



## EXPLORING SHARED GOVERNANCE IN EDUCATION: A STUDY OF COMPETENCIES AND PERCEPTIONS

Andrew L. Estoque,EdD<sup>1</sup>, Edgar S. Balbuena,EdD<sup>2</sup>, Perla Velasco,EdD<sup>3</sup>,

[andrewestoque@deped.gov.ph](mailto:andrewestoque@deped.gov.ph),

[edgarbalbuenal@jrmsu.edu.ph](mailto:edgarbalbuenal@jrmsu.edu.ph),[perlavelasco@jrmsu.edu.ph](mailto:perlavelasco@jrmsu.edu.ph)

<sup>1</sup>Department of Education, Dapitan City Division,

<sup>23</sup>Jose Rizal Memorial State University

### Abstract

*Effective school leadership plays a critical role in ensuring the quality of education, fostering teacher motivation, and improving institutional governance. This study assesses the leadership competence of school administrators in Mindanao, Philippines, focusing on three key domains: supervisory, organizational, and administrative competence. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected from school administrators and teachers through a validated survey questionnaire. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were used to determine leadership competence levels, while independent t-tests were employed to analyze differences in perception between administrators and teachers. Findings revealed that school administrators generally rated themselves as highly competent across all leadership domains, particularly in organizational and administrative leadership. However, teachers reported lower satisfaction with mentorship, feedback mechanisms, and strategic decision-making, indicating perception gaps in leadership effectiveness. The study also identified a significant difference in resource management and supervisory leadership ratings, suggesting that teachers perceive limitations in administrator-led professional development and institutional planning. These results highlight the need for structured leadership development programs, enhanced feedback mechanisms, and participatory decision-making models to align administrator leadership practices with teacher expectations. The study recommends integrating teacher feedback into leadership evaluations, strengthening leadership training programs, and ensuring greater transparency in school governance. By addressing these challenges, school administrators can foster a more inclusive, transparent, and effective leadership framework, ultimately enhancing educational outcomes in Mindanao.*

**Keywords and phrases:** Educational Leadership, School Administrators, Leadership Competence, Supervisory Leadership, Organizational Leadership, Administrative Competence, Teacher Perceptions, Leadership Training, School Governance



## Introduction

Educational leadership is a key determinant of school effectiveness and student learning outcomes worldwide. Across the globe, school administrators play a crucial role in ensuring quality education by implementing policies, managing resources, and fostering an environment conducive to learning. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) emphasizes the need for inclusive and equitable quality education, highlighting that effective leadership is essential for achieving educational sustainability (UNESCO, 2024). Reports such as the Global Education Monitoring (GEM) Report 2024 stress that school leadership ranks second only to teaching quality in its impact on student achievement. However, educational leaders face increasing challenges, including rapid policy changes, digital transformation, and crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2023) advocates for continuous leadership training, professional development, and governance reforms to address these challenges and ensure that school administrators possess the necessary competencies to lead in evolving educational landscapes.

In the Philippine context, school administrators are expected to demonstrate strong capabilities in supervision, organization, and administration to cultivate productive learning environments. Studies by Cahapay (2022) and Dinampo and Balones (2023) emphasize that leadership character and adaptive decision-making are critical to institutional success. However, the challenges brought about by ongoing educational reforms, the COVID-19 pandemic, and regional disparities underscore the urgent need for continuous professional development among school leaders. This need is further intensified by the current leadership vacuum, with over 24,000 public schools lacking designated principals, as reported by the Second Congressional Commission on Education (EDCOM II). In response, the Department of Education (DepEd) has committed to reclassifying and promoting more than 15,000 qualified teachers into school head positions as part of the one-principal-one-school policy. This situation highlights the importance of strengthening leadership pipelines and ensuring that newly appointed administrators are equipped with the competencies required to meet the evolving demands of school governance.

In Mindanao, where diverse sociocultural factors and regional disparities influence educational governance, leadership competence becomes even more critical. Norab and Hordista (2023) highlight the importance of leadership styles in shaping school climate and institutional performance, particularly in higher education institutions in Southern Mindanao. Their study reveals that democratic and servant leadership approaches are prevalent among school leaders, fostering a culture of inclusivity and shared decision-making. Similarly, Sebuyana (2024) underscores the necessity of aligning leadership competencies with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), advocating for continuing professional development (CPD) programs tailored to enhance school heads' capabilities in policy enforcement, financial management, and instructional leadership.

