
Structural Equation Model of School-Based Management Practices and Teachers' Commitment in Secondary Schools

Nanette D. Bilbao, EdD*, Janet D. Barrera, EdD, Randy A. Opadia,
MAEd*****

***& **J.H. Cerilles State College 7028 Dumingag, Zamboanga del Sur, Philippines**

*****Diongan National High School, Department of Education, Zamboanga del Norte, Philippines**

ABSTRACT

This study primarily focused on assessing the implementation level of School-Based Management (SBM) and formulating a structural equation model in the public secondary schools of Zamboanga del Norte Division. A total of 3,317 students and 63 secondary teachers and school administrators from the public secondary schools in the division of Zamboanga del Sur, Philippines. The descriptive-comparative and correlational design were used with the questionnaire checklist as the primary data-gathering tool. An internal reliability test was done on the same set of questionnaires using the Cronbach alpha coefficient. Weighted Average Mean, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used. Multiple Regression Analysis was employed for the structural equation model. All tests of inference were analyzed using SPSS. The findings disclosed that the SBM implementation level, along with Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Resource Management, are fully implemented in the public secondary schools of Zamboanga del Norte Division. In addition, it was found out that an insignificant difference existed in the level of SBM implementation among the four secondary schools, and no significant correlation between the school's level of SBM implementation and the schools' performance. Furthermore, the equation suggests that the variables of leadership and resources positively contributed to the school performance with coefficients of 1.154 and 0.075, respectively. On the other hand, the curriculum and accountability negatively predict the school performance with coefficients of -1.425 and -.271.

KEYWORDS – School Based Management (SBM), Structural equation model, SBM practices

INTRODUCTION

It's been a couple of years where School-Based Management (SBM) is implemented in elementary and secondary education levels in the entire Philippines. SBM was integrated with education to motivate the school to provide leadership and the community serving the school. According to Caldwell [1], SBM is the national government's decentralization to the school level of authority. These convictions have challenged the actual situation of how SBM is conducted and practiced in our schools and communities and how it can impact teachers' dedication to work.

Pursuant to Republic Act (RA) 9155, known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, mandated for decentralizing school management system and recognized the role of the Local Government Units and other stakeholders as partners in education service delivery. The “school shall be at the heart of the formal education system. It is where children learn. Schools shall have a single aim of providing the best possible education for all learners, and the state shall encourage local initiatives for improving the quality of basic education. The state shall ensure that the values, needs, and aspirations of a school community are reflected in education for the children, school youth, and adult learners [2]. Schools and learning centers shall be empowered to make decisions on what is best for the learners they served” (Valenzuela) [3].

As the need for management increases to a greater level in running their education system, the notion of decentralization has been applied to different nations of the world. A nation's school enterprise is a vast and extensive environment where one place's needs are not the same as other places' needs. Education programs are highly challenging for governments' administrative, technological and financial capabilities, and therefore, as a system, education is too difficult to be developed and delivered effectively (King and Cordeiro-Guerra, Montreal Economic Institute, Osorio, Fasih, Patrinos, & Santibañez) [4].

Teachers have referred to the shift from centralization to decentralization in our educational system as school-based management. "School-based management can conceptually be viewed as a formal change in governance structures, as a form of devolution that identifies the individual school as the primary reinforcement unit and relies on the redistribution of decision-making authority as the primary means of stimulating and sustaining improvement.

A key indicator to look at in a school is the practice of school-head practices of school-based management. SBM has shared governance, (RA 9155) [2]. Shared governance is the framework that acknowledges which every unit has a significant function, role, and obligation inherent in the office of education bureaucracy and for which it is predominantly responsible for performance. But are the school heads practiced the principle of shared governance? Are they sharing decision making? Are they practicing transparency and accountability in their respective institution? If so, to what degree are they doing it? Consequently, the emerging challenges experienced in the SBM implementation are more work for stakeholders, less productivity, unequal school results, increased need for personnel growth, uncertainty about new roles and responsibilities, and communication problems are some of the issues that SBM stakeholders might face (Prasch) [5]. Accountability is another problem. Scientific research may be conducted to address all queries and uncertainties in Zamboanga del Norte's division, particularly in the Siayan municipality.

In Siayan district, the researcher has personally observed that SBM has made progress in schools around the town. One example is the active participation of the LGU to establish school facilities like buildings and cover courts. However, there is feedback from the secondary schools within the municipality that the school organization's system was only changed to SBM. However, the school heads still practiced the top to bottom approach in management. Teachers were divided with their observation of the SBM as practiced by their respective school heads, which affect their commitment.

