School Head's Supervisory Skills and Implementation of Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP) Among Secondary Schools of Surigao Del Norte Division Amidst Pandemic

Janriel Gordonas Maturan
St. Paul University Surigao, Cor. San Nicolas and Rizal Streets, Surigao City
Surigao Del Norte National High School, Peñaranda Street, Brgy. Washington, Surigao City
Email: janrielmaturan@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0007-8424-4684

Abstract
This research investigated the supervisory skills of school heads in secondary schools within the Surigao del Norte Division during the pandemic. It examined their skills in areas such as instructional leadership, human resource management, learning environment, community partnership, and school operations. Additionally, the study explored the implementation of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP). The study employed a descriptive survey method. The findings indicated that all three school heads received an "outstanding" rating based on the OPCRF, signifying exceptional performance and commitment. The BE-LCP implementation was also perceived as "very high" by teachers, with 96-100% successful implementation. Interestingly, the study found no significant relationship between the school heads' OPCRF rating and the BE-LCP implementation. Similarly, there was no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of the school heads' supervisory skills and their actual OPCRF ratings.

Keywords: Supervisory Skills, BE-LCP Implementation, Secondary Schools, Surigao Del Norte, Pandemic

1. Introduction
The global pandemic triggered a seismic shift in education, abruptly transitioning from traditional face-to-face instruction to remote learning modalities (Baron et al., 2021). While this crisis underscored the resilience and adaptability of the education sector, it also presented formidable challenges, particularly in the realm of instructional supervision (Glickman et al., 2010).

The pandemic disrupted established supervisory practices, forcing school heads and administrators to navigate uncharted territory. The shift to remote work arrangements and the need to cater to learners' diverse needs in a virtual environment amplified the complexity of instructional supervision. As Alfonso, Firth, & Neville (1984) emphasize, effective supervision necessitates a blend of knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical acumen.

In this context, school principals faced the daunting task of upholding instructional quality and ensuring smooth school operations amidst unprecedented circumstances. The pandemic underscored the critical importance of their role in adapting supervisory practices to support teachers and students in the new normal.

Research Objectives
1. To collect profile data on School Heads.
2. To collect profile data on teacher respondents.
3. To evaluate School Heads' Supervisory Skills based on OPCRF ratings.
4. To gauge School Heads' Supervisory Skills as perceived by teachers.
5. To analyze the school's BE-LCP.
6. To measure the level of implementation of the BE-LCP as perceived by teachers.
7. To examine the relationship between supervisory skills and BE-LCP implementation.

8. To compare OPCRF ratings and teacher perceptions of supervisory skills.
9. To design enrichment programs for School Heads.

2. Literature Review

In academia, supervision fosters collaboration between school leaders, like principals and school heads, and their teachers (Venas, 2020). This shared vision of teaching and learning is crucial for achieving educational goals (Glickman et al., 2015). Supervision encompasses daily operations, coordination, and positive interpersonal relationships (Durotulo, 2002). Supervisors inspire, guide, and support their subordinates (Tampan, 2016). Effective supervision enhances job satisfaction, curriculum development, and new professional success (Holmes, 2014). The COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacted educational institutions worldwide, causing widespread closures and affecting over 90% of the student population (UNESCO, 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted not only our daily lives but also our social interactions and the way education is delivered. It has necessitated adjustments in supervision, impacting school performance. Supervisory skills are evaluated using the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF), which covers areas like instructional leadership, learning environment, human resource management, and community partnerships. The Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP) implementation level is assessed using Regional Memorandum No. 251, series of 2020, which outlines key dimensions such as safe operations, focus on learning, and well-being.

The pandemic has also prompted revisions to the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), as outlined in DepEd Memorandum No. 050, s. 2020. This emphasizes the need for continuous professional development for teachers and school leaders to improve learning outcomes. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 further recognizes the importance of professional standards for school heads, highlighting their critical role in fostering a conducive learning environment.

The Department of Education (DepEd) introduced its plan for continuous learning during the Covid-19 pandemic through DepEd Order No. 12, s. 2020. This plan, called the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP), aims to address the challenges brought about by the pandemic and ensure the health, safety, and well-being of all involved in the education sector (DepEd Order No. 12, s. 2020, section 2).

The BE-LCP prioritizes health and safety while offering learning opportunities through blended distance learning modalities until face-to-face instruction is permitted again (DepEd Order No. 12, s. 2020, section 14). The plan was developed with several guiding principles: prioritizing health and safety, ensuring learning continuity through various modifications, facilitating the safe return of staff and students, addressing equity concerns, and linking the BE-LCP to the broader goals of quality education and future-oriented learning (DepEd 2020).

