

Human Relations Management of Secondary School Administrators in Engaging Stakeholders' Participation in Education

JOANNA O. CLAVERIA

Doctor of Education
Major in Educational Management
Urdaneta City University
joanna.claveria@deped.gov.ph

ANNIE C. MANALANG

Doctor of Philosophy
Major in History and Philosophy
Urdaneta City University
anniemanalang1947@gmail.com

Abstract — This study dealt with the extent of human relations management practices of school administrators involving stakeholders' engagement in education for the S.Y. 2022-2023. A total of one hundred sixty (160) school administrators, two hundred sixty-seven (267) members of the PTA, two hundred 88 (288) members of the faculty club, and two hundred eighty-two (282) alumni of the six (6) Divisions of Pangasinan comprised the respondents of this study. Data was collected using a questionnaire checklist designed by the researcher and then validated by field experts. The results showed that secondary school administrators have a pervasive approach to managing human relations and engaging stakeholders in education, with a weighted mean of 4.73 percent; the rating is "Very Extensive." The engagement of stakeholders among secondary school administrators is significantly dependent on their sex, years of experience as administrators, and the amount of relevant training they have received in the region. This variation in human relations management is unacceptable and requires immediate attention. All administrators must receive proper training and implement effective strategies to ensure equal engagement of all stakeholders. We do not tolerate any discrimination or neglect.

In addition, the sex of the individual and the amount of regional and national training they have received has been shown to significantly impact the level of effective human relations management when it comes to engaging stakeholders among secondary school administrators. The four dimensions of human relations management were rated, and the dimension of empowerment and control received the lowest score. Based on our analysis, it is imperative to prioritize enhancing stakeholders' sense of empowerment and control. The public secondary school administrators are encouraged to benchmark good practices of some regional schools to further improve their capabilities in engaging stakeholders to achieve organizational goals.

Keywords — *Stakeholders' Engagement, Human Relation Management, Receiving Information, Consultation, Collaboration, Partnership, Empowerment, and Control*

I. Introduction

Education is the primary avenue to impart and acquire knowledge, conversely shaping and nurturing the character and abilities of the learners. It is a lifelong process for holistic and total development, and eventually, evolves their full potential for the advancement of life. It involves developing an individual's capacities to enable them to take control of their environment and reach their full potential. Relative to this, the learned and enhanced potentials of the learners' channels to the contribution to human life impact the total evolvement for the welfare of society.

According to the Glossary of Great Education Reform, the term stakeholder is a portrayal of school-reform concepts and strategies such as leadership teams, shared leadership, and voice-which aims to expand the number of people drawn in decision-making to improve student organization and its operations. As stated by the mentioned glossary, shared leadership entails the creation of leadership roles and decision-making opportunities for teachers, staff members, students, parents, and community members.

The changing policy in the educational system to attain the needed and appropriate primary education for every Filipino learner requires all educational stakeholders to cope with innovations. The K to 12 Basic Education Program is a particular reform with its effectivity of implementation last School Year (S.Y.) 2012-2013. The development of the K to 12 Basic Education Program has been made possible by the collaborative efforts of all sectors, composed of the DepEd, CHED, TESDA, and other Stakeholders. Various entities are determined to enhance the quality of Philippine Education. These encompass different government agencies, private businesses, civil society organizations, associations of both public and private schools, the Senate, the House of Representatives, PTA's, teachers' associations, student organizations, and others.

The Basic Education Program curriculum is also sufficient to prepare students for work. The curriculum enables the students to acquire a Certificate of Competency (COC) and National Certifications (N.C.s). This is per TESDA Training Regulations. By providing graduates with intermediate-level skills, they are given more opportunities to secure gainful employment or pursue entrepreneurship. A partnership between schools and industries has been established for tech-voc tracks. This program allows students to acquire work experience while pursuing their studies and allows them to be absorbed by companies.

As to the different programs under the BEP, it strengthens the collaboration of the stakeholders and widens their participation for the direct and concrete materialization of purposes and objectives. One example of this is the Brigada Eskwela. According to DepEd Order 24, s. 2008, this nationwide program aims to involve all educational stakeholders in contributing their time, efforts, and resources towards maintaining public schools and ensuring they are ready for class opening. Another is the School Improvement Plan, as established by the Department of Education (2015), which is a roadmap that sets out specific initiatives a school undertakes within three (3) consecutive school years, with the support of the community and other stakeholders. In addition,

it seeks to enhance the three primary essential education outcome areas: access, quality, and governance. It is evidence-based, results-based, and focused on the child or learner. The plan focuses on school-based management (SBM) and is organized by the School-Community Planning Team (SPT), which has been the basis for the Annual Action Plan (AIP) for the school. The School Improvement Plan allows stakeholders to plan, implement, monitor, and evaluate their improvement plans. This could assist the school in operating effectively while also highlighting the need for interventions (Guzman, 2022).

Based on all the situations, circumstances, and premises pertinent to the K to 12 BEP discussed above, this study had been conceptualized to determine the extent of human relations management practices of school administrators toward stakeholder engagement in education in the public secondary schools of Pangasinan.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years as school administrator, number of relevant trainings attended, and self-monitoring awareness?

2. What is the extent of human relations management of secondary school administrators in engaging stakeholders' participation in education along:

- a. receiving information;
- b. consultation;
- c. collaboration and partnership;
- d. empowerment and control?

3. Are there significant mean differences in the extent of human relations management of the secondary school administrators in engaging stakeholders' participation in education across their profile variables?

4. Are there significant relationships between the extent of human relations management of secondary school administrators in engaging stakeholders' participation in education and the selected profile variables?

5. What program can be proposed to enhance the extent of human relations management of secondary school administrators in engaging stakeholders' participation in education?

II. Methodology

The researcher opted to adopt the descriptive-correlational method to examine and assess the extent of human relations management practices employed by school administrators in involving stakeholders in education.