Hence, the researcher purported to conduct this study to evaluate the implementation level of School Based Management (SBM) practices and teachers' commitment of the four public

secondary schools in Siayan District. Based on DepEd Order No. 83 series of 2012, all schools must conduct SBM assessment using the guidelines on the revised school-based management framework, assessment process, and tool.

The findings of this study would be beneficial to school administration. It allows competent individuals in the schools to make decisions that will improve learning. And give the entire school community a voice in critical decisions and an emphasis on decision accountability.

Moreover, the results would serve as a basis for the school heads in improving the school-management system for a more significant commitment of teachers and other stakeholders of the program.

Finally, it would allow teachers to rate their school-management system and serve as a reality check of the school-based management system. The study's findings and recommendations would provide better school-based management that will ultimately foster teachers' commitment to improve academic instruction. And it would also serve as a transparent document for the stakeholders to highlight some factors that will need improvement based on the study's findings.

The study mainly focused on the assessment of the level of implementation on the School Based Management (SBM) practices and teachers' commitment of the four public secondary schools in Siayan District, for three years from School Year 2017-2018 to 2019-2020. A structural equation model was formulated on the bases of the findings.

Moreover, the study included the level of school performance for three years based on Performance Improvement, in which the performance indicators are limited to enrollment increase, dropout rate, completion rate, cohort survival rate, and schools' Mean Percentage Scores (MPS). As regards to the SBM Assessment Scores, the study considered the four principles: Leadership and Governance; Curriculum and Learning; Accountability and Continuous improvement; and Resource Management.

The study further inquired whether a significant difference prevails among the level of implementation of SBM of the four (4) secondary schools and the performance level of the four secondary schools. And a significant correlation between the SBM level of implementation and school performance were part of the investigation.

On the bases of the data on the extent of implementation of School-Based Management along the principles of leadership and governance; curriculum and learning; accountability and continuous improvement; and resource management, the study further investigated on what structural model can be formulated.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to evaluate the level of implementation of School Based Management (SBM) practices, teachers' commitment, and the performance of secondary schools for three years in the province of Zamboanga del Sur, Philippines. Specifically, the study endeavored to formulate the structural equation model on the bases of the data on the extent of implementation of School-Based Management along the principles of leadership and governance; curriculum and learning; accountability and continuous improvement; and resource management. Test of significant difference among the level of implementation of

SBM practices and the performance of the secondary school; and a significant correlation between the SBM level of implementation and school performance.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

The study used descriptive-comparative and correlational designs. A survey was undertaken by the researcher using a questionnaire as the primary tool to gather the information needed to answer the specific questions and the main problem of the study. This study employed total enumeration in choosing samples for school heads, teachers, and students. Analysis was based on the points system given by the SBM Scoring Matrix Validation Form of Zamboanga del Norte Division.

The data of the school performance used documentary information from the Schools' Division Management Information System. On the other hand, the SBM assessment scores are based on SBM principles: leadership and governance (30%), curriculum and instruction (30%); continuous accountability improvement (25%); and resource management (15%). In interpreting the result, the numerical rating scale and description were used: *0.50-1.49, Good; 1.50-2.49, Better; and 2.50-3.00, Best*. For the *final rating*, sixty percent (60%) was taken from the performance improvement, and forty percent (40%) was taken from the validated SBM assessment scores. To analyze and interpret the final rating, the numerical rating scale, and description were used: *0.50-1.49, Developing; 1.50-2.49, Maturing; and 2.50-3.00, Advanced*.

The questionnaire checklist on School-Based Management underwent internal validity and reliability test. The questionnaire was validated by distributing the same to the Graduate School faculty members considered an expert in Educational Management.

An internal reliability test was done on the same set of questionnaires using the Cronbach alpha coefficient.

The researchers sought approval from the Division Superintendent of Zamboanga del Norte for him to be allowed to conduct the study and sent a consent letter to all participants in the secondary schools to make sure they are positively responding and willingly give information and answers to what is asked of them. After which, the researchers personally administered the questionnaire checklist and retrieved the answered paper from the participants. Immediately after retrieval, the researcher went through tallying, computing, discussing, and interpreting the collated data.

