

School Supervision Practice in Asean Countries: A Comparison Indonesia and the Philippines

Ikhfan Haris¹, Inero V. Ancho²

¹Faculty of Education Universitas Negeri Gorontalo Indonesia

²College of Graduate Studies and Teacher Education Research Philippine Normal University Philippines

Email: ifanharis@ung.ac.id

Received: 11.03.2020 Revised: 12.04.2020 Accepted: 28.05.2020

ABSTRACT: This article provides an overview of the school supervision practice in Asean Countries. The paper aims to explore the differences and similarities in the practices of school supervision of Indonesia and the Philippine and how these differences influence the quality of education from both countries. The recent manuscript was the result of international research collaborative and scientific publication, which undertaken by two international teams (Indonesia and Philippine). The first part of this paper presents an outline of structure of the supervision system in both countries. Subsequently, the supervision purposes, the consequences of the school supervision activities, public reporting of school supervision and the role of stakeholder. Besides, a conceive information of the problems and issues and opportunities of school supervision in Indonesia and Philippine will also described. In conclusion, this paper summarizes the contribution of school supervision in improving of education quality in these countries.

KEYWORDS: school, supervision, system, practice, Indonesia, Philippine

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, in many countries, the organization of the service in education has undergone change for different reasons, some of which are related to the need for a school based reform, some to the changing role of the school supervision services and others to the need for streamlining the existing education structure [1] [2] [3].

In some Asean countries, e.g. Indonesia and the Philippine, they faced also changing or reform in education including the way of education supervision practices. This is due to school supervisors have an important role to play in supporting principals and teachers to improve the quality of education delivered in schools, and in strengthening the capacity of principals and teachers to deliver on this goal [4].

Contextually, different countries organize their supervision service in very different ways, depending on its ole and what is expected of it [5]. Some countries have very similar supervision practices and certainly have also dissimilar service in education supervision. Many factor contributions, which has a clear impact on the organization of supervision, e.g. the size of a country, of its education system and of its management structure [6] [7].

Indonesia and Philippines are two countries that have similar geographic area. There are both archipelagic countries which connected through the unity of the sea. Even though in education system they have different structure in practicing the supervision activities, however by supervision services in special areas which have extremes of geography condition, such as in remote island, the practices of school supervision having similar strategies.

This paper will explore the differences and similarities in the practices of school supervision of Indonesia and the Philippine and how these differences influence the quality of education from both countries.

II. STRUCTURE OF THE SUPERVISION SYSTEM IN INDONESIA AND THE PHILIPPINES**A. Indonesia**

The position of supervisors in the organizational structure of education is different from teachers [8]. The superordinates of teachers are school principals; the superordinates of primary school principals are the heads of sub-district UPTD (“*Unit Pelaksana Teknis Daerah*”, local technical implementer unit) or the head of Sub-District Education Office; the superordinates of secondary school principals are the heads of District Education Office. Performance appraisal of teachers is assessed by school principals; primary schools by the head of sub-district UPTD; and secondary schools by the head of District Education Office through the head of primary or secondary education division.

At national level, supervisors are in the scope of work of the Director of Primary and Secondary Staff Empowerment, the General Directorate of Teachers and Education Staff, the Ministry of National Education. At district/city level, kindergarten and primary school supervisors report to the head of District Education Office through the head of sub-district UPTD and subject supervisors at secondary schools directly report to the head of District Education Office.

The Decree of the Indonesian President No 87 Year 1999 defines functional position as the position that reflects roles, responsibilities and rights of a civil servant in an organization unit that requires certain expertise and skills as well as independency in undertaking the position. Therefore, recommendations from school supervisors should be independent and should not be combined with other recommendations.

In the Regulation of the Minister of State for Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform No 21 Year 2010 Chapter 1 Verse 2: “School supervisors are civil servants who are fully responsible and authorized to undertake academic and managerial supervision at education units. As they are fully responsible for supervision, their supervision results should become references for decision-makings on policies and empowerment. Their supervision results should also be considered by local governments when making decisions. However, the results are not respected; therefore school supervisors are less-respected. Their recommendations do not significantly impact on school principal and teacher empowerment, which is different from what happened in the local autonomy era.

