EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.57 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 12 | Issue:7 |July 2025

THE INTERPLAY OF ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF SCHOOL HEADS ON STAKEHOLDERS SUPPORT IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF PANABO CITY DIVISION

Clinton M. Mosqueda
Master of Arts in Educational Management, Rizal Memorial Colleges, Inc.

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra23388
DOI No: 10.36713/epra23388

ABSTRACT

The study explored the relationship between administrative functions of school heads and stakeholders support in public secondary schools of Panabo City Division. Also, it investigated the association of the involved variables and the domains of administrative functions of school heads that significantly influence their stakeholders support With the use of probability sampling, 184 Grade 10 teachers were selected as the respondents. Utilizing the descriptive-correlational survey method, the data collated were analyzed through the use of Mean, Product-Moment correlation and Regression Analysis. Results revealed that there was a high administrative functions of school heads and high stakeholders support as perceived by the respondents. Furthermore, there was a significant relationship between administrative functions of school heads and stakeholders support. Moreover, all domains of administrative functions of school heads, namely, student personnel administration, staff personnel administration, school-community relation, management of school finances, management of school physical tasks, and general tasks, were found to have significantly influence the stakeholders support. Based on the findings, it was further suggested that higher officials in the Department of Education may identify means on how to strengthen the administrative functions of school heads which would invite more stakeholders support. Moreover, future researchers may further explore the involved variables considering other factors and research methods.

KEYWORDS: *Administrative Functions; Stakeholders Support; Descriptive Correlational; Panabo City Division; Philippines*

INTRODUCTION

Stakeholder support is essential in achieving educational goals, as collaborative efforts significantly enhance student success and strengthen communities (Watts, 2023). Despite this, schools often face challenges in sustaining external stakeholder involvement due to factors such as leadership mobility, coordination issues, lack of top-level support, and limited engagement from community members and organizations (Shanko, 2020). Globally, similar issues persist—ranging from lack of awareness in Nigeria (Yaro et al., 2018), conflicting interests in the U.S. (Prado Tuma & Spillane, 2019), to political and socio-economic barriers in Tanzania (Chacha & Tangi, 2023).

In the Philippine context, studies reveal limited stakeholder engagement beyond basic financial or logistical support. For instance, in Bontoc, LGU and barangay contributions are minimal (Cayabas et al., 2023), while in Quezon Province, schools face a lack of collaboration and resources (Nieva & Lim, 2023). In Mindanao, programs like Brigada Eskwela reflect low volunteer turnout and support consistency (Balinas, 2018; Colonia et al., 2024). In Panabo City Division, stakeholder participation remains weak, partly due to passive administrative outreach.

The active involvement of stakeholders is widely recognized as vital to educational quality and student performance (Çayak & Karsantık, 2020; Darrel et al., 2020). However, there is limited empirical evidence exploring how school heads' administrative functions can be aligned to strengthen such support. This study seeks to investigate the level of administrative functions of school heads and the extent of stakeholder support in schools, as well as the relationship between these two variables.

Findings from this research aim to inform educational leaders and policymakers in crafting effective strategies to enhance stakeholder engagement. Furthermore, the study intends to contribute to academic discourse through presentations at various educational forums and publication in a Scopus-indexed journal.

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.57 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 12 | Issue:7 |July 2025

REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT LITERATURE

This study is anchored on the administrative functions of school heads as the independent variable and stakeholders' support as the dependent variable. The administrative functions comprise six indicators: student personnel administration, staff personnel administration, school-community relations, management of school finances, management of school physical tasks, and general tasks (Ytem, 2023). Stakeholders' support includes planning, organizing, actuating, monitoring, and evaluating (Pascual, 2023). The following literature provides empirical and theoretical foundations for the variables involved.

Administrative Functions of School Heads

School administrators are central to fostering effective teaching and learning. They manage school operations, oversee staff and student performance, maintain facilities, and ensure adherence to educational goals (Altun & Bulut, 2021; Lewis, 2019). Administrators serve both instructional and managerial roles, including strategic planning, budgeting, evaluation, and staff development (Ray et al., 2021; Valmores, 2021). Their responsibilities have evolved due to growing demands from society and government institutions (Lee & Mao, 2020), requiring skills in leadership, communication, and decision-making (Jabonillo, 2022; Galvin, 2022).