DATA GATHERING TOOLS

The researcher employed a questionnaire checklist as this study's primary data collection instrument.

The questionnaire checklist consisted of three distinct parts, each targeting specific aspects of the research objectives. Part I of the instrument was dedicated to gathering information about the profile of the respondents. This section aimed to capture demographic details, such as age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years as a school administrator, and number of relevant training attended that could potentially influence human relations management practices. Part II of the questionnaire focused on the self-monitoring awareness of the respondents about the study being conducted. Part III of the instrument delved into the core aspect of the study, which was the extent of human relations management practices of school administrators involving stakeholders' engagement in education across receiving information, consultation, collaboration and partnership, and empowerment and control.

TREATMENT OF DATA

In order to analyze and interpret the data collected in the study, the researcher utilized the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), a widely used software program for statistical analysis. SPSS provides various tools and techniques to analyze data, allowing researchers to derive meaningful insights and draw conclusions based on empirical evidence.

The researcher evaluated various critical demographic factors, including age, gender, marital status, educational level, years of experience as a school administrator, and the number of relevant training sessions attended. The data related to these variables were analyzed using two statistical techniques: frequency counts with percentages and weighted mean, ensuring a robust exploration of the respondents' characteristics.

Furthermore, the self-awareness of the respondents was assessed using a weighted mean. This statistical approach allowed for a nuanced understanding of how respondents perceived their level of self-awareness. Respondents were asked to evaluate their awareness of human relations management practices through rating scales or Likert-type questions.

The extent of the human relations management of secondary school administrators in engaging stakeholders' participation in education along different areas, the weighted mean was used with corresponding descriptive values and equivalence in transmuted ratings.

Moreover, the *t*-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used to examine the differences in the extent of human relation management practices of school administrators in involving stakeholders' engagement in education across their profile variables.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was utilized to determine whether or not there are significant relationships between the extent of human relations management of secondary schools' administrators in engaging stakeholders' participation in education and their profile variables.

To answer problem number 5, a program to improve the extent of human relations management of secondary school administrators in engaging stakeholders' participation in education was proposed.

III. Results and Discussion

Profile of the Respondents

Age. In terms of age, the majority of the respondents' secondary school administrators belong to the age bracket of 41-50, which is 82 or 51.25 percent. 48 or 30 percent belong to the age bracket 31-40, 12 or 7.5 percent belong to the age bracket 51-60, 10 or 6.25 percent belong to the age bracket 21-30, while 8 or 5 percent belong to the age bracket 60 above. This could mean that most school heads are just in their prime age of maturity and suited for active and effective leadership.

Sex. It shows that there are more female secondary school administrators in the locale of the study, which is 82 or 51.25 percent, while 78 or 48.75 percent are males. This means that the male respondents are outnumbered by the female group. It is emphasized that women's continued development and participation in leadership positions can enhance diversity in the workplace and promote organizational success (Chuang & Eversole, 2022).

Civil status. The survey data indicates that the majority of the respondents are married. The aggregate of this account constitutes 132 or 82.5 percent of the population, while the rest are single, 25 or 15.63 percent, while 3 or 1.87 are widowed. The study of Kumento (2018) compared the circumstances of single and married professionals. The result unequivocally demonstrated that the majority of the teaching professional are married.

Highest educational attainment. A significant number of the respondents are master's degree holders that are 46 or 28.125 percent, 30 or 18.75 percent, have earned their MA units, 25 or 15.625 have earned their MA academic requirements, 20 or 12.5 are doctoral degree holders, 18 or 11.25 percent have earned their doctoral units, 10 or 6.25 percent have earned their academic requirements in doctoral. At the same time, the rest have yet to undergo post-graduate studies.

Number of Years as a School Administrator. A more significant number of the respondents have 11-15 years of experience as a secondary school principal that is 79 or 49.37%, 36 or 22.5% have 6-10 years of experience as a secondary school principal, 25 or 15.63% have 16 years and above experience. While the rest have five years and below, that is 20 or 12.5%. In terms of the number of years as a school administrator, most of them have been in the service quite long enough to have developed a school administrator's knowledge, skills, and abilities. Surprisingly, most respondents have attended at least three relevant training at the national and international extents, 95 or 59.375% and 97 or 60.625%, respectively. In comparison, they attended seven or more training in the district and division extents, that is 131 or 81.25%, 135 or 84.375%. It is seen further that the secondary school principals have attended a minimum number of relevant training on the international extent considering that it has a higher number of points given regarding ranking and promotions.

Several relevant training attended. The table also shows respondents' attendance to relevant professional growth and advancement training. Surprisingly, most respondents have attended at least three relevant training at the national and international extents, 95 or 59.375% and 97 or 60.625%, respectively. In comparison, they attended seven or more training in the district and division extents, that is 131 or 81.25%, 135 or 84.375%. It is seen further that the secondary school principals have attended a minimum number of relevant training on the international extent considering that it has a higher number of points given regarding ranking and promotions.

Table 1: The Extent of self-awareness of the respondents

Indicators	SH	TR
1. I can alter my behavior in social situations if I feel something else is called for.	4.58	FA
2. I can often read people's genuine emotions correctly through their eyes.	4.50	FA
3. I can control how I come across people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.	4.51	FA
4. During conversations, I am attentive to even the most subtle changes in the facial expressions of the person I speak with.	4.66	FA
5. My powers of intuition are good when understanding others' emotions and motives.	4.58	FA
6. I can usually tell when others consider a joke in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.	4.53	FA
7. When I feel that my image is not working, I can readily change it to something that does.	4.56	FA
8. I usually tell when I have said something inappropriate by reading the listener's eyes.	4.55	FA
9. I find it challenging to adapt my behavior to fit various individuals and circumstances.	4.51	FA
10. I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any situation I find myself in.	4.50	FA
11. I can typically detect if someone is lying to me based on their facial expressions and behavior.	4.50	FA
12. Even when it might be advantageous, I need help putting up a good front.	4.50	FA
13. Once I know what the situation calls for, I can easily regulate my actions accordingly.	4.56	FA
OWM	4.54	FA

Legend:	Descriptive Equivalent	Translated Rating
Mean Score Range	Always	Fully Aware (FA)
4.50 - 5.00	Often	Aware (A)
3.50 - 4.49	Sometimes	Moderately Aware (MA)
2.50 - 3.49	Seldom	Slightly Aware (SA)
1.50 - 2.49	Never	Not Aware (NA)
1.50 - 1.49		

The elevated extent of self-awareness experienced by these administrators bestows upon them the ability to influence outcomes and navigate complex situations. By recognizing their strengths, weaknesses, and biases, they can approach challenges with a greater understanding and adapt their perspectives accordingly. This self-awareness liberates them from preconceived notions and assumptions, enabling them to view issues from multiple angles and make more informed decisions.

