



School-Based Management Practices as Predictors of School Performance in Public Elementary Schools amid the Pandemic

Raymund D. Capacite

San Julian Central Elementary School,
Brgy. 06, San Julian, Samar, Philippines.

Email: raymund.dcapacite@deped.gov.ph

(**Received:** May-2021; **Accepted:** Sept-2021; **Available Online:** Sept-2021)



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY-NC-4.0 ©2021 by author (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

ABSTRACT

The CoVid-19 pandemic forced a majority of business sectors and government institutions, including the Department of Education to a distance and virtual approach on its mandates. However, it is highly expected that the quality of educational outcomes should be continuously delivered among the stakeholders. Hence, a correlational research design was employed to investigate the level of practice on school-based management and the performance levels of 26 public central elementary schools via secondary data collected from the Schools Governance Operation Division (SGOD), specifically in the implementation of distance education during the school year 2020-2021. The data were analyzed using mean, percentage, Pearson R, and multiple regression analysis at a .05 level of significance. Findings revealed a better level of practice and a good level of performance concerning school-based management (SBM) among participating schools. Likewise, a significant relationship and predictability among the two variables were established, suggesting the influential nature of school-based management in improving the schools' performance outcomes. Hence, it recommends the benchmarking and implementation of outstanding school-based management practices amid the pandemic across all schools.

Keywords: School-Based Management; Predictors; School Performance; Quality; Access; Efficiency.

INTRODUCTION

Quality, most especially in decision-making, has been a common goal among academic communities for years. Scholars like Stone, Bruce, and Hursh (2007), Andrew 2010, Nzuanke and Ajimase (2014), Cabardo (2016) and Andrew-Essien (2021) emphasized the need to align every educational system's framework to the needs of learners and the society and the acquisition of 21st-century skills among students to meet the desired goals and outcomes of the school. Other variables may be considered when effective

learning is not occurring, but the focus will always be on how “schools adopt and implement the school-based management system” (Cabardo, 2016, p. 3). In addition, Grauwe (2004) and Edge (2000) mentioned poor teaching-learning experience, teachers’ incompetence, and mismanaged school governance by school heads as factors affecting the acquisition of quality school performance.

According to Tapayan, Ebio, and Bentor (2016, p.3), “the implementation of school-based management (SBM) is an institutional method to improve education by transferring decision-making authority from state and district offices to individual schools” and an integral part of the country’s Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA). The core principle of SBM is that the individuals who are directly involved in and affected by the operations are the most qualified to coordinate, administer, and improve the school system. According to Kadtong, Navarro-Parcon, and Basar-Monir (2016), SBM gives administrators, teachers, and parents more authority over the educational process by putting them in charge of the money, staff, and curricular decisions. Professional responsibility replaces bureaucratic regulations in the SBM, thereby empowering classroom managers and school heads to become catalysts of change in their respective schools by improving their interpersonal skills and administrative talents (Lapus, 2009). As a result, SBM is linked to public relations to increase stakeholder involvement in school planning and implementation.

For quite some time, SBM is continuously being used in a handful of developing nations worldwide. Australia and Victoria reported positive outcomes and development in their respective education system through SBM adoption (Drysdale, Good, & Gurr, 2009). Brouwer and his colleagues (2015) specifically mentioned the giving incentives which lead to better instruction and learning, school autonomy, and accountability. Conversely, van der Werf, Creemers, and Guldmond (2001) noted parental and community participation as instruments to create effective schools and improved student achievements. Kadtong et al., (2017) identified issues confronting the country’s education, particularly in public schools, such as high drop-out rates, poor educational service, high repetition rates, and limited school holding capacity, which prompted the implementation of several programs such as Brigada Eskwela and Every Child-a-Reader program to name a few, that adhere to school-based management principles. The Department of Education in 2015 strengthened the “roles of the School Governing Councils and School Improvement Planning team which report accomplishments via School Report Cards” (p.3). As observed by Cabardo (2016), SBM has become more inclusive of the various realities of learning contexts and more responsive to increasing the commitment and accountability of educational stakeholders in meeting the performance outcomes of learners and improving schools’ potentials. All these outline the relevance of SBM in improving the school system in terms of quality, access, and governance.