Student Personnel Administration

Student personnel administration involves managing student records, academic performance, orientation, attendance, discipline, and support services (Owan & Ekaette, 2019; Chaudhary, 2023). School heads and teachers work collaboratively to meet student needs while aligning with institutional goals. Effective leadership in this area promotes a conducive learning environment and impacts student success (Sunaengsih et al., 2019).

Staff Personnel Administration

Personnel administration focuses on recruitment, development, training, and performance appraisal of staff (Salma et al., 2022; Elujekwute, 2022). Effective leadership enhances staff competence and engagement (Bashori et al., 2021). Principals must match institutional goals with employee needs, reinforcing that human resources are central to school success (Olalekan & Omojola, 2021; Rodriguez et al., 2022).

School-Community Relations

Strong school-community relationships foster student development and educational quality (Fiore, 2021; Haryati et al., 2021). Principals are expected to build inclusive communication channels with parents and stakeholders, enabling community involvement in school programs (Nobis, 2022; Tua & Rini, 2022). Open communication and collaboration promote mutual accountability and shared educational goals (Gaugham, 2024).

Management of School Finances

Financial management includes budgeting, fund allocation, monitoring, and reporting (Asy`ari et al., 2024; Amos et al., 2021). School heads often face challenges such as limited training, policy complexity, and resource shortages (Wadasen, 2024). Competent financial management is essential for accountability and education quality, highlighting the need for regular training and strategic oversight (Mirando & Jalos, 2023; Munyalo & Njoka, 2022).

Management of School Physical Tasks

School facilities management covers planning, procurement, maintenance, and supervision of infrastructure (Gunawan et al., 2020). Adequate infrastructure contributes to learning effectiveness and staff performance (Siswanto & Hidayati, 2020; Taiwo, 2019). The principal plays a key role in ensuring safe, well-maintained environments that support academic achievement (Elfina, 2022).

General Administrative Tasks

Principals act as planners, organizers, supervisors, and motivators (Chan et al., 2022). Their tasks include setting goals, implementing work plans, overseeing performance, and fostering collaboration among stakeholders (Noureen Shah & Zamir, 2020; Aquino et al., 2021). Effective leadership is driven by a clear vision, strong communication, and the ability to unite and inspire the school community (Liang, 2023; Munna, 2021; Demirdag, 2021).

Stakeholders' Support

Stakeholders' support is a vital component in the success of school improvement initiatives, especially when aligned with the continuous improvement cycle. School heads must possess a solid understanding of educational improvement processes to effectively engage families and community partners (Rafah & Woods, 2019; Campbell, 2019). Creating a strong school community involves building trust, fostering accountability, and enabling reciprocal exchanges of resources and expertise. Inclusion of stakeholders in planning, decision-making, and implementation can reduce resistance to change and build a shared sense of responsibility for student outcomes (Paraiso, 2022; Montemayor, 2019; Silberstein, 2023).

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.57 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 12 | Issue:7 |July 2025

Planning involves integrating external stakeholders—such as parents, alumni, and local businesses—into the development and execution of school plans. Their involvement in needs prioritization and strategic design contributes to better alignment with community needs and improves educational outcomes (Obiekwe et al., 2020; Elwy et al., 2022). However, implementation often faces barriers like lack of cooperation, insufficient leadership, and limited funding (Guzman, 2022). Effective communication of strategic plans and regular feedback mechanisms are essential to deepen stakeholders' understanding and support (Murugi & Mugwe, 2023).

Organizing refers to mobilizing and structuring stakeholder roles to support school goals. Schools are increasingly called to extend learning beyond classroom walls by connecting students with real-life contexts through community partnerships (Kujala et al., 2022). Action teams composed of administrators, educators, parents, and community members can plan, implement, and monitor partnership activities (Hands, 2023). A collaborative organizational culture enhances responsiveness and strengthens stakeholder ties.