The implications of this extensive level of self-awareness are significant for school administrators. By understanding themselves and their interactions with stakeholders, they can effectively manage conflicts, build strong partnerships, and promote meaningful engagement within the educational community.

Table 2

The extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders' engagement in education by the secondary school administrators, along receiving information

A. Receiving Information	SH	TC	PTA	Alumni	BO	OWM	TR
1. Accept invitations from stakeholders on updates to the Basic Education Program.	4.72	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.75	4.75	VE
2. Utilize stakeholders' information regarding the training they need to strengthen school-community partnerships further.	4.68	4.72	4.72	4.70	4.71	4.71	VE
3. Use email and newsletter for feedback from stakeholders.	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.72	VE
4. Mobilize teachers to get information from the stakeholders for effective work relationships in the implementation of school programs.	4.80	4.82	4.79	4.80	4.79	4.80	VE
5. Receive updates from stakeholders regarding their support in the implementation of school programs.	4.76	4.74	4.66	4.68	4.65	4.70	VE
6. Accept constructive feedback from the stakeholders for further improvements in the delivery of services to clientele.	4.65	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.69	VE
7. Use focus group discussions to get information from stakeholders that can help achieve organizational goals.	4.58	4.58	4.55	4.52	4.54	4.55	VE
8. Conduct environmental scanning to determine the interest and influence of stakeholders' engagement in the school.	4.70	4.71	4.71	4.72	4.70	4.71	VE
9. Log meetings of stakeholders to maintain institutional knowledge.	4.91	4.93	4.83	4.80	4.82	4.86	VE
10. Attend stakeholders meetings/to gather information as regards the extent of their participation in the implementation of DepEd programs/thrusts	4.90	4.95	4.93	4.94	4.93	4.93	VE
	OWM	4.74	4.76	4.74	4.74	4.73	VE

Legend:

Mean Score Range	Descriptive Equivalent	Translated Rating
4.50 - 5.00	Always	Very Extensive (VE)
3.50 - 4.49	Often	Extensive (E)
2.50 - 3.49	Sometimes	Moderately Extensive (ME)
1.50 - 2.49	Seldom	Slightly Extensive (SHE)
1.50 - 1.49	Never	Not Extensive (NE)

It can be gleaned from the table that secondary school administrators have a “Very Extensive” human relations management in the engagement of stakeholders in education as signified by themselves, their teacher’s club officers, PTA, alumni, and barangay council officials with an overall weighted mean of 4.74. This could mean that the secondary school heads are competent and knowledgeable regarding receiving information as part of their human relation management in engaging stakeholders’ engagement in education.

Through this, the secondary school administrators quickly established networks that facilitate communication between and among the community leaders for informed decision-making and solving school-community-wide learning problems. In this case, a smooth flow of school transactions is applied; thus, school plans aligned with institutional goals and policies are implemented.

Table 3

The extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders' participation in Basic Education by the secondary school administrators, along with consultation

B. Consultation	SH	TC	PTA	Alumni	BO	OWM	TR
1. Conducts consultation sessions with other stakeholders and DepEd officials regarding resource planning for Basic Education Program.	4.71	4.68	4.68	4.70	4.67	4.69	VE
2. Discuss with stakeholders the School Improvement Plan (SIP) 's developmental process and procedures consistent with the BEP's mission, vision, and goals.	4.65	4.70	4.73	4.68	4.72	4.70	VE
3. Organize meetings with the parents and other stakeholders concerning the learner's performance in the Basic Education Program.	4.78	4.79	4.78	4.78	4.78	4.78	VE
4. Advise stakeholders on the priority need of the school and resources needed in the implementation of school programs and projects.	4.75	4.71	4.73	4.75	4.73	4.73	VE
5. Employ the school personnel responsible for specific tasks to avoid overlapping activities.	4.85	4.82	4.81	4.81	4.80	4.82	VE
6. Suggest to stakeholders to select activities, programs, and projects in line with Basic Education Program for continuous school improvement.	4.67	4.65	4.65	4.68	4.64	4.66	VE
7. Takes action to improve the performance indicators of the school through consultation with internal and external stakeholders.	4.70	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.65	4.70	VE
8. Establish open communication with the stakeholders to listen and consider their feedback in the entire process of the Basic Education Program to ensure the quality of the different projects of the school.	4.75	4.78	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.79	VE
9. Communicate with the stakeholders the progress and accomplishments of the School Improvement Plan thru meetings, assemblies, and other forms of communication.	4.80	4.81	4.84	4.80	4.83	4.82	VE
10. Plan school activities with the stakeholders regarding the Basic Education program for the school year.	4.71	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.70	VE
	OWM	4.74	4.75	4.74	4.74	4.74	VE

Legend:

Mean Score Range	Descriptive Equivalent	Transmuted Rating
4.50 – 5.00	Always	Very Extensive (VE)
3.50 – 4.49	Often	Extensive (E)
2.50 – 3.49	Sometimes	Moderately Extensive (ME)
1.50 – 2.49	Seldom	Slightly Extensive (SHE)
1.50 – 1.49	Never	Not Extensive (NE)

It is also surprising that the alumni and PTA officials have the same equivalent rating of 4.74. This would imply that the faculty club officers and the barangay council officials observed how the secondary school heads exhibit their human relations management in engaging the stakeholders' engagement in Basic Education. The positive feedback from their peers regarding the consultation can be attributed to their pervasive extent of transmuted rating relations management.