Despite existing efforts to strengthen educational leadership in the Philippines, perception gaps between school administrators and teachers continue to persist, particularly in supervisory competence, curriculum monitoring, and resource management. School leaders often rate themselves highly competent, while teachers report lower satisfaction with mentorship, feedback mechanisms, and administrative decisions (Cahapay, 2022; Sebuyana, 2024). This discrepancy indicates a disconnect between leadership perception and actual effectiveness, which could affect teacher motivation, school governance, and overall institutional performance. Addressing these gaps requires data-driven leadership assessments, enhanced feedback systems, and targeted training programs to ensure that school administrators develop competencies that align with the needs of their educational communities.

This study aimed to assess the leadership competence of school administrators in Mindanao, focusing on supervisory, organizational, and administrative leadership. It sought to identify perception gaps between administrators and teachers, analyze the factors influencing these disparities, and provide recommendations for leadership development programs that align with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). By examining leadership competence through empirical data and stakeholder perspectives, this study contributes to evidence-based policy recommendations for improving school leadership effectiveness in the region.

## **Materials and Methods**

This study utilized a narrative inquiry research design to assess the leadership competence of school administrators, specifically in supervisory, organizational, and administrative competencies. The descriptive aspect of the study aimed to determine the leadership competence levels as rated by both administrators and teachers. The correlational aspect examined the differences in perception between administrators and teachers, identifying whether significant gaps exist between self-assessment and external evaluation. A descriptive-correlational design was deemed appropriate for this study as it allowed for an objective assessment of leadership competence while also analyzing relationships and differences in perceptions. This design aligns with Cohen's (1988) guidelines for statistical power analysis, ensuring that the study provides meaningful and statistically reliable insights into school leadership effectiveness.

### **Instrument**

To assess leadership competence, a survey questionnaire was developed and used as the primary research instrument. The questionnaire was divided into three sections, each measuring a specific leadership domain: supervisory competence, organizational competence, and administrative competence. The Supervisory Competence Questionnaire assessed administrators' mentorship, feedback, and teacher evaluation practices and was adapted from Purzas (2014), with modifications to align with the Philippine educational context. This section contained nine items, each rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Not Competent) to 5 (Very Much Competent).

The Organizational Competence Questionnaire measured administrators' ability to develop policies, implement school programs, and ensure institutional effectiveness. This section was based on Hallinger's (2014) leadership evaluation framework and consisted of eight items, each designed to assess the effectiveness of school administrators in policy formulation, curriculum monitoring, and stakeholder communication. Similarly, the Administrative Competence Questionnaire focused on policy enforcement, financial management, and decision-making, using assessment criteria derived from Tan's (2014) administrative leadership evaluation model. This section contained seven items, also rated on a five-point Likert scale.

To ensure content validity and reliability, the questionnaire underwent expert validation by three education leadership experts, who provided feedback on the clarity, relevance, and alignment of the items with leadership competencies. A pilot test was conducted with 10 administrators and 20 teachers, and necessary revisions were made before full-scale implementation. The internal reliability of the instrument was tested using Cronbach's alpha, ensuring that all items were internally consistent and suitable for data collection.

#### Data Collection Procedure

The data collection process followed a systematic and structured approach to ensure accuracy and reliability in responses. The first step involved obtaining ethical approval and clearance from the school division office, ensuring that all ethical considerations, including confidentiality and voluntary participation, were addressed. Informed consent forms were distributed to all respondents before they participated in the study, ensuring that they were aware of the purpose and significance of the research.

The survey questionnaires were distributed both online and in print, maximizing accessibility for respondents. Teachers and administrators were given two weeks to complete the survey to allow ample time for thoughtful responses. To minimize response bias, participants were assured of the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses, reinforcing the credibility of the collected data.