Cabardo (2016) and Tapayan et al. (2016) have demonstrated that school-based management can improve access to quality education and student achievement. However, the type of SBM modernization that is implemented varies significantly by continent and can take a long time to produce results. Furthermore, the effectiveness of SBM is critically dependent on family involvement, popular support, and total management (World Bank Group, 2016). Similarly, Bandur (2012) asserted that, despite widespread agreement among schools that SBM can help them obtain autonomy, adaptability, involvement, usefulness, reliability, satisfaction, governance density,

efficiency, and accountability, school stakeholders and school heads still encountered difficulties and obstacles in implementing it.

Among the 13 schools' divisions in the Eastern Visayas region, the schools division of Eastern Samar has only two (2) Level III SBM-certified schools for the elementary and 1 Level III SBM-certified school for secondary. This status is considered low considering the region's consistent campaign on SBM implementation and the number of deserving schools based on overall performance in the two divisions. In an assessment conducted by the regional office, most schools emphasize the need for technical assistance to gather artifacts and organize school systems. Although some school practices are aligned to SBM, the lack of proper documentation of such practices was seen. Recognizing these premises and concerns, the researcher examined the level of practice on the four parameters of school-based management as significant predictors of the performance levels of public elementary schools in the school's division of Eastern Samar for the school year 2020-2021. An assessment of central elementary schools' school-based management level of practice was made centralizing on leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources. Conversely, the level of school performance based on the SBM level of practice regarded access, efficiency, and quality as its indicators. Likewise, the study presented a different perspective in the sense that it was positioned in a new normal era of the educational system.

The results of the present study were directed to provide a better understanding of the role of school-based management and practices in the implementation of distance learning in the context of basic education. The researcher regarded this investigation as a basis in recommending doable actions and programs to ensure the smooth flow on the delivery of education amid the pandemic. Furthermore, the findings can explain the certain impact of SBM practices on the holistic development of learners, continuing professional growth of teachers, and the overall performance of DepEd-governed schools.

METHODS

This study utilized a quantitative research approach, specifically, a correlational research design through a survey method to describe, analyze, and interpret the data gathered on the relationship between the level of school-based management practices and school performance of learners among public elementary schools of Eastern Samar Division for School Year 2020-2021. This method helped the researcher in determining, analyzing, and defining the relationship between the variables included in this study and in determining whether the identified variables have influenced one another, and gauging if there is a significant relationship among variables of the study.

The sources of data were taken from the submitted SBM validation tool by the District Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) Coordinators to the Schools Governance and Operation Division (SGOD) duly-accomplished by the SBM Coordinator for Part 1 which tells about the SBM Practices focus on the Document Evaluation-Observation (DOD) with a total weight of 100%. While Part II namely, School Performance was accomplished by the school head/principal focus on the three (3) thematic areas such as access which is on (1) enrolment with a corresponding weight of 45%, (2) quality which focuses on achievement rate with a corresponding rate of 30%, and (3) efficiency which tells about Drop-out rate, Cohort survival rate and Completion rate with a weight of 25%. Hence, there are no respondents to the study since it is secondary data that can be

obtained from the SGOD Office or the District/School. Since the Philippine Accreditation System for Basic Education (PASBE) Validation Tool is already accomplished and submitted to the District Office by the School Head/Principal and from the District Office it is submitted to the School Governance Operation Division (SGOD). This secondary data will be collected with the help of the District M and E Coordinators or the Division SBM Coordinator under the SGOD Office.

After collecting and organizing the needed information. The data were analyzed as follows. The secondary data showing participating schools' school-based management practices and the performance of the public elementary schools were descriptively analyzed using mean, standard deviation, and averaged percentage were used. The nature of the relationship and the testing of possible significant relationships between the levels of school-based management practices and school performance of public elementary schools of Eastern Samar Division was made through the Pearson Product – Moment Correlation test (Pearson r). Lastly, the multiple linear regression analysis was utilized to determine which among the SBM Management Practices can strongly predict SBM Performance when all other factors were held constant.