As regards the rating given by the faculty club officers, which ranked the highest with a weighted mean of 4.75, they are confident with the capability of their school administration when it comes to consultation in engaging stakeholders in Basic Education

On the contrary, indicator no. 6, which suggests the stakeholders select activities, programs, and projects in line with the Basic Education Program for continuous improvement of the school, obtained the lowest overall weighted mean but is still described as very extensive. It manifested that stakeholders need to optimize their participation in selecting activities, programs, and projects, specifically in School Improvement Plan.

Table 4

The extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders' participation in Basic Education by the secondary school administrators, along with collaboration and partnership

C. Collaboration and Partnership	SH	TC	PTA	Alumni	BO	OWM	TR
1. Cooperate with stakeholders in periodic assessments of Basic Education Program practices using assessment tools.	4.80	4.82	4.81	4.81	4.80	4.81	VE
2. Participate in providing effective Basic Education Program communication channels among teachers.	4.69	4.65	4.69	4.70	4.68	4.68	VE
3. Collaborate with stakeholders to gather reliable data to address the school's issues and concerns.	4.70	4.68	4.70	4.73	4.70	4.70	VE
4. Engage the stakeholders in meaningful work in the school community to increase the extent of engagement among stakeholders.	4.61	4.58	4.68	4.60	4.67	4.63	VE
5. Allow stakeholders to fully participate in monitoring and reporting activities of the Basic Education Program.	4.92	4.90	4.91	4.92	4.91	4.91	VE
6. Organize a committee involving internal and external stakeholders' management of the Basic Education Program.	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.76	4.72	4.74	VE
7. Orient stakeholders on the concept of work immersion and other relative matters for the assessment of the academic status of the learners.	4.69	4.65	4.70	4.64	4.69	4.67	VE
8. Work religiously with the stakeholders in crafting policies and other activities on Basic Education Program, such as Annual Implementation Plan, Continuous Improvement Plan, School Improvement Plan, and the like.	4.89	4.85	4.87	4.85	4.86	4.86	VE
9. Cooperate with teachers and stakeholders to be involved in various school program activities to bring out learners' potential.	4.87	4.90	4.93	4.91	4.93	4.91	VE
10. Encourage teachers to upgrade to Basic Education Program through in-service training.	4.88	4.90	4.88	4.89	4.87	4.88	VE
	OWM	4.78	4.77	4.79	4.78	4.78	VE

Legend:

Mean Score Range	Descriptive Equivalent	Transmuted Rating
4.50 - 5.00	Always	Very Extensive (VE)
3.50 - 4.49	Often	Extensive (E)
2.50 - 3.49	Sometimes	Moderately Extensive (ME)
1.50 - 2.49	Seldom	Slightly Extensive (SHE)
1.50 - 1.49	Never	Not Extensive (NE)

This would imply that they perceived their school administrator heads to be very effective in collaborating with stakeholders. However, their given rating is slightly lower than the alumni and the barangay council officials, considering that they observed their school heads working religiously with the stakeholders in crafting policies and other activities in basic education programs, as evidenced by the presence of school improvement plan and the number of stakeholders participating in Brigada Eskwela and other school advocacy program.

Moreover, in terms of the “Very Extensive” level overall weighted mean in the area of collaboration and participation would imply that the school administrators are equipped with human relations management skills that could encourage stakeholders’ participation in achievement of school goals. Thus, ensuring a continuous improvement of the school in the different areas of development.

Table 5

The extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders' participation in Basic Education by the secondary school administrators, along with empowerment and control

D. Empowerment and control	SH	TC	PTA	Alumni	BO	OWM	TR	
1. Demonstrate collaborative decision-making and actions with the stakeholders in the implementation of programs, projects, and activities of the school	4.59	4.58	4.63	4.60	4.62	4.59	VE	
2. Involve stakeholders in the teachers' appraisal in the decision-making process	4.56	4.55	4.60	4.60	4.59	4.58	VE	
3. Support stakeholders' ideas, suggestions, and insights in strategic planning.	4.71	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.69	VE	
4. Entrust stakeholders in the evaluation process of the implemented school activities.	4.62	4.59	4.70	4.70	4.71	4.65	VE	
5. Deliberate with the stakeholders the feasible solutions to identify the priority needs of the school and the learners	4.73	4.70	4.71	4.68	4.70	4.70	VE	
6. Develop school project designs with the help and insights of the stakeholders	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.65	4.68	4.69	VE	
7. Delegate stakeholders to evaluate the school's programs, projects, and activities to see if they met the set objectives	4.69	4.71	4.67	4.72	4.68	4.70	VE	
8. Assure that stakeholders are part of the monitoring scheme of various activities aligned with the Basic Education Program	4.71	4.72	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.71	VE	
9. Provide stakeholders opportunities to be accountable with different school and community-initiated activities	4.69	4.65	4.70	4.60	4.70	4.66	VE	
10. Engage stakeholders in analyzing the root causes of the priority improvement areas parallel to the Basic Education Program.	4.73	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.74	4.70	VE	
	OWM	4.68	4.66	4.68	4.66	4.68	4.67	VE

Legend:

Mean Score Range	Descriptive Equivalent	Transmuted Rating
4.50 – 5.00	Always	Very Extensive (VE)
3.50 – 4.49	Often	Extensive (E)
2.50 – 3.49	Sometimes	Moderately Extensive (ME)
1.50 – 2.49	Seldom	Slightly Extensive (SHE)
1.50 – 1.49	Never	Not Extensive (NE)

This would imply that respondent secondary school administrators are very competent regarding their human relations management in engaging stakeholders, empowerment, and control. This includes their expertise in demonstrating collaborative decision-making and actions with the stakeholders in the implementation of programs, projects, and activities of the school, involving stakeholders in the teachers' appraisal in the decision-making process, supporting stakeholders' ideas, suggestions, and insights, the strategic planning process, entrusting stakeholders in the evaluation process of the implemented school activities, deliberating with the stakeholders the feasible solutions to identified priority needs of the school and learners, developing school project designs with the help and insights of the stakeholders and in delegating stakeholders to evaluate school programs, projects, and activities.