The study used Weighted Average Mean and the Analysis of Variance of F-test to test the significant difference, and Pearson Correlation Coefficient to test the significant correlation. Multiple Regression Analysis was employed for the structural equation model. All tests of inference were analyzed using SPSS were the statistical tools employed by the researchers in analyzing the gathered data

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 reveals the teachers' assessments on the SBM implementation based on the four categories, namely: leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management and resources.

As shown, the four secondary schools obtained a total weight of 2.70 described as “Best” in terms of the four SBM principles. The result implies that the evidence indicates planned practices and procedures are fully implemented. The result further implies that evidence indicates practices and procedures satisfy quality standards.

The result of this investigation is substantiated by the findings of Rutherford & Jackson (2006) with the implementation of School-Based Management, and principals have new roles. Instead of the usual traditional, legal, and functional authority for the school's total management, principals or school heads are encouraged to build a policy that promotes community participation and collaboration because educating a child is a concerted and collaborated effort. Furthermore, several scholars assert that the traditional leadership style is no longer used in leading and governing schools. Today, school heads have to become a transformational leader (Adams & Gamage, 2008; Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Yukl, 2006; and Huber, 2004); an ethical leader (Yukl, 2006; and Duignan, 2006); a situational leader (Yukl, 2006; and Schermerhorn, 2001); and an authentic leader (Duignan, 2006).

Table 1. Level of Implementation of School Based Management (SBM) of the Four Secondary Schools as Assessed by Teachers

Construct	Weight	Descriptor
Leadership and Governance	2.72	Best
Curriculum and Instruction	2.75	Best
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	2.67	Best
Management of Resources	2.67	Best
Total Percent Weight	2.70	Best

Table 2. Significance of the Difference on the Level of Implementation of School Based Management Among the Four Secondary Schools

Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum of Squares	F	P value	F Critical
Between Groups	0.0436	3	0.01455	0.37	0.78	3.49
Within Groups	0.4741	12	0.0395			
Total	0.517	15				

H_{01} : There is no significant difference on the level of implementation of SBM among the four secondary schools.

As reflected, the computed Pearson r-value of 0.78 is lesser than the F critical value of 3.49 at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The finding indicates that the level of implementation among the four secondary schools does not significantly vary. An implication to this is that the implementation of school-based management in all secondary schools of Siayan district are of the same level in terms of leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management and resources.

Research over the past decades also revealed that SBM has contributed to significant student achievement improvements (Gamage, 2006). Dempster (2000) agreed that there SBM has an impact on the progress of student outcomes. This idea was supported by Sheldon & Voorhis (2004) when he affirms that community and parental attachment in support of school-based management programs can improve schools and the quality of education that the children achieved as well as the academic achievements of students.

Moreover, Blank (2004) showed that School-Based Management would facilitate student performance changes by establishing partnerships between schools and different community institutions. He also claimed that developing relationships that connect education, family, and society are directly related to student accomplishments because the link between schools and community resources contributes to the availability of programs and help meet students' diverse needs.

Table 3. The Schools' Performance for Three Years

Constructs	Points	Results
Performance Improvement (60%)	1.02	0.61
SBM Assessment. (40%)	3.49	1.40
Total		2.01 (Maturing)

Overall Rating of the Schools' Performance for Three Years

The performance of each school is based on Performance Improvement (60%), which includes five performance indicators, namely: enrolment increase, dropout rate, completion rate, cohort survival rate, and school MPS. On the other hand, the SBM Assessment indicators (40%) are leadership, curriculum and learning, accountability, and resource management.

As displayed in Table 3, the overall rating of the four schools' performance improvement is 0.61 and SBM assessment is 1.40 with a total point of 2.01 which are categorized as "Maturing". The success of schools depends on how school leaders used their authority to manage their schools. Bandur (2008) mentioned that School-Based Management (SBM) enables the schools to create healthier school climates and improved system environments and provide a better teaching and learning environments. Teachers would be more committed to improving student achievements.

Table 4. Significance of the Difference on the Performance of the Four Secondary Schools

Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum of Squares	F	P Value	F Crit
Between Groups	0.66	3	0.22	0.53	0.69	6.59
Within Groups	1.67	4	0.42			
Total	2.33	7				

Ho₂: There is no significant difference on the performance of the four secondary schools.

The computed p-value of 0.69 is lesser than the critical F-value of 6.59, with three between groups and four within-groups degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, there is enough evidence to accept the null hypothesis.

The finding suggests that the performance of the four secondary schools in Siayan District has no significant difference. It implies that the four schools have a similar performance level. Its school thrives and progresses with the SBM implementation and with community linkages.