Actuating highlights the importance of stakeholder empowerment and participation in operationalizing school initiatives. Stakeholders contribute through volunteerism, resources, and advocacy for educational improvement. Although awareness and participation are moderate (Millano & Callo, 2024), meaningful involvement—such as participatory problem-solving and decision-making—can significantly improve educational outcomes (Luik & Lepp, 2021; Wang et al., 2022). Collaboration also ensures adaptability to technological and societal changes (Bozkurt et al., 2020; Burke & Dempsey, 2020).

Monitoring ensures ongoing stakeholder engagement and program accountability. Parents, LGUs, and other community actors provide financial, psychosocial, and logistical support, especially in underserved areas (Cayabas et al., 2023; Gecolea et al., 2023). However, disparities exist, as schools in affluent communities tend to provide more involvement opportunities than those in poorer districts (Lynch, 2021). Policies must address such gaps by equipping families with the tools to support student success (Patton, 2019). Stakeholder salience varies depending on the institutional and societal context (Alsowaidi & Hasna, 2023).

Evaluating involves assessing the effectiveness of school programs, with stakeholders playing key roles in ensuring quality and accountability. Evaluations inform decision-making and guide improvement initiatives (Nwanakezie & Ogona, 2022). While external evaluation systems are designed to promote transparency and development (Hofer et al., 2020), their impact depends on school staff responsiveness and contextual relevance (Olafsdottir et al., 2022; Seabra et al., 2021). As such, evaluation processes must be collaborative, transparent, and actionable.

Integration of School Heads' Administrative Functions and Stakeholders' Support

The administrative functions of school heads are interwoven with stakeholder engagement. Principals must reconcile institutional priorities with community expectations, especially in resource-constrained environments (Prado Tuma & Spillane, 2019; Ytem, 2022). Empowering stakeholders through shared leadership, training, and transparent communication fosters a culture of collaboration and school ownership (Sanam et al., 2024). Strong stakeholder participation improves academic performance, promotes equity, and enhances overall school governance (Ramasimu, 2023; Darrel et al., 2020).

Community engagement initiatives—such as partnerships with NGOs, local businesses, and public service entities—enhance educational access and relevance, especially for marginalized students (Behtoui, 2019; Amaba, 2024). Open communication channels and strengthened public relations enable schools to address challenges more responsively and holistically (Werdiningsih, 2020). Ultimately, fostering accountability, inclusiveness, and mutual support among stakeholders ensures the sustainability and success of school improvement efforts.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study determined the relationship between the administrative functions of school heads and stakeholders support in public secondary schools of Panabo Division. More specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of administrative functions of school heads as perceived by the public secondary teachers in terms of:
    - 1.1 student personnel administration;
    - 1.2 staff personnel administration;
    - 1.3 school-community relation;
    - 1.4 management of school finances;
    - 1.5 management of school physical tasks; and
    - 1.6 general tasks?
2. What is the level of stakeholders support as perceived by the public secondary teachers in terms of:
    - 2.1 planning;
    - 2.2 organizing;

2.3 actuating;
2.4 monitoring; and
2.5 evaluating?

3. Is there a significant relationship between administrative functions of school heads and stakeholders support?
4. Which domains of administrative functions of school heads significantly influence the stakeholders support?

METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology for this study, encompassing the research design, research participants, research tools, data collection procedure, and data analysis to be utilized in this investigation.

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative methodology, focusing on a descriptive correlational approach. Quantitative research collects numerical information and employs statistical methods for analysis. The objective is to produce objective, empirical data that can be measured and expressed in numerical terms. This approach is frequently used to test hypotheses, identify patterns, and predict future results. Quantitative data consists of numerical figures, whereas qualitative data is more descriptive and pertains to observable events that cannot be quantified (McLeod, 2023).

On the other hand, the descriptive correlational approach aims to assess the extent of the relationship between two or more variables using statistical methods. This design emphasizes revealing and understanding the connections among different data points. While it seeks to uncover trends and patterns within the dataset, it does not attempt to establish causal relationships. This type of observational research refrains from determining cause and effect; instead, it analyzes the data, relationships, and variable distributions in their natural context without any manipulation (Bhandari, 2023).