B. The Philippines

In order to carry out its mandates and objectives, the Department of Education is organized into two major structural components. The Central Office maintains the overall administration of basic education at the national level. The Field Offices are responsible for the regional and local coordination and administration of the Department’s mandate. To address weaknesses in access, equity, and equality, the Department of Education has undertaken large-scale reforms in the education system. In August 2001, Republic Act No. 9155 (RA 9155), An Act Instituting A Framework of Governance for Basic Education, Establishing Authority and Accountability, Renaming the Department of Education, Culture and Sports as the Department of Education, and for Other Purposes, otherwise known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, was issued. It provided a framework for the governance of education, decentralizing governance to the field, and making the schools and learning centers the heart of the educational system. It provided the overall framework for (1) school head empowerment by strengthening their leadership roles and (2) school-based management within the context of transparency and local accountability. The goal of basic education is to provide the school age population and young adults with skills, and knowledge, and values to become caring, self-reliant, productive, and patriotic citizens.

School-based management (SBM) was further reaffirmed with the passing of the Basic Education Reform Agenda (BESRA) in 2006. Key principle of this agenda was to have school-level stakeholders involved in the improvement of their own schools by increasing the number of schools with school improvement plans (SIPs) prepared, implemented, and monitored through a participatory process, and by increasing the amount of resources managed and controlled at the school level. The reform was seen to be successful that by 2014, most schools were implementing their own SIPs and managing significant budgets [9].

In 2015, the Department underwent a restructuring of its office functions and staffing. The result of which was the Rationalization Plan for the new organizational structure. The detail of the structure was stipulated in DepEd Order No. 52, s. 2015, also known as the New Organizational Structures of the Central, Regional, and Schools Division Offices of the Department of Education.

One of the drastic restructuring came with the creation of the School Effectiveness Division within the Bureau of Human Resource and Organizational Development. The new division was given the task of overseeing the

Enhanced School Improvement Planning Process and all school-based management reforms. Though the goal of these restructuring and processes is to bolster decision-making and autonomy, master teachers and school principals are often unable to satisfy elaborate data collection, analysis, and implementation processes as demanded by the guidelines set by DepEd. Though instructions are explicit, trainings are provided to school heads, and planning and analysis tools are provided, oftentimes the teachers and school heads do not have the time, resources, or capacity to undertake all steps, resulting in a continuation of previous practices of simply copying and submitting information found on templates rather than deeply engaging with data analysis to support decision-making [10].

III. SUPERVISION PURPOSES, CONSEQUENCES, AND PUBLIC REPORTING

A. Indonesia

The most important activity in school teaching delivery is interaction between teachers and students in classrooms, which require supervision to ensure that the set objectives are achieved [11; 12] 13]. School principals and teachers cannot do a double role as supervisors for teaching and learning delivery. Even if they can, the results will tend to be subjective. School supervisors are required and, as they used to be teachers and the objective of supervision is to achieve the set school goals, they are the partners of school principals and teachers in meeting the shared objectives.

Therefore, even though school supervisors have shared objectives with school principals and teachers, the “trio” of education actors: teachers, school principals and supervisors have respective roles and responsibilities; school principals are planners; teachers are actors; and school supervisors are assessors of feasibility of implementation process and achievement of set objectives.

In general, the major function of the supervisor is to assist others to become efficient and effective in the performance of the assigned duties. Apart from this general function, supervisors also perform the following roles in the school system: (1) Instructional leader: Instructional leadership is one of the most important roles of supervisor: Supervisor leads other teachers in instruction to make them as effective as possible. They also lead teachers in developing and implementing an effective plan of instruction. Supervisors have to adapt to meet the needs of the people and the particular environment rather than practice a normative kind of leadership. Instructional leaders improve the quality of instruction by furthering professional growth for all teachers. Supervisors should be flexible enough to deal with any situation and should maintain a good relationship with their staff; (2) Assessing student progress: A supervisor assesses student’s progress toward the established standards by the regulatory agencies, and also facilitates the planning of various types of instruction. Supervisors ensure that teachers are utilising information from a variety of valid and appropriate sources before they begin the planning of lessons or teaching. Supervisors determine if teachers are using the numerous evaluation processes available to assist in planning meaningful instruction, and (3) The Supervisors ensure that teachers are preparing and maintaining adequate and accurate records of student’s progress. This will include the regular and systematic recording of meaningful data regarding student’s progress on specific concepts and skills related to the standards for each subject for the grade level they are teaching [13].

The Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform No 21 Year 2010 on Functional Position of School Supervisors and their Credit Scores, the main task of school supervisors is to do academic and managerial supervision at an education unit covering the development of supervision program, empowerment implementation, implementation monitoring of the eight national standards of education, assessment, assistance, and teacher professional trainings, evaluation of the results of supervision program, and the implementation of supervision tasks in specific areas.

The purpose of supervision closely relates with the purpose of education at schools that is to help schools (teachers) undertake their roles to get the set objectives met. The main purpose of supervision is to improve teaching and learning [14; 15; 16; 17]. The main target of supervision activities is improved teacher professional development. The teachers are related with human resource development, which in the end determines the prosperity and the sustainability of a nation [18].

Operational implementation of academic and managerial supervision focuses on things related with the following school condition and context: (1) checking on the availability of teaching-learning materials; (2) advising on the appropriateness of the teaching-learning materials in use; (3) assessing staff levels; (4) advising on the school climate; (5) advising the availability and quality of advising and support services available to the teacher; (6) promoting curriculum change and innovation; (7) attending to the welfare of teachers; (8) attending to institutional problems; (9) data collection to facilitate planning and decision making, and (10) monitoring policy implementation.

When we focus shifts to the teacher as a professional operating in classroom, some of the reasons for conducting supervision would be: providing feedback on teacher's performance; identifying needs for staff development; identifying potential for promotion; conducting quality assurance checks as well as ensuring teacher motivation and morale and providing professional support and guidance to the teachers

In both of the above situations, supervision ensures that the professional environment is supportive of the teaching and learning process. The ultimate objective of supervision is to improve the quality of teaching and learning. This means that supervisor needs to play the roles of planner; organizer; leader; helper; evaluator, appraiser, motivator, communicator, and decision-maker.

B. The Philippines

Educational supervision refers to all efforts designated to school officials directed toward providing leadership for teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of teaching-learning process. Educational supervisors make sure that educational institution operates efficiently and with the legal mandates of the Constitution. Major functions of supervision include (1) studying the teacher-learner situation, (2) improving the teacher-learner situation, and (3) evaluating the means, methods, and outcomes of supervision. Emphasis of supervision is on administration, curriculum, instruction, human relations, leadership, and evaluation. With this mandate, it is necessary that a school leader is equipped with the skills necessary to handle complex tasks [19].

For the public sector, school heads are guided by the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS), that is aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) in ensuring the delivery of quality, accessible, relevant, liberating basic education in the country (DepEd, 2018). RPMS is a systematic mechanism for school leaders to supervise, manage, monitor, and measure performance, and identify human resource and organizational development needs to enable continuous work improvement and individual growth [20].

The PPST outlines the required skills and competencies of quality teachers, enabling them to cope with the emerging global standards. If, upon school leaders' assessment, the required skills and competencies are not met, various professional development interventions will be provided. PPST helps assure parents that their children receive quality basic education from qualified professionals whose competencies are abreast with the advancements in the information age.

IV. ROLE OF STAKEHOLDER

A. Indonesia

School supervisors that have supervision and enabling functions to schools are required to be able to develop cooperation between schools and other related stakeholders for the sake of school empowerment: (1) Encourage schools to do dialogues with school committee and community. School supervisors can play the role to smoothen school quality improvement program within the networks they have, e.g. with the head of District Education Office, the head of Sub-District Education Office, industry and entrepreneurship parties, local libraries, and museums. They not only monitor the relationship between schools and communities in a passive note but also provide assistance to support the relationship; (2) Assist schools in curriculum development; (3) Assist schools in developing relationships with scientific and professional organizations, e.g. higher education institutions and other International insitutions knows as Coalition Schools. The cooperation is aimed for professional institutions to provide opportunities for students to interact and become the sources of information; (4) Help schools develop intititional relationships among school levels within the areas of supervision. This means schools can exchange information on their respective school conditions and policies, i.e. kindergartens exchanging information with primary schools; primary schools with junior high schools; junior high schools with senior high schools. The collaboration is helpful to accommodate the interest of students to continue their study; (5) Help schools improve local content teaching and learning. School supervisors not only monitor but also accelerate quality improvement of local content curriculum. Therefore collaboration between school supervisors across districts/cities to succeed local content curriculum is required; (6) Help schools conduct shared activities, e.g. exhibitions, sports and art week among schools, contests of wits, student exchange, leadership training among the students as well as tryout and empowerment of olympic participants. The activities are instruments in developing collaboration with related stakeholders to get them engaged in education quality improvement in their areas; (7) Help schools promote successful teachers, students and other academic aspects; (8) Help schools find funds for teacher training and research, e .g. classroom action research through collaboration with higher education institutions, empowerment of teacher working group or information delivery

on grant funds; and (9) Help schools develop relationships with entrepreneurship actors if schools are to work on school cooperation, teacher well being improvement, and other relevant efforts.