Table 6

Summary of the overall extent of human relations management of secondary school administrators in engaging stakeholders' participation in education

Summary of the overall extent of human relations management of secondary school administrators in engaging stakeholders' participation in education

Indicators	SH	TC	PTA	Alumni	BO	OWM	TR
1. Receiving information	4.74	4.76	4.74	4.74	4.73	4.74	VE
2. Consultation	4.74	4.75	4.74	4.74	4.73	4.74	VE
3. Collaboration/Partnership	4.78	4.77	4.79	4.78	4.78	4.78	VE
4. Empowerment and Control	4.68	4.66	4.68	4.66	4.68	4.67	VE
OWM	4.74	4.74	4.74	4.73	4.73	4.73	VH

Legend: SH- School Head, TC- Teacher Club Officers, PTA- Parent Teacher Association Officer, BO- Barangay Officials

Mean Score Range	Mean Score Range	Mean Score Range
4.50 – 5.00	4.50 – 5.00	4.50 – 5.00
3.50 – 4.49	3.50 – 4.49	3.50 – 4.49
2.50 – 3.49	2.50 – 3.49	2.50 – 3.49
1.50 – 2.49	1.50 – 2.49	1.50 – 2.49
1.50 – 1.49	1.50 – 1.49	1.50 – 1.49

On the other hand, though empowerment and control ranked the lowest, a slight difference is noted from the other three dimensions that catapulted a "Very Extensive" in transmuted rating. This would imply that the secondary school administrators still have room for improvement in developing a clear structure that promotes empowerment among the stakeholders, allowing them to fully participate in monitoring and reporting activities of the Basic Education program to achieve institutional goals.

Table 7

The mean difference in the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in the education of the secondary school administrators across their profile variables

Profile Variables	Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	1.833	4	.456	2.326	.057
	Within Groups	45.913	155	.198		
	Total	47.747	159			
Civil Status	Between Groups	.498	2	.249	1.239	.292
	Within Groups	47.249	157	.203		
	Total	47.747	159			
Highest Educational Attainment	Between Groups	1.272	4	.319	1.594	.176
	Within Groups	46.474	155	.199		
	Total	47.747	159			
No. of Years as School Administrator	Between Groups	4.340	5	.867	4.639	.000
	Within Groups	43.407	154	.187		
	Total	47.747	159			
Division	Between Groups	.433	2	.214	1.075	.343
	Within Groups	47.314	157	.201		
	Total	47.747	159			
Regional	Between Groups	5.805	2	2.904	16.264	.000
	Within Groups	41.941	157	.178		
	Total	47.747	159			
National	Between Groups	1.086	2	.545	2.736	.067
	Within Groups	46.661	157	.199		
	Total	47.747	159			
International	Between Groups	.331	2	.164	.820	.442
	Within Groups	47.416	157	.202		
	Total	47.747	159			
Self-Awareness	Between Groups	2.231	3	.745	3.823	.011
	Within Groups	45.516	156	.195		
	Total	47.747	159			

Based on the summary table for ANOVA, the mean difference in the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in Basic Education across profile variables is indicated. Generally, most of the data do not indicate differences among the secondary school administrators' extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders across their profile variables.

Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that there are no significant differences in the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education across profile variables age, civil status, Highest educational attainment, and the number of relevant training attended in the division and international extents are accepted at .05 extent of significance. These ANOVA results imply that secondary school administrators are similar in their extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education.

On the other hand, the profile variables, number of years as a school administrator, and the number of training attended in the regional extent marked differences in the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education.

Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that there are no significant differences in the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education by the secondary school administrators, is rejected at a .05 extent of significance. This would imply that public school administrators vary in their extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education.

Table 8

Post Hoc (Scheffe) test for the number of years as a school administrator

(I) Years as School Administrator	(J) Years as School Administrator	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
5-below	6-10	.07578	.07585	.962	-.1788	.3304
	11-15	.03416	.08328	.999	-.2454	.3137
	16-20	-.19511	.09596	.532	-.5172	.1270
	21-25	.39829	.12400	.071	-.0179	.8145
	26-above	-.21860	.11409	.599	-.6015	.1643
6-10	11-15	-.04162	.09309	.999	-.3541	.2708
	16-20	-.27089	.10459	.247	-.6219	.0801
	21-25	.32251	.13079	.302	-.1165	.7615
	26-above	-.29438	.12144	.322	-.7020	.1132
11-15	16-20	-.22927	.11009	.504	-.5988	.1402
	21-25	.36414	.13523	.207	-.0897	.8180
	21-above	-.25276	.12621	.549	-.6764	.1708
16-20	21-25	.59341*	.14339	.005	.1122	1.0747
	25-above	-.02348	.13491	1.000	-.4763	.4293
21-25	26-above	-.61689*	.15611	.010	-1.1408	-.0929

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

As shown in the table, the comparison between the years of experience as a secondary school administrator with their extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education. It can be observed that there are significant values marked with asterisks indicative of significant differences at .05 extent of significance so that the number of years as a school administrator is a positive indicator of non-comparability of the respondents' extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in Basic Education. This means that the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education by the school administrators depends on the number of years as school administrators. This varies from one category to the other, e.g., between 16-20 years of experience compared to 21-25 years of experience, 21-25 years of experience compared to 26 years and above years of experience as a school administrator are found to have a significant difference. As such, the number of years as a school administrator in

the abovementioned categories impacts the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education. This would imply that a more significant number of years of experience as school administrators would greatly help them carry their pervasive extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education.