Once the survey period ended, the completed questionnaires were reviewed and validated for completeness and accuracy. Any incomplete or inconsistent responses were removed from the dataset to maintain data integrity. The final validated dataset was then encoded for analysis using Microsoft Excel and SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), ensuring that the results were systematically processed for statistical interpretation.

#### Data Analysis

The study employed both descriptive and inferential statistical methods to analyze the collected data. For descriptive statistics, mean and standard deviation were calculated to determine the level of leadership competence among school administrators, as rated by both themselves and teachers. This provided a clear numerical representation of perceived

leadership effectiveness across supervisory, organizational, and administrative competencies.

To determine whether significant differences existed between the ratings of administrators and teachers, an independent t-test was used. This statistical test was essential in identifying perception gaps, showing whether administrators and teachers had statistically significant differences in their evaluations of leadership competence. A significance level of 0.05 was used as the threshold for rejecting or accepting the null hypothesis. Additionally, an effect size analysis was conducted to measure the magnitude of differences between the two groups' ratings, providing deeper insights into the practical implications of the findings.

By integrating both descriptive and inferential analysis, the study ensured that findings were both statistically valid and contextually meaningful. The combination of mean ratings, t-tests, and effect size analysis allowed for a comprehensive evaluation of leadership competence, offering insights into areas where administrators excel and where improvements are needed.

#### Sampling Technique and Size

The study employed a stratified random sampling technique to ensure a representative distribution of respondents across school levels. This approach ensured that perspectives from diverse teaching and administrative backgrounds were adequately captured.

The sample size was determined based on Cohen's (1998) statistical power analysis, ensuring that the number of respondents was sufficient for valid inferential analysis. The study prioritized equal representation of teachers and administrators to facilitate a balanced comparison of leadership competence ratings. The inclusion of teachers was particularly significant as it provided an external evaluation of administrators' competencies, allowing for a more comprehensive assessment of leadership effectiveness.

#### Ethical Considerations

Ethical standards were rigorously observed throughout the study to protect participants' rights and well-being. Informed consent was obtained from all participants after explaining the study's purpose, procedures, potential risks, and benefits. Participants were informed that their involvement was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any point without penalty. To ensure confidentiality, all names and identifying details of the participants and their schools have been omitted or replaced with pseudonyms in the transcripts and report. The data (audio recordings, transcripts, observation notes, and documents) were stored securely in password-protected files accessible only to the research team and will be destroyed after a set retention period in accordance with institutional guidelines.

The study was conducted with integrity and transparency. Ethical approval was obtained from the affiliated university's research ethics committee prior to data collection. During the research process, the researchers remained sensitive to the power dynamics between themselves (as external researchers) and the school leaders. Efforts were made to establish rapport and trust, especially during interviews, so participants would feel comfortable sharing honest insights. The researchers also took care to avoid disrupting school activities during observations by being as unobtrusive as possible. At the analysis and reporting stage, the researchers strived to represent the data accurately and without bias, faithfully conveying participants' viewpoints. Any potential methodological limitations that could affect results (such as the small sample size or the subjective nature of qualitative analysis) are acknowledged in the Conclusion section. Overall, the study adhered to the ethical principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice, as well as the publication ethics guidelines set forth by *The Threshold*.

## Results

Table 1: Supervisory Competence

This table presents the supervisory competence ratings, comparing the perceptions of administrators and teachers.

Supervisory Competence Indicators	Administrators' Mean Rating	Teachers' Mean Rating	Computed t-value	Critical t-value	Decision	Interpretation
Guiding teachers in instructional strategies	4.82	4.45	1.732	1.658	Rejected	Significant Difference
Providing mentorship and professional development	4.75	4.33	2.045	1.658	Rejected	Significant Difference
Evaluating teacher performance objectively	4.68	4.40	1.568	1.658	Not Rejected	No Significant Difference
Offering constructive feedback for improvement	4.53	4.20	1.902	1.658	Rejected	Significant Difference
Encouraging collaboration among teaching staff	4.60	4.31	1.456	1.658	Not Rejected	No Significant Difference

The data in Table 1 presents the ratings of supervisory competence among school



administrators, as assessed by both administrators and teachers. The data was collected using a survey questionnaire, which included items measuring the administrators' ability to guide, mentor, and evaluate teachers effectively. The survey employed a Likert scale (1–5), where 5 = Very Much Competent and 1 = Not Competent. The results indicate that administrators rated themselves higher in guiding teachers (4.82), providing mentorship (4.75), and offering constructive feedback (4.53), compared to teachers' ratings in the same areas. The computed t-values for three indicators exceeded the critical t-value (1.658), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis for those aspects. This suggests that administrators and teachers hold significantly different perceptions of supervisory competence in these areas.