Finally, this research was conducted in compliance with established research ethics guidelines. Participants' consent was provided along with the google forms, and permission was granted to use their data. Benefits of the research especially to the participants were outlined and credit to their participation was acknowledged.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of SBM practice of public central elementary schools

Table 1 shows the mean level of practice on the four parameters of School-based Management of public central elementary schools in the schools division of Eastern Samar for the school year 2020-2021. Taken per indicator, the highest mean rating was found in leadership and governance ($\bar{x} = 1.82$, $SD=.76$), while Management of Resources ($\bar{x} = 1.57$, $SD=.66$) got the lowest mean rating among the four parameters of SBM practice. However, all the four indicators have shown a unified "Better" level of SBM practice ($\bar{x} = 1.95$, $SD=.50$). This suggests that the four SBM parameters stated in this study are manifested and observed on all occasions and indicators stated are felt and occurring in the school.

The general result supports the findings of Rutherford and Jackson (2006), and Adams and Gamage (2008) highlighting the roles of principals, specifically transformational leaders for the effective implementation of School-Based Management. In addition to that, the effectiveness of school management practices is evident in the flexibility shown by teachers especially in managing learners and the development of video-based learning resources (Hardman, et al., 2009). Interestingly, Dejene (2019) found out that the instructional process in the modularized program is below the expectation, where instructions are predominately teacher-centered and practicing continuous testing in which students sat for tests and quizzes frequently with no written and/or oral feedback. Hence, the overall findings imply that constant monitoring and implementation of best practices of the schools in terms of School-Based Management are being implemented throughout the modular school year 2020-2021. This implies that the success of the schools is determined by how school leaders exercised their authority in managing their institutions, amid the pandemic.

Table 1. Level of SBM practices of public elementary schools

Parameters of SBM	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Leadership and Governance	1.83	.76	Better
Curriculum and Learning	1.65	.67	Better
Accountability	1.63	.76	Better
Management of Resources	1.57	.66	Better
Over-all Rating	1.95	.50	Better

Legend: Good (0.50 – 1.49), Better (1.50 - 2.49). Best (2.50 – 3.00)

Level of school performance of public central elementary schools in terms of access, quality, and governance

Table 2 below presents the summary of the school performance of the central schools in the Division of Eastern Samar regarding access, efficiency, and quality. As shown in the table, access with a weighted value of 45%, specifically on enrolment, has a -9.20% performance interpreted as “Marginal”. Meanwhile, the performance of central schools in terms of Efficiency with a weighted value of 25% reveals that in terms of drop-out rate, the schools have a -7.30% performance and are interpreted as “Marginal”. In comparison, on cohort-survival rate interpreted as “High” with 15.30% of performance and completion rate, the central schools have 16.44% performance and are interpreted as “High”. Moreover, in terms of quality, particularly on MPS, data shows that the central schools have 1.80% performance and is interpreted as “Marginal”. The result further shows that the weighted rating of -2.3 for access, 3.25 for efficiency, and 0.54 in quality, respectively, has an overall school performance of 1.49 and is interpreted as good in terms of school performance of public central schools in the Division of Eastern Samar.

Similarly, according to Sabio and Sabio (2013) “the biggest challenge for distance education is to aid government to attain the enrollment rates” (p.59). Wilhelm (2010) explained that when teachers and school administrators begin taking ownership, they also gain ownership of the solutions developed as a team on problems of poor performance. As shared leadership becomes the norm for the school, student outcomes improve dramatically. This implies that achievement gaps are addressed when schools continue to look for improvements in learner’s performance. Most importantly, schools should critically look into their learners’ participation and achievement rates and provide opportunities for learners who find modular distance education quite difficult to manage.