Of all school empowerment ideas already mentioned, some may go beyond the tasks and responsibilities of school supervisors. This is when the importance of school supervisors having the knowledge of opportunities and rights is required. When done, they will get closer to school principals and teachers and will become school partners.

B. The Philippines

The stakeholders play an important role in managing schools. They are the partners of school leaders in making the schools conducive to teaching and learning. In crafting the School Improvement Plan, the stakeholders are members of the working committee who looks into their involvement in making the school conducive to learning. They are also responsible for achieving the learning outcomes through their active participation in several school activities, programs, and projects. External stakeholders are also included as members of the evaluating team, to evaluate the SBM level of practice. With this, the school leaders have to build harmonious relationship with the school community because the stakeholders are now in the integral part of the school system.

Despite the efforts of the Department of Education to enhance school-based management, the Department remains highly centralized; the central office maintains the overall administration of basic education policies, plans, and procedures, while field offices and schools are responsible for the regional and local coordination and administration of the department's mandate [21].

Interviews with stakeholders suggest that a prevalent "memo culture" ensures that full decentralization is not realized at the local level, and that the bulk of planning and funding decisions at the central level limits discretion within schools and regions to implement contextualized reforms based on the needs of the locality. In this case, decentralization is seen as just an administrative transfer of authority "from DepEd central officials to those stationed in regions, divisions, and schools."

V. PROBLEMS/ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF SCHOOL SUPERVISION

A. Indonesia

The situations in the field indicate decreased performance quality of Indonesian school supervisors. This is caused by the following factors: (1) recruitment of school supervisors through seniority or extension of pension age for a bureaucrat means that schools that need the most highly qualified supervisors with specific expertise may not receive this high level support [22; 23]; (2) the tasks of school supervisors are not fully supported with adequate infrastructure, facilities and resources to make the supervision process successful; (3) the position of school supervisors may be viewed as a challenging and an unrewarding career path for innovative educators needed to fulfil this role [24]; (4) attention to empowering the career of school supervisors is not viewed as a MoEC priority and (5) the process of school supervision is seen as a compliance activity by both schools and the supervisor [23; 25].

Initially school supervisors apply inspection approach for supervision activities. Classroom and school visits done by school supervisors are viewed as formal, scary activities. They get into classrooms, checking how teachers teach and how curriculum is applied, and verbally assessing student competences. The results of the checking are very meaningful for school supervisors and teachers as they impact on their future career. School principals do inspection on teachers as part of daily internal supervision system.

Unfortunately the assignment of school supervisors has never been supported with sufficient funds and has been the burden to schools. It psychologically impacts on school supervisors being less respected at schools. In addition to this, the government only releases policies that support training and education on supervision activities focusing on school principals and not engaging school supervisors. It makes the function of school supervisors at schools is neglected/not supported. It slows down the response and anticipation of school supervisors towards new education policies and innovations as facilities and support from central and local governments are very limited in providing supporting programs as they are mostly for school principals and teachers. School supervisors should have been aware of new education policies and innovations before they become known by school principals and teachers.

The supervision paradigm of school supervisor mentioned above should be changed, not only controlling to look for mistakes made by school principals and teachers but also helping them to find solution.

By considering what has been elaborated, there needs to be revitalization of the role of school supervisors to make improvements in every aspect so that education processes at schools are effectively delivered. School supervision should be directed to quality control to improve education quality, requiring eligible competences to do academic and managerial supervision (quality controlling auditing).

Any supervision model cannot guarantee the perfect solution to supervision issues, particularly those related with the existence of school supervisors as the external parties of education quality control at schools as education units that should reflect education quality that are mostly ignored. School supervisors are even blamed when failures are reflected in the education results. The big question is why this happens. In this context, the revitalization of the role of school supervisors is important to make improvements towards effective education processes at schools. School supervision should be directed to improve education quality by requiring appropriate competences to do academic and managerial supervision (quality controlling auditing).