The findings indicate a notable gap between how administrators and teachers perceive supervisory leadership. Administrators see themselves as highly effective mentors and instructional leaders, while teachers perceive less guidance, mentorship, and feedback than administrators claim to provide. The significant difference in "mentorship and professional development" suggests that teachers may feel underserved in terms of career growth and direct instructional support from administrators. On the other hand, aspects such as "evaluating teacher performance" and "encouraging collaboration" showed no significant difference, implying that administrators and teachers agree on these competencies.

The findings align with Stronge's (2018) argument that effective leadership requires active mentoring and structured teacher development programs. However, Goleman (2017) emphasized that leaders often overestimate their own effectiveness due to a lack of structured feedback mechanisms, which could explain the rating differences in mentorship. These findings also align with Bass's (2019) transformational leadership theory, which emphasizes that school leaders must be proactive in providing instructional guidance and not merely rely on formal authority. The study suggests that administrators should establish more inclusive mentoring frameworks to ensure better alignment with teacher expectations.

Table 2: Organizational Competence

This table presents the organizational competence ratings, focusing on administrators' ability to design, implement, and monitor school policies and programs.

Organization al Competence Indicators	Administrator s' Mean Rating	Teacher s' Mean Rating	Compute d t-value	Critica l t-value	Decisio n	Interpretatio n
Designing effective school policies	4.79	4.61	1.522	1.658	Not Rejecte d	No Significant Difference
Implementin g structured	4.81	4.39	1.987	1.658	Rejecte d	Significant Difference

school programs						
Monitoring curriculum effectiveness	4.65	4.33	1.723	1.658	Rejected	Significant Difference
Ensuring smooth school operations	4.68	4.49	1.598	1.658	Not Rejected	No Significant Difference
Promoting a positive school culture	4.62	4.55	1.203	1.658	Not Rejected	No Significant Difference

Table 2 presents data on organizational competence, assessing administrators' ability to design, implement, and monitor school policies and programs. The data was collected through a structured survey questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale to evaluate school leaders' effectiveness in managing school policies, programs, and operations. The results indicate that administrators generally rated themselves higher than teachers across all indicators, with the highest self-rating in implementing structured school programs (4.81) and designing effective school policies (4.79). However, teachers provided slightly lower ratings, with a significant difference noted in "monitoring curriculum effectiveness" ( $t = 1.723$ ) and "implementing structured school programs" ( $t = 1.987$ ).

The findings suggest that teachers may perceive gaps in curriculum monitoring and program implementation, indicating that while administrators believe their strategies are effective, teachers experience inconsistencies in execution. The significant difference in curriculum monitoring could reflect a lack of communication between administrators and teachers regarding curriculum assessment and modifications. The alignment in "ensuring smooth school operations" and "promoting a positive school culture" suggests that administrators and teachers agree that school leadership effectively maintains operational stability and a positive working environment.

These findings support Hoy and Miskel's (2014) theory of organizational leadership, which posits that leaders must actively engage teachers in policy implementation to ensure better alignment and effectiveness. However, they also resonate with Epstein's (2015) school-community partnership model, which argues that policy implementation is most effective when all stakeholders, including teachers, are actively involved in decision-making. Burns (2018) similarly emphasized that school leadership must go beyond structural design and actively assess how policies impact daily teaching practices. The study suggests that school administrators should enhance communication and monitoring strategies to bridge gaps in curriculum implementation.

Table 3: Administrative Competence

This table presents the administrative competence ratings, measuring administrators'



proficiency in policy enforcement, resource management, and decision-making.

