collen H., & Jackson, J. (2016). *Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership*. USA: Vell Publishers 38(2)
- [24] Cranston, J. (2019). *Honoring roles: The story of a principal and a student*. Brock Education, 22(1), 41–55
- [25] Creswell, J. W. (2012). *quantitative* (pp. 146-166). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [26] Cuban, K. (2019). *The school administrator internship handbook: Leading, mentoring, and participating in school*, Thousand Oaks: CA, Corwin Press p 963(1)
- [27] Darling-Hammond, L. (2020). *Teachers quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence*. Education Analysis Archives, 8(1)
- [28] Datnow, A. (2020). *Power and politics in the adoption of school reform models*. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 22(4), 357–374.
- [29] Deer R., & Protheroe, N. (2016). *Principals' role in supporting new teachers: Principal Leadership High School Edition: USA*.
- [30] Deped Order No. 75 s. 2009. *Guidelines for the Implementation of School Based Management Grants*: DepEd website, Pasig City, Philippines.
- [31] Deped Order No. 36 s. 2013. *Department of Education Vision, Mission and Core Values*: DepEd website, Pasig City, Philippines.
- [32] Deped Order No. 02 s. 2015. *Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in Department of Education*: DepEd website, Pasig City, Philippines.
- [33] Deped Order No. 42 s. 2017. *National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Standards for Teachers*: DepEd website, Pasig City, Philippines.
- [34] DepEd Order No. 24 s. 2020. *The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads*: Meralco Avenue, Pasig City.
- [35] Dickson P., & Sullivan, S. (2015). *Building effective learning communities: Strategies for leadership, learning and collaboration*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- [36] DuFour, R., & Smith P. (2017). *Building a professional learning community: For system leaders*, The school Administrator. Ervin Press: USA, p 23(4)
- [37] Ehrich, L. C., & Lindle, N. (2016). *Developing senior management teams in schools: Can micropolitics help?* International Studies in Educational Administration 32(1).
- [38] Elmore, G., & Pons H. (2020). *Schools as learning communities, educational leadership handbook*. Teachers College Press: California, p (487)

- [39] Ellen S. (2017) *Slovin formula sampling technique*, scribd.com
- [40] Ferce G., & Johnson, S (2018). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership: Casting light of shadows*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage 260
- [41] Ford, D., & Parsons, J (2016). *Teachers as mentors: College educational handbook education week*: Jerson Publishing: USA
- [42] Fullan, M. (2020). *The new meaning of educational change: Mentors and advisers role in school improvement*. New York: Teachers College Press. P 74
- [43] Furr P., & Leithwood, K. (2017). *Building leadership capacity for shared leadership. School and Its Policy*. Harper and Collins: USA p(45)
- [44] Gardiner M.E. et al. (2016). *Leaders on the front line-managing emotion for ethical decision making: A teaching case study for supervision of school personnel*.
- [45] Gay, L.R. (2016). *Organizational behavior in the organizational era*, Annual Review of Research design, 48:515-46
- [46] Gordon, S., & Maxey, S. (2020). *Helping beginning teachers to succeed*. 2nd edition Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- [47] Gruenert, S., & Jones L. (2016). *Correlations of collaborative school cultures with student achievement*. NASSP Bulletin, 88(645)
- [48] Harris, A. (2016). *Building leadership capacity for school improvement. School and its policy*. MaidenHead: UK, Open University
- [49] Hatch, T. (2015). *Keeping up the good work: Developing and sustaining capacity for school improvement*, Seattle, WA
- [50] Huler, M. (2019). *The leadership and socialization of assistant principal: from the perspective of local school district*, Education and Urban Society. P 78(3)
- [51] Iannaccone, L. (2016). *Micropolitics of education: Education and urban society* New York: Teachers College Press. p. 689(3)
- [52] Jones, G., & Lambert, L. (2018). *A framework for shared leadership*. Educational Leadership Association for Supervision and Curriculum. Harper: USA, p 56(2)
- [53] Jones, G., & Reed, C. (2020). *Teaching with power: Shared decision making in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press
- [54] Kaplan, H. (2015). *The study of educational politics: 2004 Commemorative Yearbook Of the Politics of Education Association*, Washington DC: The Falmer Press
- [55] Kedro, J. (2017). *Coherence: When the puzzle is complete*, Principal Leadership High School Edition: USA, 4(8)
- [56] Kirby, S. (2015). *The conduct of micropolitics inquiry methodology for behavioral science*. New York: Chandler/Harper and Row p 67(2)
- [57] Lawler, E. (2020). *Crafting coherence: How schools strategically manage multiple external demands*, Educational Research (33)8
- [58] Lee, P. & Newmann, F. (2020). *Successful school restructuring: A report to the public and educators*. Madison, WI: Center of Organization and Restructuring of Schools.