As Cranston (2001) stressed, schools should always be ready to link with the community stakeholders to facilitate whatever deficiencies in schools' plant facilities and resources. The majority accepts that schools cannot exist alone in the community. For schools to be progressive, and its goals will be realized, community linkages should be strengthened (Allawan, 2012).

Table 5. Significance of the Correlation Between the School's Level of SBM Implementation and Their Performance

Variables	rp	df	Level of Significance	t-value	
				Computed	Critical
Level of Implementation of SBM Performance	0.06	2	0.05	0.09	2.92

Ho₃: There is no significant correlation between the school's level of SBM implementation and their performance.

The significance of the correlation between the school's level of SBM implementation and its performance is disclosed in Table 5.

The computed t-value of 0.09 is lesser than the critical value of 2.92 with 2 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, there is sufficient proof to accept the null hypothesis.

The result attests that the school's SBM implementation level is not associated with the school's performance. Contrary to Bandur (2008) findings, School-Based Management (SBM) enables the schools to create healthier school climates and improved system environments and provide a better teaching and learning environment in which teachers would be more committed to improving student achievements. This further implies that schools' success depends on how school leaders used their authority to manage their schools.

Structural Equation Model

Linear Regression Model

Question: On the bases of the data on the extent of implementation of School-Based Management along the principles of leadership and governance; curriculum and learning; accountability and continuous improvement; and resource management, what structural equation model may be formulated?

Regression Model: with School Performance as the dependent variable

School Performance

$$0.515(\text{Leadership}) - 0.635(\text{Curriculum}) - 0.12(\text{Accountability}) + 0.031(\text{Resources}) + 2.74$$

Taking the school performance as the outcome variable, the assessment of the School-Based Management implementation in the aspects of leadership and governance; curriculum and instruction; accountability and continuous improvement; and management and resources as the predictor variables, the above equation model was formulated with the SPSS.

The equation suggests that the variables of leadership and resources positively contributed to the school performance with coefficients of 0.515 and 0.031, respectively. On the other hand, the curriculum and accountability negatively predicts the school performance with coefficients of -0.635 and -0.12, respectively.

Taking Performance Improvement (PI) as the Dependent variable

$$PI = 0.097(\text{Leadership}) - 0.116(\text{Curriculum}) - 0.018(\text{Accountability}) - 0.002(\text{Resources}) + 1.144$$

Taking the performance improvement as the outcome variable, the assessment of the School-Based Management implementation in the aspects of leadership and governance; curriculum and instruction; accountability and continuous improvement; and management and resources as the predictor variables, the above equation model was formulated with the SPSS.

The equation suggests that among the four predictor variables, it is only the leadership which positively predicted the performance improvement with coefficient of 0.097. The three other predictor variables, namely curriculum, accountability and resources negatively predict the performance improvement with coefficients of -0.116, -0.018 and -0.002, respectively.

Taking the SBM Assessment as the Dependent Variable:

$$SBM = 1.154(\text{Leadership}) - 1.425(\text{Curriculum}) - 0.271(\text{Accountability}) + 0.075(\text{Resources}) + 5.143$$

The SPSS was used to formulate the structural equation model showing the SBM assessment as the outcome variable while the implementation in the aspects of leadership and governance; curriculum and instruction; accountability and continuous improvement; and management and resources served as the predictor variables.

The equation suggests that the variables of leadership and resources positively contributed to the school performance with coefficients of 1.154 and 0.075, respectively. On the other hand, the curriculum and accountability negatively predicts the school performance with coefficients of -1.425 and -0.271, respectively.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the conclusions are hereby drawn:

The three secondary schools are exceedingly meet the minimum standards in the implementation of SBM as to leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management and resources. Only one has satisfactorily implemented SBM. Consequently, the level of schools' performance for three years of the Siayan District based on Performance Improvement and SBM Assessment Scores is level 2 and level 3.

The coefficients of 1.154 and 0.075, respectively, indicate that leadership and resources variables contributed significantly to school success. On the other hand, curriculum and

accountability negatively predict school performance, with coefficients of -1.425 and -.271, respectively.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the initial findings and conclusions, the following are hereby recommended:

1. That the DepEd key officials may continuously monitor and regularly evaluate School-Based Management implementation in the entire division to ensure the program's quality standards and outcomes.
2. The school administrators may develop strategies that would help improve the school performance from maturing to advanced level.
3. That the secondary school teachers may remain committed and dedicated to serving their students' academic needs in maintaining and achieving high schools' Mean Percentage Scores.
4. That a qualitative study on the impact of the SBM program on stakeholder community be conducted.