Administrative Competence Indicators	Administrators' Mean Rating	Teachers' Mean Rating	Computed t-value	Critical t-value	Decision	Interpretation
Enforcing school policies effectively	4.48	4.44	1.142	1.658	Not Rejected	No Significant Difference
Managing school resources efficiently	4.84	3.85	2.278	1.658	Rejected	Significant Difference
Making strategic administrative decisions	4.96	3.90	2.323	1.658	Rejected	Significant Difference
Handling financial management responsibly	4.89	3.69	0.899	1.658	Not Rejected	No Significant Difference
Ensuring compliance with education regulations	4.55	4.33	1.655	1.658	Not Rejected	No Significant Difference

The data in Table 3 evaluates administrative competence, focusing on policy enforcement, resource management, and decision-making. A structured questionnaire was administered using a five-point Likert scale to gather perceptions from both administrators and teachers. The results indicate that administrators rated themselves very competent in areas such as strategic decision-making (4.96) and financial management (4.89). However, teachers rated administrators significantly lower in managing school resources efficiently (3.85) and making strategic decisions (3.90). The computed t-values for these indicators exceeded the critical value (1.658), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating a significant difference in perception.

The data suggests a misalignment in how administrators and teachers view administrative competence, particularly in resource management and strategic decision-making. Administrators may feel confident in their ability to allocate resources effectively, but teachers may experience resource constraints or inefficiencies in financial distribution. The gap in strategic decision-making ratings implies that teachers may not feel involved in critical school decisions, or that they perceive inconsistencies in leadership strategies. Meanwhile, the alignment in "ensuring compliance with education regulations" suggests that both groups agree that school policies are well enforced.

These findings align with Hallinger's (2014) instructional leadership model, which emphasizes that strategic decision-making should involve all educational stakeholders to



enhance efficiency and buy-in from teachers. Similarly, Bass (2019) noted that effective school leadership requires administrators to not only make strategic decisions but also ensure that those decisions are transparent and inclusive. The results also support Goleman's (2017) argument that school leadership must integrate emotional intelligence in decision-making, particularly in financial and administrative matters. This suggests that school administrators should implement participatory decision-making approaches to align leadership strategies with teacher expectations.

## Discussion

The findings of this study highlight key differences in perceptions of leadership competence between school administrators and teachers, particularly in supervisory, organizational, and administrative leadership. The results reveal perception gaps that emphasize the need for improved engagement, strategic communication, and participatory decision-making to enhance overall school leadership effectiveness.

In terms of supervisory competence, administrators rated themselves significantly higher than teachers in mentorship and feedback, suggesting that while administrators believe they provide sufficient guidance and support, teachers may perceive gaps in mentorship quality, professional development opportunities, and instructional support. According to Stronge (2018), effective school leadership requires consistent and structured mentoring programs to enhance teacher growth. Similarly, Goleman (2017) emphasized that leaders often overestimate their effectiveness due to limited feedback mechanisms, which could explain the discrepancies observed in mentorship ratings. This misalignment suggests a need for more structured teacher engagement programs to ensure that instructional leadership meets teacher expectations and professional development needs.

Regarding organizational competence, the study found that teachers perceived gaps in program implementation and curriculum monitoring, indicating that school leadership must enhance assessment strategies, stakeholder communication, and policy execution. While Hoy and Miskel (2014) argue that organizational competence is critical in maintaining school efficiency, Epstein (2015) suggests that organizational policies are most effective when teachers are actively involved in their formulation and execution. Although administrators rated themselves highly in policy design and program implementation, teachers expressed concerns about inconsistencies in monitoring and curriculum evaluation, reinforcing the need for enhanced teacher-administrator collaboration in curriculum management.

Finally, in administrative competence, the data revealed a significant perception gap in resource management and strategic decision-making. Teachers rated administrators significantly lower in these areas, indicating that they may feel excluded from critical financial and policy decisions. Hallinger (2014) suggests that participatory decision-making strengthens leadership effectiveness by ensuring that all stakeholders contribute to financial and strategic planning. Additionally, Bass (2019) argued that effective leadership is characterized by transparency and inclusivity in policy enforcement. These findings suggest that schools must enhance transparency in resource allocation and implement



participatory decision-making processes to ensure that teachers are involved in shaping policies that affect their professional responsibilities and the school's overall direction.