3. Methodology

This study used a descriptive survey approach to quantify school heads' supervisory skills and BE-LCP implementation during the pandemic. Focusing on large public secondary schools in Surigao Del Norte, the research employed purposive universal sampling to select participants. Data collection tools included a modified RPMS-PPSSH questionnaire for supervisory skills and a researcher-made questionnaire for BE-LCP implementation. Documentary analysis was also conducted on school heads' OPCRs and BE-LCPs. Data analysis involved statistical techniques using Microsoft Excel. Ethical considerations were prioritized throughout the study.

4. Results and Discussions

Table 1. Demographic profile of the School Head

Group		f (N=3)	%
Sex			
	Male	3	100.00

School			
	School 1	1	33.33
	School 2	1	33.33
	School 3	1	33.33
Designation			
	Principal I	1	33.33
	Principal IV	2	66.67
Highest Educational Attainment			
	PhD Degree Holder	1	33.33
	MA Degree Unit Earner	2	66.67
Number of Years as School Head			
	8 years	1	33.33
	35 years	1	33.33
	39 years	1	33.33

Table 1 shows that all three school heads in the study are male. Two are Principal IVs and one is a Principal I. Two have earned master's degrees, while one holds a doctorate. All three have over 8 years of experience, and two have over 30 years of experience as school heads. These findings relate to existing research on gender and educational attainment in school leadership. Burton (2021) suggests that gender isn't a barrier to leadership roles or styles, but Tan et al. (2020) note that gender orientation can influence leadership approaches. Kintanar (2017) highlights the importance of educational attainment for effective leadership, suggesting that underperforming schools might be linked to principals' lack of professional development. Therefore, it's crucial for school heads to continually engage in professional development opportunities.

Table 2. Demographic profile of the Teachers

Group		ƒ (N=260)	%
School			
	School 1	52	20.00
	School 2	63	24.23
	School 3	145	55.77
Designation			
	Teacher-I	58	22.31
	Teacher-II	105	40.38
	Teacher-III	73	28.08
	Master Teacher-I	12	4.62
	Master Teacher-II	8	3.08
	Master Teacher-III	4	1.54
Number of Years as Teachers			
	1-8 years	176	67.69
	9-16 years	35	13.46
	17-24 years	21	8.08
	25-32 years	24	9.23
	33 years and above	4	1.54

Table 2 displays the demographic profile of the teacher participants. In this table, it can observe that School 3 has the most numbered participants with a number of 143 or 55.77% of the total population while School 1 has the fewer number of participants with 52 or 20% and followed by School 2 with 63 or 24.23% of the total population. Also in this table, it is evident that most teacher participants are Teacher II with 105 or 40.38% of the total population while only 4 or 1.54% are Master Teacher III followed by Master Teacher II and I with 8 or 3.08% and 12 or 4.62% respectively and Teacher I and III has 58 or 22.31% and 73 or 28.08% respectively. It is also shown in the table that 176 or 67.69% of the teacher participants mostly has 1-8 years of teaching experience while few only with 4 or 1.54% are 33 years and above in service followed by 17-24 years and 25-32 years with 21 or 8.08% and 24 or 9.23% respectively and 9-16 years with the second highest years in service with 35 or 13.46% of the total population. Teachers can only be promoted by either promotion or reclassification in accordance to DepEd Order No. 66 s. 2007, teacher must have at least 1 year of teaching experience as Teacher I to be promoted or reclassified as Teacher II and 2 years for Teacher III with 20 MA units and MA equivalent respectively. Master teacher promotions, on the other hand, are directed by the 2019 DepEd Guidelines for Master Teacher Promotion, and only one (1) MT position per subject area for at least 5-7 instructors should be the base at the secondary level (DECS Order No. 70, s. 1998) as mentioned in the guidelines the reason why only few master teachers are there in a school compare to teacher. According to the data results of Basilio, M. B., & Bueno, D. C. (2019), mainly of the Master teachers are middle-aged which is at least around 40 or 45 years old to the age before 60 years old retirement age, which denotes that Master teachers are already in a long-term service in teaching.