B. The Philippines

The “administrative” decentralization is burdensome for school heads, district officials, and teachers, who are assigned to demonstrate measurable progress toward priority areas, but often without the means or resources to implement targeted responses. Also, reliance on a memo process means that reforms and targets are not seamlessly integrated into the strategic plans at other levels of governance, leading to overlaps and contradictions among plans.

The Philippine Public Educational System, with the current demands of 21st century learning demands educational leaders to reflect, analyze, plan, and take action in order to cope up with the challenges, threats, and internal problems or issues that the current educational system is experiencing. Effective school leaders and managers play integral roles in the educational highway in preparation of learners to globalization, Philippine Qualification Framework, and ASEAN integration.

Several researches support the idea that leadership makes a difference between mediocrity and excellence. There is a positively significant correlation between effective principals and effective schools. Education leaders should possess the capacity to contribute to the learners’ academic performance, capacity for innovation in academics, culture, and fiscal management. These skills, however, are often challenging for leaders who are not trained well. Therefore, school leaders must also see themselves as learners, constantly seeking the environment for new ideas, tools, and solutions. To do so, school leaders must never stop learning. This can be achieved by enrolling themselves to graduate school and/or attending professional development trainings [26].

Another important element is moral authority. School leaders of long ago inherited moral authority, today, they have to earn it. School leaders, specifically from the public sector seem to get less respect than before because of several factors: intervention of politics, leadership styles, decision-making, communication skills, and the unending issues about favoritism and corruption. Moral authority comes from the adherence to ethical principles such as fairness, honesty, hard work, and compassion. Educational leadership should be built on these virtues; school leaders must establish credibility by listening and learning before making decisions and establish a “moral voice” that transcends within the school community [27].

Along the highway of Philippine education, school leaders continue to search for the right balance between management and leadership. Current management theories emphasize the importance of empowerment [28]; [29]. However, in the present educational system that still retains the top-down orientation and is quite slow in transforming into new principles of leadership and management, this becomes a dilemma to school heads. It would be good to review and reform management functions of the present and future breed of school heads to make them more productive, dynamic, and efficient like our counterparts in various parts of the world who are getting ready for globalization. School heads must be ready to meet the challengers of the education system particularly in the face of effective implementation of the School Based Management (SBM), Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA), ASEAN Integration, Philippine Qualification Framework, K-12 Curriculum Implementation, and Globalization [30]; [31].

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper dealing with the practice of school supervision in Asean countries with particular concern on Indonesia dan the Philippines. The study aims to explore the differences and similarities in the practices of school supervision of Indonesia and the Philippine and how these differences influence the quality of education from both countries.

Indonesia and the Philippines organize their supervision service in very different ways, depending on its role and what is projected of it. There are many factor contributions, which has a clear impact on the organization of supervision in the both countries, e.g. the size of a country, of its education system and of its education management structure.

VII. REFERENCES

- [1] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2015), *Rethinking Education, Towards a global common good?*, UNESCO, Paris.
- [2] Greenfield, Susan A. (2012). *Tomorrow's People: How 21st-Century Technology is Changing the Way We Think and Feel*. Penguin, London.
- [3] Kirschner Paul A and van Merriënboer, Jeroen J. G.. (2013). Do Learners Really Know Best? *Urban Legends in Education. Educational Psychologist* 48: 169–183.
- [4] Kennedy, D. M., and Fox, B. (2013). Digital natives: an Asian perspective for using learning technologies. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology* 9. No. 1: 64–79.
- [5] Agih, A. Allen. (2015). Effective School Management and Supervision: Imperative for Quality Education Service Delivery. *AFRREV, International Multidisciplinary Journal* Vol. 9(3), Serial No. 38. (7): 62-74
- [6] Hovde, Kate. (2010). *Supervision and Support of Primary and Secondary Education: A Policy Note for the Government of Poland*, World Bank, Policy Paper 68722, May 19, 2010.
- [7] Shuaibu, Mohammed (2016). The principals' supervisory roles for quality Education and effective school administration of Basic education schools in Nigeria, *Proceedings of ISER 18th International Conference*, Dubai, UAE, 16th January 2016,
- [8] Raihani, Raihani. (2008). An Indonesian model of successful school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration* 46 (4): 481-496.
- [9] Al-Samarrai, Samer. (2016). *Assessing basic education service delivery in the Philippines : public education expenditure tracking and quantitative service delivery study (English)*, Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group.
- [10] DepEd Order No. 52, s. 2015. (2015). *New Organizational Structures of the Central, Regional, and Schools Division Offices of the Department of Education*.
- [11] Gablinske, Patricia Brady. (2014). *A case study of student and teacher relationships and the effect on student learning*, Open Access Dissertations. Paper 266, 2014.
- [12] Coe, Robert, Cesare Aloisi, Steve Higgins and Lee Elliot Major. (2014). *What makes great teaching? Review of the underpinning research*. Center of Evaluation and Monitoring (CEM), Durham University. The Sutton Trust.
- [13] Sutoyo, Arif Rahman and Irsan. (2017). Needs Assessment of Senior High School (SMA) Supervisors of Jambi Province. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*.7 (5): 80-83. DOI: 10.9790/7388-0705028083
- [14] Neagley, R. L., & Evans, N. D. (1980). *Handbook for effective supervision of instruction*. Englewood Cliffs. Prentice-Hall. New Jersey:
- [15] Oliva, P. F., (1993). *Supervision for today's schools*. (4th ed.). Longman, New York.
- [16] Ünal, Ali. (2013). Development and validation of supervisory behavior description scale. *Educational Research and Reviews* Vol. 8(2): 69-76.
- [17] Glickman, Carl D, Ross-Gordon, Jovita M. and Gordon, Stephen P. (2013). *Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach*. 9th edition. Allyn and Bacon Published. Boston.
- [18] Wiles, Jon and Bondi, Joseph. (2004). *Supervision: A Guide to Practice*. 6th Edition. The University of Virginia. Pearson Publisher.