This research was categorized as quantitative, utilizing numerical data for analysis and interpretation. It adopted a descriptive approach to evaluate how the administrative functions of school heads influence support from stakeholders. Furthermore, it was correlational in nature, examining the relationship between the administrative functions of school heads and the support provided by stakeholders within the public secondary schools of the Panabo City Division.

Research Respondents

This study focused on a sample of 184 Grade 10 teachers from the Panabo City Division. Utilizing the Raosoft calculator, the total population of 350 public secondary school teachers with at least three years of teaching experience resulted in a calculated sample size of 184. When determining sample sizes, various factors such as resource availability and statistical considerations were taken into account. Generally, a sample size of 100 was considered the minimum for larger populations. However, the specifics of data analysis and expected response rates significantly influenced the sample size in research. Many statisticians agreed that a sample of at least 100 is essential for generating meaningful results (Akman, 2023). Thus, the selection of 184 respondents exceeded this minimum threshold.

The researcher also applied a probability sampling method called cluster random sampling. This approach allowed for examining a population comprehensively without needing to survey each individual, making it both economical and efficient. By segmenting the population into clusters, this method ensured the sample accurately represents the larger group. Random selection of participants within clusters was used to ensure each cluster has an equal chance of being part of the study (Mahmutovic, 2021).

The inclusion and exclusion criteria for this study required participants to be Grade 10 teachers with at least 3 years of teaching experience, as this timeframe was anticipated to provide them with an in-depth understanding of their school head's administrative role and the level of support from external stakeholders. Participants retained the right to withdraw from the survey if they felt uncomfortable or choose not to participate, and their choice was respected fully. This approach highlighted the study's commitment to prioritizing the comfort and well-being of all participants throughout the research process.

Research Instruments

Data for this study were gathered using an adapted survey questionnaire developed specifically for this research. The questionnaire consisted of two sections to comprehensively meet the study's objectives: the first section examined the administrative roles of school heads, while the second evaluated the support from stakeholders.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The study revealed that school heads exhibited a high level of administrative functions across most domains, particularly in student personnel administration, staff personnel administration, and financial management. In terms of student personnel administration, the results indicated that school heads consistently performed key functions such as setting performance goals, gathering student data, and encouraging varied teaching strategies. These efforts suggest a strong administrative focus on improving student outcomes and supporting instructional quality.

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.57 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 12 | Issue:7 |July 2025

Similarly, in the domain of staff personnel administration, school heads demonstrated high engagement through respectful workplace conduct, effective communication, and holding staff accountable for their duties. These practices foster a productive school climate and contribute to efficient school operations. The results affirm that school heads maintain a balance between professional support and performance oversight.

With respect to school-community relations, the findings showed a moderately high level of administrative function. While school heads were found to engage with the community through participation in activities and project collaborations, their involvement was observed to be less frequent compared to other areas. This suggests the need for deeper and more sustained efforts to strengthen school-community ties.

Financial management emerged as another area of high administrative engagement. School heads effectively allocated budgets, prioritized impactful projects, and ensured transparency in fund utilization. Their strategic use of financial resources reflects a commitment to fostering student success and improving overall school performance.

On the other hand, the management of physical facilities was rated at a moderately high level. School heads demonstrated awareness in maintaining and planning infrastructure improvements and preventive maintenance, though their actions in this area were occasionally evident rather than consistently applied. This indicates room for enhancement in the consistency and frequency of physical facilities management.

Overall, the findings underscore the comprehensive role school heads play in educational administration. Their strong performance in key administrative areas contributes positively to school effectiveness, though targeted improvements in school-community engagement and physical facilities management may further enhance their impact. These results align with related literature emphasizing the importance of leadership in promoting school development, resource management, and stakeholder collaboration.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Presented in this chapter are the findings based on the results of data gathered, the conclusions drawn from the findings and the recommendations for consideration.