Table 9

Post Hoc (Scheffe) test for the mean differences of the relevant training attended to the regional extent.

(I)	(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
3-below	4-6	.23937*	.07988	.012	.0426	.4362
	7-above	-.19063*	.06054	.008	-.3398	-.0415
4-6	7-above	-.43000*	.07740	.000	-.6207	-.2393

The table shows the comparison between the number of relevant training attended by in the regional extent by the respondent school administrators. There are significant values marked with asterisks that are indicated significant differences at .05 alpha extents. The number of relevant training attended to the regional extent attended is a strong positive indicator of the non-comparability of the respondents in their extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education.

This would imply that the extent of human relation management in engaging stakeholders in education by the school administrator depends on the number of relevant training attended to the regional extent. This verifies from the category to the, e.g., between 3 and below compared to 4-6, the number of training attended are found to be significant as such number of relevant training in the regional extent in the categories as mentioned earlier has an impact on the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders' participation in Basic Education. This could mean that the more significant number of relevant training attended by the respondents significantly impacts the extent of human relations management

Table 10
t-test on the significant difference in the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education across the profile variable sex

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	T	df.	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	13.260	.000	-2.783	236	.006	-.17751	.06379	-.30319	-.05184
Equal variances not assumed			-2.584	104.759	.011	-.17751	.06870	-.31374	-.04129

Levene's test was used to conduct the equality of the variances of the two groups (male and female administrators). The result of this test shows a significant Levene's F value of 13.260 at a significance level of .000, which is lesser than the set of significant levels of 0.05, which indicates a violation of the assumption of equal variance.

On the other hand, the t-test for equality of means was conducted with both equal variances assumed and equal variances not assumed. When equal variances are assumed, the t-value is -2.783 with 236 degrees of freedom. The corresponding p-value is .006, lesser than the level of significance, 0.05, which indicates a statistically significant difference between male and female administrators' extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders' participation in education.

The mean difference between male and female administrators' ratings was -0.17751. The standard error difference is 0.06379. The 95% confidence interval of the difference ranged from -0.30319 to -0.05184. These results suggest that, on average, female administrators rated their extent of human relations management slightly higher than male administrators in engaging stakeholders' participation in education.

Conversely, when equal variances are not assumed, the t-value is -2.584 with 104.759 degrees of freedom. The corresponding p-value is .011 is lesser than the significant level of 0.05, indicating a statistically significant difference between male and female administrators' ratings.

The mean difference, standard error difference, and 95% confidence interval of the difference, in this case, were the same as when equal variances were assumed. It can be said that

the profile variable sex is a positive indicator for comparability in the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders' participation in education.

Table 11

Pearson-r correlation between the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education by the secondary school administrators

Profile Variables	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)
Age	-.019	.779
Sex	.178**	.006
Civil Status	.087	.183
Highest Educational Attainment	.104	.109
No. of Years of Experience as a School Administrator	.047	.472
District	.068	.243
Division	.070	.281
Regional	.205**	.001
National	.149*	.021
International	.084	.203
Personality Type	-.086	.187

In terms of sex, there is a weak positive correlation of 0.178. This suggests a slight relationship between gender and the administrators' engagement of stakeholders. The correlation is statistically significant ($p = 0.006$), indicating that gender may play a role in influencing the extent of human relations management. However, it is essential to note that correlation does not imply causation and further analysis would be needed to understand the nature of this relationship.

Meanwhile, the correlation between civil status and the extent of human relations management is 0.087, which is very weak. This correlation is not statistically significant ($p = 0.183$), indicating that civil status does not significantly influence the administrators' engagement of stakeholders in education.

Similarly, the highest educational attainment, number of years of experience as a school administrator, attending trainings in district and division, and self-awareness show weak correlations with the extent of human relations management. None of these correlations are statistically significant ($p > 0.05$), suggesting that these variables do not significantly impact the administrators' engagement of stakeholders.

On the other hand, the regional and national levels show moderate positive correlations with correlation coefficients of 0.205 and 0.149, respectively. These correlations are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating that being involved at the regional and national levels is associated with a greater extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education.

In summary, while there are some weak correlations between certain profile variables and the extent of human relations management, the significance of these correlations is limited. However, regional and national involvement has a stronger association with the administrators' engagement of stakeholders.

The proposed plan/program for stakeholders' engagement

Stakeholder organization, group or individual	Potential role in the activity	Engagement strategy How will you engage this stakeholder in the activity?	Follow-up strategy Plans for feedback or continued involvement
A. RECEIVING INFORMATION			
Alumni	Disseminate the information of School Report Card Data likewise the School Projects, Programs and Activities	Organize annual meetings for the school management and data reporting	Provide copies and pertinent papers to them, coordinate them for possible school programs, projects and activities
Teachers/Faculty Club	Upkeep files and documents on the implemented programs, projects and activities for Basic Education Program	Create working committee on establishing various communication channels for the stakeholders	Regular monitoring and faculty meeting must integrate
PTA	Coordinate parents about the School Improvement Plan as the primary baseline in conducting school projects	Organize working committee to lead the dissemination of information to the parents	Establish meetings every quarter for the monitoring of school projects
Barangay Officials	Provide an information center for the school to disseminate information to the community	Craft a scheduled posting of the plans and current programs, projects, and activities of the school	Invite the barangay officials to all the events of the school to be updated. Regular postings of events should be monitored by the school principal
B. CONSULTATION			
1. Alumni	Prepare comments and suggestion on conducted school programs, projects, and activities	Designate them to be one of the monitoring teams of the school for school-appraisal of the Basic Education Program	Identify the issues, concern, and gaps on the implemented basic education program for its improvement
2. PTA			
3. Teacher			
	Craft a school-based appraisal tool for the monitoring and evaluation purposes to	Organize a regular meetings, create working committees, make comments and	Conduct a SWOT Analysis, strategic planning and make analysis template for the attainment of target goals