- [19] Republic Act No. 9155 (RA 9155). (2001). An Act Instituting A Framework of Governance for Basic Education, Establishing Authority and Accountability, Renaming the Department of Education, Culture and Sports as the Department of Education, and for Other Purposes, 2001.
- [20] Chemers, M. (2004). *The Social Organizational and Cultural Context of Effective Leadership*. New Jersey Prentice Hall. New Jersey.
- [21] Colinares, N (2011). *21st Century Trends, Issues, and Challenges in Philippine Education*. National Bookstore, Quezon City, Philippines,
- [22] Media Indonesia. (2018). Rekrutmen Pengawas Sekolah Belum Ideal. Accessed on 5 April 2020. Internet Source: <http://mediaindonesia.com/news/read/60029/rekrutmen-pengawas-sekolah-belum-ideal/2016-08-05>
- [23] The Education Sector Analytical And Capacity Development Partnership (ACDP). (2013). *School and Madrasah Principals and Supervisors Competencies Baseline Study Report of the Findings of the Principal and Supervisor Competency Baseline Study . Data collection and Recording instruments : February 2013*. ACDP. Jakarta.
- [24] Universitas Gajah Mada (UGM). (2016). Kurang Diminati, DIY Minim Pengawas Sekolah. 2016. Accessed on 18 May 2020. Internet Source: <https://ugm.ac.id/id/berita/3955-kurang-diminati.diy.minim.pengawas.sekolah>
- [25] Syahbani. (2010). *Analisis Kinerja Pengawas Sekolah Dasar dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Pendidikan Di Kota Dumai*. Dissertation. Unpublished. Program Pascasarjana Universitas Islam Negeri. Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau. Pekanbaru.
- [26] Icutan, Sherelle Lou Sumera and Sumera-Sagaoinit, Catherine. (2017). *Conflicts and Resolutions of School Administrator.: Basis for Innovative Administrative Program*. Asia Pacific Journal of Contemporary Education and Communication Technology, Vol. 3 (1): 247-260.
- [27] Read, Lindsay & Tamar Manuelyan Atinc. (2017). *Investigations into Using Data to Improve Learning: Philippines Case Study*. Manila: Global Economy and Development. Accessed on 23 May 2020. Internet Source: <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads>.
- [28] Villegas, Bernardo. (2010). *The Philippine Advantage*. Manila: University of Asia and the Pacific, 3rd edition.
- [29] Balisacan, Arsenio & Hill Hal. (2003). *The Philippine Economy: Development, Policies, and Challenges*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [30] Sutherland, I. & J. Brooks. (2013). *School Leadership in the Philippines: Historical, Cultural, and Policy Dynamics in A. Normore & N. Erbe [eds]. Collective Efficacy: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on International Leadership*. UK [United Kingdom]: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- [31] Oracion, Carmela Canlas. (2015). *Teacher Leadership in Public Schools in the Philippines*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. UK [United Kingdom]: Institute of Education, University of London