The main focus of the study was to determine the significance of the relationship between administrative functions of school heads and stakeholders support in public secondary schools. The study was conducted in the selected public schools of Panabo City Division. There were one hundred eighty-four (184) grade 10 teachers who participated in this study. Descriptive correlational method of research was used in this study utilizing adapted research instruments. The said instruments were validated by the panel of experts and subjected to pilot testing before it was made ready for administration. Mean, Pearson Product Correlation of Coefficient, and Regression Analysis were the statistical tools used in analyzing the data. The hypothesis raised in this study was tested at 0.05 level of significance.

The level of administrative functions of school heads is high. This suggests that effective execution of tasks such as planning, organizing, budgeting, and reporting. This high level of performance reflects strong leadership and management skills that support smooth school operations. As a result, it likely contributes to better institutional efficiency, staff coordination, and overall school performance.

Meanwhile, the level of stakeholders support is high. This indicates that strong involvement and commitment from parents, community members, and other external partners in school activities. This high level of support enhances resource availability, strengthens school-community relationships, and promotes a shared responsibility for student success. Such engagement is essential in fostering a collaborative and supportive educational environment.

It was found out that there is a significant relationship between administrative functions of school heads and stakeholders support of teachers. Moreover, all domains of administrative functions of school heads are linked to stakeholders support of teachers. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This highlighted the impact of effective leadership on community engagement.

Furthermore, all domains of administrative functions were found to be significantly influential in strengthening stakeholder support. Of which, student personnel administration indicates a higher influence on the stakeholders support compared to other indicators. This suggests that well-executed administrative practices by school heads foster greater trust, collaboration, and involvement from stakeholders in supporting teachers and school initiatives.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were offered:

The level of administrative functions of school heads is high which means that it is oftentimes evident. Notably, student personnel administration, staff personnel administration, management school finances, and general tasks are oftentimes evident while school-community relations and management of physical facilities are occasionally evident.

Meanwhile, the level of stakeholders support is high. Specifically, planning, monitoring, and evaluating are oftentimes evident. On the other hand, organizing and actuating are occasionally evident.

Based on the findings, administrative functions and stakeholders support are related. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis confirming there is a significant relationship between administrative functions and stakeholders support.

Also, all domains of administrative functions of school heads significantly influenced the stakeholders support. Of which, student personnel administration has the greater impact on stakeholders support. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis confirming that all domains of administrative functions of school heads have significant impact on stakeholders support.

The significant and positive correlation between the administrative functions of school heads and the stakeholder support substantiated the principles established in the System Theory of Management by Bertalanffy (1950) as cited in Große (2023). In the context of this study, this theory views a school as an interconnected system where each part, administration, teachers, students, parents, and the community, affects and is affected by others. Under Systems Theory, school heads act as key agents who align internal operations with external inputs, enabling a collaborative approach to resource management, policy alignment, and addressing community needs. This theory highlights the importance of open communication and feedback loops between the school and its stakeholders to maintain balance and enhance overall educational outcomes, making it particularly suitable for analyzing the impact of stakeholder support on the administrative efficacy of school heads.

Recommendations

The following suggestions were offered based on the conclusions of the study:

In light with the findings, DepEd officials may strengthen capacity-building programs focused on enhancing the less evident domains of administrative functions, particularly school-community relations and physical facilities management. These areas play a critical role in fostering stronger stakeholder support, especially in organizing and actuating school initiatives. By providing targeted training, allocating resources, and setting performance standards for these administrative areas, DepEd may help school heads further improve stakeholder engagement and ensure more holistic and sustainable school development.

Moreover, school heads are encouraged to strengthen their administrative functions by giving more attention to school-community relations and the management of physical facilities, as these areas are only occasionally evident yet play a vital role in building stakeholder support. Enhancing these domains may lead to more active involvement of stakeholders in organizing and actuating school initiatives. By fostering strong partnerships with the community and maintaining conducive learning environments, school heads may significantly boost collaboration and support, ultimately contributing to more effective school operations and outcomes.

Furthermore, teachers may collaborate with school heads in enhancing school-community relations and the management of physical facilities, as these areas were found to be only occasionally evident. By participating in community outreach activities, providing feedback on facility needs, and supporting school-led initiatives, teachers may contribute to strengthening stakeholder engagement. Their involvement will help reinforce the connection between administrative functions and stakeholder support, fostering a more inclusive and responsive educational environment.