Table 3. Summary of School Head 1's Supervisory Skills

Indicators	School Heads 1's OPCRF Ratings		Teachers' Assessments			Overall		t-test (Reject Ho if p <0.05)	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	p-value	decision
Instructional Leadership	5.00	Outstanding	4.60	0.60	Outstanding	4.80	Outstanding	1.157606	Do Not Reject Ho
Learning Environment	4.89	Outstanding	4.64	0.59	Outstanding	4.76	Outstanding	0.508839	Do Not Reject Ho
Human Resource Management and Development	4.67	Outstanding	4.61	0.63	Outstanding	4.64	Outstanding	0.959759	Do Not Reject Ho
Parents' Involvement and Community Partnership	4.71	Outstanding	4.70	0.51	Outstanding	4.70	Outstanding	1.007137	Do Not Reject Ho
School Leadership, Management and Operations	4.76	Outstanding	4.83	0.36	Outstanding	4.79	Outstanding	0.824615	Do Not Reject Ho
Plus Factor	4.40	Outstanding	4.69	0.61	Outstanding	4.55	Outstanding	0.875154	Do not Reject Ho
Average	4.74	Outstanding	4.68	0.55	Outstanding	4.71	Outstanding	0.888852	Do Not Reject Ho

Table 3 shows that School Head 1 received an "Outstanding" overall assessment. They scored highest in Instructional Leadership, aligning with Bada et al. (2020), who suggest principals prioritize instructional leadership for improved teacher effectiveness. Teachers also rated School Head 1 highest in School Leadership, Management, and Operations, particularly for timeliness and efficiency during the pandemic. This echoes Biñas et al. (2023), emphasizing the importance of adaptable school leadership in the context of ongoing change, such as during the formulation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP).

Table 4. Summary of School Head 2's Supervisory Skills

Indicators	School Heads 2's OPCRF Ratings		Teachers' Assessments			Overall		t-test (Reject Ho if p-value is <0.05)		
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	p-value	decision	interpretation
Instructional Leadership	4.33	Outstanding	4.94	0.12	Outstanding	4.64	Outstanding	0.471477	Do Not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Learning Environment	3.67	Very Satisfactory	4.61	0.44	Outstanding	4.14	Very Satisfactory	0.04244	Reject	Significant
Human Resource Management and Development	4.56	Outstanding	4.69	0.42	Outstanding	4.62	Outstanding	0.825754	Do Not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Parents' Involvement and Community Partnership	4.50	Outstanding	4.69	0.42	Outstanding	4.60	Outstanding	0.422526	Do Not Reject Ho	Not Significant
School Leadership, Management and Operations	4.43	Outstanding	5.00	0.00	Outstanding	4.71	Outstanding	-	Do Not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Plus Factor	5.00	Outstanding	4.70	0.46	Outstanding	4.85	Outstanding	0.910584	Do not Reject	Not Significant
Average	4.41	Outstanding	4.77	0.31	Outstanding	4.59	Outstanding	0.534556	Do Not Reject Ho	Not Significant

Table 4 shows that School Head 2 received an "Outstanding" overall assessment. This school head was rated highest in Plus Factor and Human Resource Management and Development. The "Outstanding" rating for providing technical assistance ahead of schedule aligns with Elfrianto et al. (2020), emphasizing the administrator's role in creating a supportive environment for teacher development. However, School Head 2 received the lowest assessment from teachers in Learning Environment. The indicator regarding budget-conscious repairs aligns with Sundaniawati et al. (2021), which stresses the importance of needs assessments before infrastructure procurement. Additionally, the study highlights the principal's key role in classroom arrangement, resource preparation, and maintenance oversight.

Table 5. Summary of School Head 3's Supervisory Skills

Indicators	School Heads 3's OPCRF Ratings		Teachers' Assessments			Overall		t-test (Reject Ho if p-value is <0.05)		
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	p-value	decision	interpretation
Instructional Leadership	5.00	Outstanding	4.40	0.71	Outstanding	4.70	Outstanding	0.161387	Do Not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Learning Environment	4.67	Outstanding	4.14	0.87	Very Satisfactory	4.40	Outstanding	0.229384	Do Not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Human Resource Management and Development	5.00	Outstanding	4.05	1.06	Very Satisfactory	4.52	Outstanding	0.014135	Reject Ho	Significant
Parents' Involvement and Community Partnership	4.58	Outstanding	3.94	0.95	Very Satisfactory	4.26	Outstanding	0.001224	Reject Ho	Significant
School Leadership, Management and Operations	5.00	Outstanding	4.23	0.79	Outstanding	4.62	Outstanding	0.34595	Do Not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Plus Factor	5.00	Outstanding	4.20	0.88	Very Satisfactory	4.60	Outstanding	0.957283	Do not Reject	Not Significant
Average	4.87	Outstanding	4.16	0.88	Very Satisfactory	4.52	Outstanding	0.284894	Do not Reject	Not Significant

Table 5 shows School Head 3 received an "Outstanding" overall assessment, scoring highest in four out of five Key Results Areas (KRAs). However, they were rated lowest in Parents' Involvement and Community Partnership. This contrasts with Jones & Forster (2021), who found that family-school partnerships strengthened during the pandemic. The lowest teacher assessment for School Head 3 was also in Parents' Involvement and Community

Partnership, specifically for holding quarterly GPTA meetings. This aligns with Zarate (2007), who identified differing perspectives on parental involvement and a lack of clear goals in this area.