	the implemented Basic Education Program. Share insights for the improvement of School - Based Management System	suggestions on the proposed improvement of the Basic Education Program and School Based Management System	and objective
4. Barangay Officials	Provide strategic scheme for the school community extension services of the school	Build partnership and include them as a part of executive committee	Signed memorandum agreement, and resolutions for the community extension services
C. COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIP			
1. Alumni	Provide valuable resources for the implementation of Basic Education Program.	Identify them as essential donors of extending assistance to fill in the lacking or insufficient school resources, Include them as members of School Governing Council	Materialize deeds of donations, conduct physical and financial reporting, Present the School Profile, School Report Card, and School Improvement Plan
2. PTA	Engage and participate decision making process for the collaborative development of resource management system.	Clarify and define their specific roles and responsibilities in the crafting of School Improvement Plan and other related activities for the implementation of Basic Education Program.	Conduct quarterly meetings, Provide updates on planning process and request review of Basic Education Program.
3. Teachers/Faculty Club	Initiate school projects and training for Basic Education Program	Designate them as project proponent, organize working committee	Conduct regular meetings, craft project and training proposal
4. Barangay Officials	Offer support and suggestive policies and programs to strengthen relationship and partnership to the Local School Board (LSB) with the Local Government Unit	Appoint them as members of School Governing Council, School Based Management System, and School Extension Services	Invite them to attend planning meetings, and in crafting project designs
D. EMPOWERMENT AND CONTROL			
1. Alumni	Support the school community in the implementation of Basic Education Program	Sponsor school projects, programs, and activities	Provide valuable feedback to the sponsored projects, programs, and activities, Schedule a quarterly meetings and assessment of sponsored school projects, programs, and activities

PTA	Engage and participate decision making process for the collaborative development of resource management system.	Clarify and define their specific roles and responsibilities in the crafting of School Improvement Plan and other related activities for the implementation of Basic Education Program.	Conduct quarterly meetings, Provide updates on planning process and request review of Basic Education Program.
3. Teachers/Faculty Club	Facilitate the crafting of school-appraisal tool for the monitoring, and evaluation of the implement Basic Education Program.	Initiate and supervise the stakeholders during the planning, implementing and post evaluation of conduct	Conduct regular meetings, Organize Learning Action Cell on the School on the construction of school-appraisal tool, School Monitoring, Evaluation Adjustment (SMEA)
4. Barangay Official	Help to address the root causes of the issues , concern and gaps of the community projects of the school	Designate them as part of working community on the extension and community projects of the school	Coordinate meetings, feedback mechanism, organize trainings on the improvement of community projects and extension services of the school

IV. Conclusion

1. The secondary school administrators vary widely in their profile; in certain instances, their variations are extreme cases and are distinctively female-dominated respondents.
2. Secondary school administrators do a remarkable job of managing human relations to involve stakeholders in education, but even if they could perform even better, their current extent of the said management is a stepping stone toward improving not only their personal growth but also their relationship with others parallel to the organization itself.
3. The extent of human relations management across profile characteristics, including sex, number of years serving as a school administrator, and number of pertinent training attended in the regional scope, is significantly similar among secondary school administrators.
4. The secondary school administrator's extensive extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders' engagement in education is associated with the profile variables, sex, and the number of relevant training attended by the regional extents.m

V. Recommendations

Based on the salient findings in this study and the conclusions drawn, the following are recommended.

1. Since relevant training attended to the regional extent is significantly related to the extent of human relations management in engaging stakeholders in education, the school administrators should take the initiative in attending seminars and training specifically in human relations management to the regional extent to further hone their skills and capabilities in dealing with stakeholders.

2. The secondary school administrator should aspire for excellent performance in human relation management in engaging stakeholders for the school's continuous improvement.

3. School administrators are urged to benchmark the best practices with those of other institutions to develop further their capacity for involving stakeholders in achieving organizational objectives.

4. The proposed program must be implemented to improve further the key result areas of human relations management of the school administrators,

5. Further studies may be conducted related to human relations management in a broader scope.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akanbang, B. & Osei, R & Atengdem, B. P. (2013). Programme implementers' experiences of process use types in three evaluation contexts in Northern Ghana. *Operant subjectivity: The International Journal of Q methodology*. 36, pp. 297-319. Retrieved from <https://sddubidsjplm.com/journal/index.php/jplm/article/view/34/23>
- [2] Akomolafe, C. O. (2008). *Human Behaviour in Organization: Lagos: Premier Publishers*
- [3] Apodaca-Tucker, M. T., & Slate, J. R. (2002): *School-based management: views from public and private elementary school principals*. Retrieved 27 August 2011, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n23.html>
- [4] Avolio, B.J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance:MADE/born.Mahwah,NJ:Erlbaum*. [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(czeh2tfqw2orz553k1w0r45\)\)/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=1174200](https://www.scirp.org/(S(czeh2tfqw2orz553k1w0r45))/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=1174200)
- [5] Bandur, A. 2008. *A Study of the Implementation of School-Based Management in Flores Primary Schools in Indonesia*. Published Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Newcastle, Australia. Documents accessed and retrieved on August 15, 2013 from <http://goo.gl/3wiz1n>.
- [6] Bartle P., (2007). *Participatory Management: Methods to Increase Staff Input in Organizational Decision Making*: accessed available at <http://cec.vcn.bc.ca/cmp/modules/pm-pm.htm>
- [7] Belenardo, S. J. (2001): *Practices and conditions that lead to a sense of community in middle schools*. *NASSP Bulletin*, 85(627), 33-45.