Lastly, future researchers may conduct further studies that explore the less evident domains of administrative functions such as school-community relations and management of physical facilities, and their deeper impact on stakeholder support, particularly in organizing and actuating. Expanding the scope to include qualitative methods like interviews or focus group discussions may provide richer insights into the specific challenges and contextual factors affecting these areas. Additionally, comparative studies across different school divisions or regions may offer a broader understanding of how administrative practices influence stakeholder engagement in diverse educational settings.

REFERENCES

1. *Aina, A. & Plessis, A. (2023). Financial management in fee-paying public schools in South Africa: How responsible is the school governing body? https://scielo.org.za/pdf/saje/v43n4/06.pdf*
2. *Akman, S. (2023). Research type and sample size: Is there a correlation? https://forms.app/en/blog/correlation-between-research-type-and-sample-size*

3. *Alave, J. & Ancho, I. (2020). Outsourcing funds for the preparation of school opening: The experiences and best practices of rural public schools. https://www.journal.nu.ac.th/JCDR/article/view/Vol-13-No-1-2020-19-27*
4. *Alsowaidi, S. & Hasna, M. (2023). Unveiling the interests of stakeholders in institutional accreditation. https://doi.org/10.5430/irhe.v8n2p44*
5. *Altun, S. & Bulut, M. (2021). The roles and responsibilities of school administrators during the emergency remote teaching process in Covid-19 pandemic. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1324043.pdf*
6. *Amaba, V. (2024). Stakeholders' involvement and the performance level of secondary schools in area II-A of Leyte Division. https://www.jetir.org/papers/JETIR2405F82.pdf*
7. *Amos, O., Ephrahem, G., & Africanus, A. (2021). Effectiveness of school heads' financial management skills in provision of quality education in secondary school. https://www.ijern.com/journal/2021/March-2021/15.pdf*
8. *Anderson, G., Drone, D., Drouin, C., Kobus, K., Martin, N., Molgat, E., & Pinet, L. (2019). Good governance: A guide for trustees, school boards, directors of education and communities. Ontario Education Services Corporation.*
9. *Andokari, A T., Agbe, J., & Okwori, A. (2021). Problems of staff management and the implementation of universal basic education (UBE) programme in southern education Zones of Taraba State. https://www.bsum.edu.ng/journals/files/jem/vol2n1/article2.pdf*
10. *Aquino, C., Afalla, B. & Fabelico, F. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1327379.pdf*
11. *Asy`ari, F., Winarni, R. & Al-Amin. (2024). Efficiency of school financial management and its impact on improving the quality of teaching and learning. https://btqur.or.id/index.php/injosedu/article/view/158*
12. *Balci, S. & Ozkan, H. (2023). Development, implementation, and evaluation of an effective feedback program for school principals to improve in-class teaching. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ej1392140.pdf*
13. *Balinas, J., (2018). Stakeholders support in the Brigada Eskwela program of Department of Education in the Division of Negros Occidental, Philippines. Journal of Education and Technology Management, 1(1), 18-22.*
14. *Bangayan- Manera, A. (2020). Writing without permission: A case study on skinner's analogy through vandalism. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343880670*
15. *Barrett, P., Treves, A., Shmis, T., & Ustinova, M. (2019). The impact of school infrastructure on learning: A synthesis of the evidence. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ed604388.pdf*