REFERENCES

- i. Abdulla Al Kaabi, Shaikha Ali, "An Evaluation of the School-Based Management Practices in The New School Model: A Study on Al Ain Schools" (2015). Theses 38. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.uaeu.ac.ae/all_theses/38
- ii. Abulencia, Arthur. (2012). School-Based Management: A Structural Reform Intervention. 6. 30. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277957224_School-Based_Management_A_Structural_Reform_Intervention
- iii. Biddle, S. & Asare M. (2011). Physical activity and mental health in children and adolescents: a review of reviews. British Journal of Sports Medicine. Available at <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Physical-activity-and-mental-health-in-children-and-Biddle-Asare/96c9e14b9d5caf2523bbb58af91738089cae445f>
- iv. Briggs, K. & Wohlstetter, P. (2003). Key element of a successful school-management strategy. School Effectiveness and School Improvement. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237956473_KeyElements_of_a_Successful_School_Based_Management_Strategy
- v. Brooks, J. & Brook, M. (2015). Urban Educational Leadership for Social Justice: International Perspectives. Information Age Publishing, INC. Charlotte, NC. Retrieved from [https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=vAYoDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA234&lpg=PA234&dq=Leithwood+and+Menzies+\(1998&source=bl&ots=FMFZs4JUvP&sig=ACfU3U2a1Pg57T_2pJdhooK7zIoqjoECg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjvwtbZi_7pAhUHhZQKHaadCDEQ6AEwAnoECAYQAQ#v=onepage&q=Leithwood%20and%20Menzies%20\(1998&f=false](https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=vAYoDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA234&lpg=PA234&dq=Leithwood+and+Menzies+(1998&source=bl&ots=FMFZs4JUvP&sig=ACfU3U2a1Pg57T_2pJdhooK7zIoqjoECg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjvwtbZi_7pAhUHhZQKHaadCDEQ6AEwAnoECAYQAQ#v=onepage&q=Leithwood%20and%20Menzies%20(1998&f=false)
- vi. Bush, C. & Odden, A. (1997). Local Management of Schools: Analysis and Practice. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X97033002009>