- [8] Chuang, Szufang, and Barbara Eversole. "Organization Development and Effectiveness: Essential Female Leadership Competencies for Industry 4.0 Transformation." *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal* 41.1 (2022): 37-49. Retrieved from <https://awl-ojs-tamu.tdl.org/awl/article/view/411>
- [9] Continuing Professional Development (2012). Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. Continuing Professional Development. Retrieved from <https://docplayer.net/49533108-Monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-continuing-professional-development-2012.html>. Accessed: 28/05/2020.
- [10] Dininni, J. (2017). Human relations management theory. Retrieved from <https://www.business.com/articles/human-relations-management-theory/july/2017>
- [11] Duke, D. & Ganseder, B., (1990). Teacher Empowerment: The View from the Classroom. *Education Policy*.
- [12] Emeagwali, S. (2009). Fostering parent-teacher collaboration in the classroom. *Techniques (Association for Career and Technical Education)*, 84(5), 8.
- [13] Ferlazzo, L. (2015). Creating the conditions for student motivation, student engagement, 19 March. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/creating-conditions-for-student-motivation-larry-ferlazzo>
- [14] Flynn, G. (2007). Increasing parental involvement in our schools: The need to overcome obstacles, promote critical behaviors, and provide teacher training. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 4(2), 23–30
- [15] Freeman, R.E. (2010). *Strategic management: A stakeholders' approach*. University Press.
- [16] Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- [17] Frew, A. (2010). *Practices and Challenges of Implementing School Improvement Program in Primary Schools of Jimma City Administration*. Unpublished Senior Essay. Addis Ababa University.
- [18] Gamage, D. T., & Pang, N. S. (2003). *Leadership and Management in Education: Developing Essential Skills and Competencies*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- [19] Guzman, J. (2022). Stakeholders' participation in School Improvement Plan and School Performance of Secondary Schools. *International Journal of Arts, Sciences and Education*, 3(July Special Issue), 51-66.
- [20] Harrison, J. B. (2019). *Part IV-Stakeholders' theory in education and practice*. University Press.
- [21] Hemmati M (2002). Multi-stakeholder processes for governance and sustainability: beyond. Retrieved: [id=bKNj41QI2RwC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260211111_Multi-stakeholder_processes_for_governance_and_sustainability_beyond)
- [22] Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [23] Koopman, P. L., & Wierdsma, A.F.M. (1998): Participative management. In P.J.D. Doentgen, H.
- [24] Kossen, S. (1994). *The Human Side of Organizations*. New York: Harper Collins.
- [25] Landau, P. (2022, MARCH 22). What Is a Stakeholder? Definitions, Types & Examples. Retrieved from PROJECT MANAGER: <https://www.projectmanager.com/blog/what-is-a-stakeholder>
- [26] Leal Filho, W., & Brandli, L. (2016). Engaging Stakeholders for Sustainable Development. *World Sustainability Series*, 335– 342. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-26734-0_21

- [27] Leung, A.K., & Chiu, C. (2010). Multicultural Experience, idea receptiveness, and creativity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 41(5-6), 723-741. doi:10.1177/0022022110361707
- [28] Neal, J. (Ed.). (2018). *Handbook of Personal and Organizational Transformation*. Fayetteville, AR, USA: Edgewalkers International. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/referencework/10.1007/978-3-319-66893-2>
- [29] Newman, B. (1997). *10 Laws of Leadership*. Benin City: Marvellous Christian Publications.
- [30] McBurney, D., & White, T. L. (2009). *Research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- [31] Maryani (2017) Coordination Patterns In Educational Institutions In The Perspective Of Islam. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 6 (4). pp. 2059-2063. ISSN (Online): 2319-7064
- [32] Mesele, S. (2011). *Current Practices and challenges of School Improvement Program in Some Selected Primary Schools of SodoZuraWoreda in Wolyita Zone*. Senior Essay Addis Ababa University (Unpublished).
- [33] Moreno, J.L. (1960). *The sociometry reader*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- [34] O'Hair, M. J., & Reitzug, U. C. (1997): *Restructuring schools for democracy: Principals' Perspective*. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7, 266-286.
- [35] Omodan, Bunmi & Tsotetsi, Cias & Bekithemba, Dube. (2020). Analysis of human relations theory of management: A quest to re-enact people's management towards peace in university system. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*. 8. 1184. 10.4102/sajhrm.v18i0.1184.
- [36] Rhodes, Jo & Bergstrom, Bruce & Lok, Peter & Cheng, Ting Pong. (2014). A framework for stakeholder engagement and sustainable development in MNCs. *Journal of Global Responsibility*. 5. 10.1108/JGR-02-2014-0004.
- [37] Sage pub (2011). *Human relations Theory and People Management*. Retrieved from Sagepub.com
- [38] Sukawati, N. N., Gunawan, I., Ubaidillah, E., Maulina, S., & Santoso, F. B. (2020, November). *Human resources management in basic education schools*. In *2nd Early Childhood and Primary Childhood Education (ECPE 2020)* (pp. 292-299). Atlantis Press. Retrieved from <https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/ecpe-20/125946118>
- [39] Studd, K. (2002). *An Introduction to deliberate methods of Stakeholders' and Public Participation*. ISSN 0967- 876X: English Nature Research Report.
- [40] Thierry, & C. J. de-Wolf (Eds.), *Personnel psychology: Handbook of work and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 297-324). Hove, UK: Psychology Press/Erlbaum Taylor and Francis.
- [41] Unerman, J., Bebbington, J. & O'Dwyer, B., 2010. *Sustainability Accounting and Accountability*, Routledge. Retrieved from https://books.google.de/books?id=8G2sAgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=falsehttps://books.google.de/books?id=8G2sAgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false
- [42] Wong, E. O. W. (2003). *Leadership Style for School-Based Management in Hong Kong*. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 17(6), 243-247.
- [43] Woodruff SG and Kowalski TJ (2010) Problems reported by novice high school principals. In: Shoho A, Barnett B and Tooms A (eds) *The Challenges Of New Principals in the 21st Century*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Shun-NG->

2/publication/276086727_Preparing_school_leaders/links/5ecba608a6fdcc90d69750cc/Prepa
ring-school-leaders.pdf