16. *Bashori, B., Prasetyo, M. A. M., & Susanto, E. (2020). Change management transfromation in islamic education of Indonesia. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340988514*
17. *Behtoui, A. (2019). Swedish young people's after-school extra-curricular activities: attendance, opportunities and consequences. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01425692.2018.1540924*
18. *Bhandari, P. (2023). Correlational research: When & how to use. https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/correlational-research/*
19. *Bozkurt, A., Jung, I., Xiao, J., & Vladimirschi, V. (2020). A global outlook to the interruption of education due to COVID-19 pandemic: Navigating in a time of uncertainty and crisis. https://asianjde.org/ojs/index.php/AsianJDE/article/view/462*
20. *Bridich, S. (2021). Approved to fail: A Case study of leadership at three new high schools. https://digitalcommons.du.edu/elps_fac/2*
21. *Burke, J. & Dempsey, M. (2020). Covid-19 practice in primary schools in Ireland report. http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14091.03369*
22. *Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. NY: Harper & Row.*
23. *Campbell, M. (2019). A plan for supporting new initiatives. https://www.edutopia.org/article/plan-supporting-new-initiatives*
24. *Cayabas, J., Codod, C., Sumeg-ang, D. & Lacaben, E. (2023). Contributions and partnership strategies of external stakeholders in the implementation of the alternative learning system in Bontoc District: Insights from Teachers. https://mail.ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/view/8016*
25. *Çayak, S., & Karsantık, I. (2020). A stakeholder approach to the educational process: Parental involvement. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348170091*
26. *Chacha, M., Tangi, F., & Mhagama, M. . (2023). Challenges facing stakeholders' participation in improving teaching and learning process in public secondary schools in Rorya District, Mara, Tanzania. International Journal of Humanities and Education Development (IJHED), 5(6), 30-36. https://doi.org/10.22161/jhed.5.6.4*
27. *Chan, T., Ridley, A. & Morris, R. (2022). Principals' perception of their roles as curriculum leaders: A comparison of high, middle and elementary schools. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1360925.pdf*
28. *Chaudhary, R. (2023). Exploring student-administration relations in educational institutions: A multifaceted analysis. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377650168*
29. *Cherry, K. (2024). How transformational leadership can inspire others. https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-transformational-leadership-2795313*
30. *Colonia, R., Osias, N., & Comon, J. (2024). Stakeholders' participation on the implementation of Brigada Eskwela Program: Basis for an intervention plan. European Modern Studies Journal, 2024, 8(3) 659*
31. *Darrel, A. P., Anietie, R., & George, A. (2020). Stakeholders consultation for secondary educational goals achievement in public schools in Rivers State. https://www.globalscientificjournal.com/researchpaper/Stakeholders*
32. *Dedumo, L., Chua, L., Ninal, M. & Ederio, N. (2024). Financial management and resource allocation practices in the schools division of Surigao Del Norte, Philippines. https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2024/4/25687.pdf*
33. *Demirdag, S. (2021). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher motivation. https://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie/vol13/iss2/6*
34. *Elfina, E. (2019). The importance of facilities and infrastructure management in school. www. enrichment.iocspublisher.org*