- vii. Cabardo, J. (2016). Levels of Participation of the School Stakeholders to the Different School-Initiated Activities and the Implementation of School-Based Management. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 8(1), 2016
- viii. Crosswell, L. & Elliot, B. (2004). Committed Teachers, Passionate Teachers: The dimension of passion associated with teacher commitment and engagement. Retrieved from <https://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2004/cro04237.pdf>
- ix. Dempster, N. 2000. Guilty or Not: The Impact and Effects of Site-Based Management on Schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(1),47-62.
- x. Fleming, J. & Kleinhenz, E. (2007). Towards a moving school. Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=3UDvFl1ML1MC&pg=PA20&lpg=PA20&dq=DarlingHammond+1988,+p.+11&source=bl&ots=pLnW9SK4uQ&sig=ACfU3U3hAfs3o4BSsL4OBMwhm2ieXjoAw&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjM78KF3pAhUP E6YKHXobBUUQ6AEwAXoECAoQAQ#v=onepage&q=DarlingHammond%201988%2C%20p.%2011&f=false>
- xi. Gamage, D.T. 2008. A Study of Leadership Effectiveness in a Large VET Institution in Australia. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 22(3), 214- 228
- xii. Glenn, C. (2000). The Ambiguous Embrace: Government and Faith-Based Schools and Social Agencies. Retrieved from [https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=mK9Vlr847tYC&pg=PA308&lpg=PA308&dq=Anita+A.+Summers+and+Amy+W.+Johnson+\(1995&source=bl&ots=21oxQq73e3&sig=ACfU3U0JOAAiN7fdt7kWRn_2Xsrp90x3A&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjwusOOif7pAhWkGKYKHxHcCh0Q6AEwBHoECAoQAQ#v=onepage&q=Anita%20A.%20Summers%20and%20Amy%20W.%20Johnson%20\(1995&f=false](https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=mK9Vlr847tYC&pg=PA308&lpg=PA308&dq=Anita+A.+Summers+and+Amy+W.+Johnson+(1995&source=bl&ots=21oxQq73e3&sig=ACfU3U0JOAAiN7fdt7kWRn_2Xsrp90x3A&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjwusOOif7pAhWkGKYKHxHcCh0Q6AEwBHoECAoQAQ#v=onepage&q=Anita%20A.%20Summers%20and%20Amy%20W.%20Johnson%20(1995&f=false)
- xiii. Hanushek, E. & Woessmann, L. (2007). The Role of education Quality for Economic Growth. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 4412. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=960379
- xiv. Malahay, J. O. (2013). Effectiveness of school based management, teachers' commitment and capability improvement in the academic instruction. A Thesis Presented to The Faculty of the Graduate School, Saint Vincent's College, Dipolog City, Philippines.
- xv. Murphy, J. (2005). Connecting teacher Leadership and School Improvement. Corwin Press. Thousand Oaks, California: CA. Retrieved from [https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=CIF1AwAAQBAJ&pg=PA26&lpg=PA26&dq=Mojkowski+and+Fleming+\(1988&source=bl&ots=sOI3O9o3AJ&sig=ACfU3U3kqVMFaoqGpKrXtrPapr3GdT2eDg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiZ74vjhP7pAhWQwZQKHeZCD54Q6AEwAXoECAyQAQ#v=onepage&q=Mojkowski%20and%20Fleming%20\(1988&f=false](https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=CIF1AwAAQBAJ&pg=PA26&lpg=PA26&dq=Mojkowski+and+Fleming+(1988&source=bl&ots=sOI3O9o3AJ&sig=ACfU3U3kqVMFaoqGpKrXtrPapr3GdT2eDg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiZ74vjhP7pAhWQwZQKHeZCD54Q6AEwAXoECAyQAQ#v=onepage&q=Mojkowski%20and%20Fleming%20(1988&f=false)
- xvi. Nehru, S. (2019). Economic Reforms in India: Achievements and Challenges. MJP Publishers. Retrieved from [https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=gKmcDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA99&lpg=PA99&dq=King+and+Ozler+1998;+Ozler+2001\)&source=bl&ots=58IXttPqxh&sig=ACfU3U3MN2EXTaK24k6AnVHB9OkPryMwwg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi83L76iv7](https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=gKmcDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA99&lpg=PA99&dq=King+and+Ozler+1998;+Ozler+2001)&source=bl&ots=58IXttPqxh&sig=ACfU3U3MN2EXTaK24k6AnVHB9OkPryMwwg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi83L76iv7)

- pAhUnG6YKHWr1AZUQ6AEwDXoECAgQAQ#v=onpage&q=King%20and%20Ozler%201998%3B%20Ozler%202001)&f=false
- xvii. Nir, A. (2002). School-based management and its effect to teacher commitment. Internal Journal of Leadership in Education. DOI: 10.1080/13603120210134616. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44833230_Schoolbased_management_and_its_effect_on_teacher_commitment
- xviii. Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H., & Santibañez, L. (2009). Decentralized Decision-Making in Schools (The Theory and Evidence in School-Based Management). The World Bank. Available at <https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=eFBxQ6EIJUkC&pg=PA113&dq=EDUCATION+REFORMS+IN+EAST+ASIA+KING+AND+CORDEIRO&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjtsIOR4v3pAhWHHqYKHV2NDn4Q6AEIJzAA#v=onpage&q=EDUCATION%20REFORMS%20IN%20EAST%20ASIA%20KING%20AND%20CORDEIRO&f=false>
- xix. **RA 7160 or the Local Government Code of 1991.** Teacher Commitment and Engagement: The dimensions of ideology and practice associated with teacher commitment and engagement within Australian perspective. AARE Annual Conference, Brisbane, 2002. Retrieved from <https://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2002/cro02522.pdf>
- xx. Tansiri, I., Bong, Y. (2019). The Analysis of School-Based Management (SBM) Implementation to the Educational Quality Service of State Junior High School DOI <https://doi.org/10.2991/icream-18.2019.89>
- xxi. Valenzuela, E. (July 2010). The roles and challenges of District Education Offices in context decentralization experiences from Philippines and Sri Lanka. Decentralization of Education in the Philippines. IIEP Workshop in Manila, 12-16 July 2010. Retrieved from https://gseuphsdlibrary.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/decentralization_education_philippines.pdf
- xxii. Yau, H. K. & Cheng, A. L. F. (2011). Principals and Teachers' perceptions of School policy as a key element of School-Based Management in Hong Kong Primary Schools. e-Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership, Spring, Volume 9, No. 1.