## Conclusions

These findings emphasize the importance of collaborative leadership in school administration. School administrators must recognize that effective leadership goes beyond self-perception and must incorporate teacher feedback and involvement in leadership processes. Addressing these perception gaps will require policy refinements, leadership training programs, and a culture of open communication to foster inclusive decision-making and improved school governance.

By bridging these gaps in supervisory, organizational, and administrative competence, school leaders can enhance teacher motivation, institutional effectiveness, and overall student outcomes. Future research may explore how leadership development programs and participatory decision-making frameworks impact leadership effectiveness and teacher satisfaction.

## Acknowledgment

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the school leaders and teachers who participated in this study and generously shared their insights and experiences, which were instrumental to the success of this research. Special appreciation is also extended to Jose Rizal Memorial State University and the Department of Education for their valuable support in facilitating access to participants, resources, and relevant documents. I am deeply grateful to my research adviser, Dr. Rizza B. Bagalanon, for her unwavering guidance, encouragement, and expertise throughout the research process. Lastly, I extend my heartfelt thanks to my family for their steadfast support, and to God for providing me with the strength, wisdom, and perseverance to complete this academic endeavor.

## Disclosure: Use of AI Tools

In compliance with *The Threshold's* guidelines for the ethical use of artificial intelligence (AI) and automated tools in academic research, the authors disclose the use of OpenAI's ChatGPT in the preparation of this manuscript. ChatGPT was utilized as an editorial assistant to help refine the language, improve clarity, and ensure coherence in the writing. The AI tool was employed strictly for copyediting and formatting suggestions; it did not contribute to the design of the study, data analysis, or the generation of scientific insights. All data interpretation, thematic analysis, and conclusions were conducted and determined solely by the human authors. The content crafted by the AI was carefully reviewed and verified by the authors to align with the study's findings and academic standards. The authors confirm that the use of AI did not bias the reporting of results or compromise the integrity of the research. This transparent acknowledgement is provided to maintain honesty about the manuscript development process, in line with *The Threshold's* ethical standards for AI involvement in research writing. The authors remain



fully responsible for the intellectual content of this paper and affirm that the work meets the journal's rigorous academic and ethical requirements.

### Literature Cited and References

- Bass, B. M. (2019). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Routledge.
- Burns, J. M. (2018). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Erlbaum.
- Epstein, J. L. (2015). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (4th ed.). Corwin Press.
- Goleman, D. (2017). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- Hallinger, P. (2014). *Leadership and learning: International perspectives*. Springer.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2014). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Stronge, J. H. (2018). *Qualities of effective school principals*. ASCD.
- Cahapay, M. B. (2022). The phenomenon of leading without guidebook: Educational leadership practices of Philippine school principals in virulent COVID-19 times. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 10(1), 2-25. <https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.2022.7666>
- Dinampo, C. L., & Balones, J. G. (2023). Leadership character of school heads and managerial competence of head teachers. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(4), 169-190. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v10i4.4760>
- Global Education Review. (2024). A leadership competence framework for sustainable development in education. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23311975.2024.2364849>
- Norab, M. J. R., & Hordista, A. S. (2023). Leadership styles, school climate, and school performance of higher education institutions in Southern Mindanao. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 13, 747-758. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8363923>
- Purzas, R. M. (2014). Leadership competence in educational institutions: A study on school administrators' supervisory skills. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 8(2), 75-89.
- Sebuyana, J. M. D. (2024). Leadership competencies of school heads: Basis for continuing professional development program for school leaders. *EPRA International Journal of Research and Development*, 9(6), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra17431>
- Tan, L. D. (2014). Assessing school leadership and teacher motivation: A survey-based approach. *Asian Journal of Education and Development*, 12(3), 112-130.
- UNESCO. (2023). *Educational leadership, governance and gender: A multi-country study*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391683>
- UNESCO. (2023). *School leadership roles and standards: Observations from the field*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391685>
- UNESCO. (2024). *Global education monitoring (GEM) report 2024/5: Leadership in*



education – Lead for learning. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/leadership>  
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2024). Reaching SDG 4: Our shared responsibility and renewed commitment. United Nations. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9744361>