35. *Elujekwute, E., Danburam, I., Uwalaka, M. & Umar, I. (2022). The roles of the head teacher in ensuring good personnel management policies and strategies in educational organizations. https://www.sgojahds.com/index.php/SGOJAHDS/article/download/396/425*
36. *Elwy, A., Maguire, E. M., Kim, B. & West, G. S. (2022). Involving stakeholders as communication partners in research dissemination efforts. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8993948/*
37. *Evangelista, C. D. R. (2019). Stakeholders' commitment to continuous learning and capacity building in support of brigada eskwela implementation. https://journal-ems.com/index.php/emsj/article/view/1172*
38. *Figueiredo, C. (2024). External school evaluation feedback and school self-evaluation: what feedback is provided? https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/real/issue/83953/1300512*
39. *Fiore, D. (2021). School-community relations. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003025993*
40. *Galvin, M. (2022). Effective practices of feedback of elementary school administrators during the post-observation conference. https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/3611*
41. *Gaugham, H. (2024). Starting small: Perspectives on building family and community engagement in preschool. https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:4f23vw64w/fulltext.pdf*
42. *Gecola, C., Pagulayan, E. & Gecolea, P. (2023). Implementation of project CBISp-EDP (Communicate, Build and Intensify Stakeholders' Participation- Exemplified and Deepened Partnership) and external stakeholders' participation. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370358574*
43. *González-Falcón, I., García-Rodríguez, M. P., Gómez-Hurtado, I., & Carrasco-Macías, M. J. (2019). The importance of principal leadership and context for school success: insights from '(in)visible school.' School Leadership and Management. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1612355*
44. *Grace, O., Abuya, I. & Amolo, P. (2020). Influence of stakeholder empowerment on mobilization of resources for science activities in early years' education programmes in Kisumu West Sub-County, Kenya. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/33922878*
45. *Große, C. (2023). A review of the foundations of systems, infrastructure and governance. https://pdf.sciencedirectassets.com/271730/1-*
46. *Gunawan, I., Bafadal, I. & Nubardi, A. (2020). School leadership strategy in excellent schools. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/347424880*
47. *Guzman, J. (2022). Stakeholders' participation in school improvement plan and school performance of secondary schools. https://ijase.org/*
48. *Hands, C. (2023). School-community collaboration: Insights from two decades of partnership development. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-19-9972-7_3*
49. *Haramain, J. (2023). Administration of academic support system and achievement of desired outcomes of student affairs and services in higher educatioN: A correlational inquiry. https://philarchive.org/archive/haraoa-19*
50. *Haryati, W., Kristiawan, M., & Puspita, Y. (2021). School principal strategy in improving the school based management through the quality of education. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210716114*
51. *Hofer, S. I., Holzberger, D., & Reiss, K. (2020). Evaluating school inspection effectiveness: A systematic research synthesis on 30 years of international research. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. stueduc.2020.100864*
52. *Jabonillo, E. (2022). School culture and its implications to leadership practices and school effectiveness. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=21069*
53. *Jungay, T. & Guillo, R. (2019). Promoting educational stakeholder volunteerism in the division of Batangas City, Philippines. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/a437/d5f4db6dbca48558b5e733593494d072610a.pdf*
54. *Ketprapakorn, N. & Kantabutra, S. (2022). Toward an organizational theory of sustainability culture. https://pdf.sciencedirectassets.com/*
55. *Kujala, J., Sachs, S., & Laude, D. (2022). Stakeholder engagement: past, present, and future. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/00076503211066595*
56. *Lee, S. & Mao, X. (2020). Recruitment and selection of principals: A systematic review. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1741143220969694*
57. *Lewis, D. (2019). Examining the phenomenon of elementary school principal succession through the perspectives and experiences of novice principals. https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/3199*
58. *Liang, X. (2023). Professional attributes of school administrators towards a strategic development. https://drpress.org/ojs/index.php/ajmss/article/view/15252/14798*
59. *Lolo, J M. N., & Cabigas, M. E. A. (2023). The school heads' and personnels' perception on administrative services. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371569908*
60. *Luik, P. & Lepp, M. (2021). Local and external stakeholders affecting educational change during the coronavirus pandemic: A study of facebook messages in Estonia. https://doi. org/10.3390/educsci11030113,*
61. *Lynch, J. (2021). Elementary school teachers' and parents' perspectives of home–school engagement and children's literacy learning in a lowincome area. https://www.adi.org/journal/2021ss/LynchSS21.pdf*
62. *Mahmutovic, J. (2021). What is cluster sampling? Pros, cons, and examples. https://www.surveylegend.com/sampling/cluster-sampling/*
63. *McConell. K., Geesa, R., Mayes, R. & Elam, N. (2020). Improving school counselor efficacy through principal-counselor collaboration: A comprehensive literature review. https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/mwer/vol32/iss2/4*
64. *McLeod, S. (2023). Qualitative vs quantitative research methods. https://www.simplypsychology.org/qualitative-quantitative.html*
65. *Merano, E. (2023). Financial management competence of school heads and performance of schools in Leyte division. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376075028*

66. *Millano, G. & Callo, E. (2024). Awareness level of internal and external stakeholders' participation in the implementation of sustainable school programs and projects: input to effective stakeholders management plan. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=22574*
67. *Mirando, R. & Jalos, L. (2023). Financial management practices of school heads related to the implementation of the basic education learning continuity plan (BE-LCP) in the Division of Quezon: Basis for intervention program. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=21464*
68. *Montemayor, A. (2019). Family engagement for school reform. https://www.idra.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Lit-Review-Family-Engagement-for-School-Reform-IDRA.pdf*