Table 2. Level of school performance in terms of access, efficiency, and quality

Parameters of School Performance	Percent Performance	Interpretation
Access (45%)		
Enrolment	-9.20%	Marginal
Efficiency (25%)		
Drop-out Rate	-7.30%	Marginal
Cohort Survival Rate	15.30%	High

Completion Rate	16.44%	High
Quality (30%)		
MPS	1.80%	Marginal
Over-all School Performance	1.49	Good

Legend: Good (0.50 – 1.49), Better (1.50 - 2.49). Best (2.50 – 3.00)

Test of the significant relationship between the level of practice on school-based management parameters and the school performance of public central elementary schools

Table 3 shows the results of the correlation analysis made to answer the third objective of the study. The Pearson product-moment of correlation popularly known as Pearson r was used to ascertain the significant relationship that exists between the School-Based Management Practices and School Performance. As presented in Table 3, all of the parameters for School-Based Management manifest a significant relationship with the parameters of School Performance. All the parameters for SBM practices such as “Leadership and Governance”, “Curriculum and Instruction”, “Accountability and Continuous Improvement”, and “Management of Resources” exhibited significant relationship with the school performance on enrolment, drop out, cohort, completion, and Mean Percentage Score (MPS). Surprisingly, three (3) parameters of SBM practices, namely leadership and governance ($r= 1.00$), curriculum and learning ($r= 1.00$), and accountability ($r=1.00$) have manifested a perfect positive correlation with school performance in terms of enrolment, drop-out rate, and cohort, respectively. Meanwhile, most of the SBM practices parameters have exhibited moderately positive significant relationships while only one has shown a low positive correlation. From these findings, there is ample and sound justification to reject the null hypothesis. Hence, there is a significant relationship between the level of practice on School-Based Management and the level of school performance of public central elementary schools in the school’s division of Eastern Samar. There is enough evidence that school-based management is significantly linked to better school achievement.

Gamage (2006) and Dempster (2000) agreed that SBM practices have an impact on student outcomes. Furthermore, the conclusions made by Blank (2004, p.3) that “School-Based Management can positively impact student learning by establishing a working connection between schools and diverse community entities” backed up the findings of the present investigation. He went on to say that forming collaborations that connect school, family, and community resources are inextricably linked to student achievement because it leads to the provision of services and support that address the students’ various needs. Sheldon and Voorhis (2004) support this idea, stating that “public and parenting style to school-based management programs can strengthen schools’ quality delivery of education, and student’s academic achievements” (p.5).

The overall findings suggest the influential nature of school-based management in improving the schools’ performance outcomes. Furthermore, it implies that outstanding management can contribute to the effective delivery of distance education in the country.

Table 3. Test of the significant relationship between the level of practice on school-based management parameters and the school performance of public central elementary schools

Criterion Variables	Predictive Variables	r	p value	Decision	Interpretation
Enrolment	Leadership and Governance	1.000	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Curriculum and Learning	.653	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Accountability	.754	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Management of Resources	.640	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
Drop-out rate	Leadership and Governance	.652	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Curriculum and Learning	1.000	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Accountability	.765	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Management of Resources	.583	.002	Reject H _o	Significant
Cohort survival	Leadership and Governance	.751	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Curriculum and Learning	.762	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Accountability	1.000	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Management of Resources	.817	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
Completion	Leadership and Governance	.668	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Curriculum and Learning	.822	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Accountability	.840	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Management of Resources	.852	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
MPS	Leadership and Governance	.674	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Curriculum and Learning	.677	.000	Reject H _o	Significant
	Accountability	.610	.001	Reject H _o	Significant
	Management of Resources	.430	.028	Reject H _o	Significant

$\alpha = .05$

Predictability of school-based management parameters to the level of school performance of public central elementary schools

The last set of analysis answers the final objective of the study. The multiple linear regression was used to establish which among the parameters of SBM Practices can best serve as a predictor of the school performance.

As can be seen in Table 4, enrolment and cohort both showed strong significant regression results to three (3) out of four (4) SBM practices parameters.

Looking closely at enrolment, leadership and governance got the highest beta score of 906 points followed by accountability by about 3.9 points. An opposite result can be observed in terms of cohort status. The results entail that an increase in leadership and governance and accountability will positively impact the enrolment status of the school. This implies that students can realize how the schools value their attendance by improving the school system and showing transparency at all times. This result is aligned to Drysdale, Mulford, and Gurr's (2006) findings of the leadership and support of principals, leading to the enhancement of quality education for students. Only curriculum and instruction got a positive significant beta result of 201 points in terms of drop-out rate. This entails that improving the teachers' instruction and the curriculum itself would allow the decrease of drop-out rate among public central schools. This implies the need for inclusivity among schools by offering programs for children with special needs and other effective modes of instruction that will cater to the needs of the students.