- [59] Levine, A. (2015). *The dynamic relationship between restructuring, reculturing, and retiming*. Educational Administration Quarterly. Pp 33(2)
- [60] Lindle, J. (2016). *Leadership and management. What can study of micropolitics contribute to the practice of leadership in reforming schools*, USA p (34)
- [61] Lonchamp, J. (2016). *The art of shared leadership*, VA; Association for Supervision And Curriculum Development. Collins Press: USA p 56(2)
- [62] Lozano, S. (2015). *The micropolitics of instructional supervision*. A Call for Research Educational Administration, 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey Bass p 456 (2)
- [63] Luke, J.B. (2017). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organization*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press p 34(2)
- [64] Malen, R., & John D.(2018). *The micropolitics of education: Mapping and multiple power relations in school policies*, New York: Falmer Press, p 763 (2)
- [65] Malen, B. (2015). *The micropolitics of education: Mapping the multiple dimensions of power relations in school politics*. In J. D. Scribner & D. H. Layton (Eds.),
- [66] Melton, A., & Robert G. (2017). *An exploratory study of dyadic relationship of the beginning teacher and the administrator*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Michigan SU 56 (2).
- [67] Moller, J. (2015). *Team leadership and school leadership and management in upper secondary education* 25(4)
- [68] Moxley, R., & Weed P. (2018). *Leadership skills and spirit: School and its policy*.

- Harper and Collins: Harvard Business School Press.
- [69] Mumford, M. (2018). *Leadership skills for changing world: Solving social complex problems*. Leadership Quarterly 1(1)
- [70] Newmann F. et al. (2017). *Instructional program coherence: Guide to school improvement policy*. Educational Evaluation Analysis. 23 (4).
- [71] Pashiardis, P. & Taliadorou, N., (2015). *Examining the role of emotional intelligence and political skill to educational leadership and their effects to teachers' job satisfaction*. Journal of Educational Leadership, 53(5), 642–666.
- [72] Pearce, C. (2019). *Shared leadership: Reframing the why's and how's of leadership*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- [73] Piot, L., & Kelchtermans, G. (2016). *The micropolitics of distributed leadership: Four case studies of school federations*. Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 44(4), 632–649.
- [74] Pollock, K., & Winton, S., (2019). *Preparing politically savvy principals on Ontario, Canada*. Journal of Educational Administration, 51(1), 40–54.
- [75] Randolph R., & Segiovanni, T. (2015). *The lifeworld of leadership: Creating culture, community and personal meaning in our schools*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass
- [76] Roberts, S. (2015). *Schools as professional learning communities: Collaborative activities and strategies for professional development*, Thousand Oaks
- [77] Rohde, S. (2017). *Does micropolitics affect the classroom? Teachers work and student work in restructuring schools*. American Journal Education 106(4)
- [78] Simon, S. (2017). *The micropolitics of educational leadership: From control to empowerment*. Wiltshire, CA: Readwood Books
- [79] Shortell, K., & Wenger J. (2015). *Introduction: Knowledge based micropolitics problems in educational administration*. Multiple Perspective. New York: Suny Press.
- [80] Spilline, J., & Lee, L. (2015). *Novice school principals' sense of ultimate responsibility: Problems of practice in transitioning to the principal's office*. Educational Administration Quarterly, 50(3) 431–465
- [81] Steiner, D., & Supovitz (2016). *Building leadership Capacity for shared Leadership*. *school and its policy*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass
- [82] Wallace, M., & Jass K. (2018). *Modelling distributed leadership and management effectiveness primary school senior management teams in Wales England*.