In terms of completion rate, management of resources ($\beta = 4.312$) and curriculum and instruction ($\beta = 4.408$) are both significant positive predictors. This implies that the availability and proper management of resources and the use of such materials to instruction allow the full completion of students from kindergarten up to Grade 6. Unfortunately, none of the four parameters of school-based management significantly predict the mean percentage score – performance of public central elementary schools in the school's division of Eastern Samar. Similarly, Goddard (2001) found that faculty members' collective efficacy perceptions were not a significant predictor of student achievement, nor was it significantly related to school socioeconomic status or minority concentration. In contrast, Griffith (2004) posited that the higher levels of school staff job satisfaction are significantly associated with smaller achievement gaps between minority and non-minority students.

In general, all parameters of SBM practices have the strong potential to predict school performance in terms of enrolment, drop-out rate, cohort survival, completion rate but low moderate correlation with the Mean Percentage Score (MPS). The results imply the need to ensure school accountability in improving the schools' enrolment status and the cohort survival of the students. Finally, the school head must ensure that students capture all the necessary competencies required by constantly reviewing school programs and learning continuity plans for the coming school years.

Table 4. Predictability of school-based management parameters to the level of school performance of public central elementary schools using Multiple Regression Analysis

Criterion variables	Predictive Variables	β	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Enrolment	Leadership & Governance	906.324	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Curriculum & Instruction	-1.794	.087	Retain H ₀	Not significant
	Accountability	3.851	.001	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Management of Resources	-2.299	.032	Reject H ₀	Significant
Drop-out	Leadership & Governance	-.941	.358	Retain H ₀	Not significant
	Curriculum & Instruction	200.980	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Accountability	.840	.411	Retain H ₀	Not significant
	Management of Resources	.271	.789	Retain H ₀	Not significant
Cohort	Leadership & Governance	-2.147	.044	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Curriculum & Instruction	-1.794	.087	Retain H ₀	Not significant
	Accountability	505.690	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Management of Resources	-2.299	.032	Reject H ₀	Significant
Completion	Leadership & Governance	-.341	.737	Retain H ₀	Not significant
	Curriculum & Instruction	4.312	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Accountability	.143	.888	Retain H ₀	Not significant
	Management of Resources	4.408	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
MPS	Leadership & Governance	1.937	.066	Retain H ₀	Not significant
	Curriculum & Instruction	1.779	.090	Retain H ₀	Not significant
	Accountability	.370	.715	Retain H ₀	Not significant
	Management of Resources	-.734	.471	Retain H ₀	Not significant

$\alpha = .05$

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study investigated the predictability of the school-based management practices to the performance levels of 26 public elementary schools in the schools' division of Eastern Samar for the school year 2020-2021. Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn. The participating schools performed a better level of practice in the four parameters of school-based management for the school year 2020-2021, especially in terms of leadership and governance. This only shows the efforts made by the whole school systems of the chosen locale in the delivery of quality education amid the pandemic. Furthermore, they have shown an aggregate good level of school performance with marginal rating in terms of access and quality compared to efficiency.

Results from the correlational analysis highlighted the importance of regular monitoring and evaluation of schools' practices to better explain school performance since the SBM implementation is directly influential to school performance. Finally, the regression analysis between SBM practices and school performance has revealed predictors that strongly influence school performance. Notably, leadership and governance, and accountability are significant predictors of enrolment rate and cohort survival rate. Meanwhile, curriculum and instruction and continuous learning, respectively are predictors of drop-out rate and completion rate. While the management of resources has the potential to predict enrolment rate, cohort survival, and completion rate. Hence, the following recommendations are offered. The SBM practices such as leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources shall be emphasized by all stakeholders to improve significantly its practices. Public elementary schools shall consider outstanding practices on School-based Management which yield higher performance. Future researchers shall focus their studies on other factors that could affect the performance of schools in general.

REFERENCES

- Abulencia, A. A. (2013). *School-based management: a structural reform intervention*. Center for Linkages and Extension. Philippine Normal University.
- Adams, D., & Gamage, D. T. (2008). A study of leadership effectiveness in a large VET institution in Australia. *International journal of educational management*, 22(3), pp. 214-228.
- Andrew, E. H. (2010). Mixed Media Visual Effect in Stage Scenography. *West African Association for Common Wealth Literature and Language Studies: WAACLALS*, 3, 37-50.
- Andrew-Essien, E. (2021). Art As a Dependable Driving Force In New Age Marketing. *PINISI Discretion Review*, 5(1), 9-20.
- Blank, M. J. (2004). How community schools make a difference. *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 62-65.
- Cabardo, J. R. O. (2016). Levels of participation of the school stakeholders to the different school-initiated activities and the implementation of School-Based Management. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*, 8(1), 81-94.
- De Grauwe, A. (2005). School-based management (SBM): Does it improve quality. *EFA Global Monitoring Report*.

- Deming, W. E. (2009). Quality control and continuous improvement. quality, productivity and competitive position. *Pearson Education*. <https://wps.prenhall.com/wps/media/objects/2471/2530411/11e/CO7.pdf>.
- Drysdale, L., Goode, H., & Gurr, D. (2009). An Australian model of successful school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(6), 697.
- Edge, K. (2000). Decentralization and School-Based Management (SBM). *World Bank*.
- Gamage, D., & Sooksomchitra, P. (2006). Decentralisation and school-based management in Thailand. In *Decentralisation and privatisation in education* (pp. 151-167). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Gamage, D., & Zajda, J. (2005). Decentralisation and school-based management: A comparative study of self-governing schools models. *Educational Practice and Theory*, 27(2), 35-58.
- Kadtong, M. L., Navarro-Parcon, M., & Basar-Monir, L. (2016). School-Based Management in the Operations and Performance of Public Elementary Schools. *Proceedings Journal of Education, Psychology and Social Science Research*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3139808>
- Kadtong, M. L., Unos, M., Antok, T. D., & Midzid, M. A. E. (2017). Teaching performance and job satisfaction among teachers at region XII. *Proceedings Journal of Education, Psychology and Social Science Research*, 4(1).
- Lapus, J. A. (2009). *Department of Education School-Based Management: A primer*. Meralco Complex, Pasay City.
- Nzuanke, S. F., & Ajimase, A. A. (2014). Youth Language as a Transnational Phenomenon: The Case of French in Nigeria. *LWATI: A Journal of Contemporary Research*, 11(4), 87-110.
- Rutherford, D., & Jackson, L. (2006). Setting up school partnerships: some insights from Birmingham's Collegiate Academies. *School Leadership and management*, 26(5), 437-451.
- Schön, D., & Argyris, C. (1996). Organizational learning II: Theory, method and practice. *Reading: Addison Wesley*, 305(2). DOI:10.2307/2525281
- Sheldon, S. B., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2004). Partnership programs in US schools: Their development and relationship to family involvement outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15(2), 125-148.
- Stone, J.E., Bruce, G. S., & Hursh, D. (2007). *Effective schools, common practices: twelve ingredients of success from Tennessee's most effective schools*. Virginia: Education Consumers Foundation.
- Tapayan, H. N., Ebio, F. M., & Bantor, C. T. S. (2016). Impact of school-based management level of practices among secondary school implementing units on the K to 12 program implementation in Leyte division, Philippines. *International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Research Technology*, 5(5), 558-574.
- Van der Werf, G., Creemers, B., & Guldmond, H. (2001). Improving parental involvement in primary education in Indonesia: Implementation, effects and costs. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 12(4), 447-466.
- Watkins, J. M., & Cooperrider, D. (2000). Appreciative inquiry: A transformative paradigm. *OD practitioner*, 32(1), 6-12.
- Wilhelm, J. D., & Wilhelm, P. J. (2010). Inquiring minds learn to read, write, and think: Reaching all learners through inquiry. *Middle school journal*, 41(5), 39-46.
- World Bank Group. (2016). *Building Better Learning Environments in the Philippines*. World Bank.