Table 6. Summary of the Perceived Implementation of the BE-LCP of School 1 Teachers

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Safe Operations	4.84	0.43	Very High Level of Implementation
Focus of Learning	4.77	0.49	Very High Level of Implementation
Hiniusang Pag-alagad para sa Edukalidad	4.82	0.41	Very High Level of Implementation
Researching the Most Marginalized	4.76	0.47	Very High Level of Implementation
Well-being and Protection	4.81	0.42	Very High Level of Implementation
Education Financing	4.82	0.44	Very High Level of Implementation
Average	4.80	0.44	Very High Level of Implementation

Table 6 reveals a "Very High Level of Implementation" for the BE-LCP in School 1 across all key dimensions. The highest rating was observed in Safe Operation, with a mean of 4.84 and a standard deviation of 0.43. This high score is particularly notable for indicators related to adherence to health policies and protocols, suggesting a strong emphasis on safety measures during the pandemic. Overall, this indicates that School 1 successfully implemented 96-100% of its planned BE-LCP programs and projects.

Table 7. Summary of the Perceived Implementation of the BE-LCP of School 2 Teachers

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Safe Operations	5.00	0.00	Very High Level of Implementation
Focus of Learning	5.00	0.00	Very High Level of Implementation
Hiniusang Pag-alagad para sa Edukalidad	5.00	0.00	Very High Level of Implementation
Researching the Most Marginalized	5.00	0.00	Very High Level of Implementation
Well-being and Protection	5.00	0.00	Very High Level of Implementation
Education Financing	5.00	0.00	Very High Level of Implementation
Average	5.00	0.00	Very High Level of Implementation

Table 7 demonstrates that School 2's BE-LCP implementation was rated "Very High" across all key dimensions, indicating outstanding execution of planned programs and projects. This success aligns with Rabor et al. (2022), who found high levels of LCP implementation despite challenges.

Table 8. Summary of the Perceived Implementation of the BE-LCP of School 3 Teachers

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Safe Operations	4.51	0.65	Very High Level of Implementation
Focus of Learning	4.34	0.85	Very High Level of Implementation
Hiniusang Pag-alagad para sa Edukalidad	4.47	0.70	Very High Level of Implementation
Researching the Most Marginalized	4.42	0.76	Very High Level of Implementation
Well-being and Protection	4.46	0.68	Very High Level of Implementation
Education Financing	4.27	0.87	Very High Level of Implementation
Average	4.41	0.75	Very High Level of Implementation

Table 8 reveals School 3's BE-LCP implementation is rated "Very High" by teachers, with an average of 4.41 and a standard deviation of 0.75. This high level is consistent across all key dimensions. Notably, Safe Operations received the highest rating (mean = 4.51, SD = 0.65), particularly in adhering to health policies, but scored lower in monitoring learner and staff health. OPCRF evaluations show all three school heads achieved an "Outstanding" rating, demonstrating exceptional performance and commitment. School Heads 1 and 2 received similar positive feedback from teachers. School Head 3, however, received a "Very Satisfactory" rating, indicating performance exceeding expectations. Finally, all three schools demonstrated a "Very High" level of BE-LCP implementation according to teacher perceptions, suggesting 96-100% of planned activities were successfully executed.

5. In conclusion

Among the Key Results Areas (KRAs) for Supervisory Skills, Instructional Leadership was ranked highest for School Heads 1 and 3. School Head 1 excelled in evaluating the teaching-learning process, while School Head 3 focused on monitoring grade sheets. In contrast, School Head 2's strength lay in School Leadership, Management, and Operations, particularly in financial management and transparency. This suggests a varied focus among school heads, with some prioritizing instructional support and others emphasizing administrative efficiency. Regarding the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP), all three schools demonstrated a very high level of implementation, especially in Safe Operations. This was evident in their adherence to health policies, physical distancing, hygiene practices, and disinfection procedures. The schools also implemented best practices such as constructing handwashing facilities, establishing monitoring mechanisms, and providing professional development opportunities for teachers to adapt to the new learning modalities. The study found no significant relationship between school heads' supervisory skills (based on OPCRF ratings) and BE-LCP implementation. This implies that BE-LCP implementation, being mandatory, is not directly influenced by a school head's supervisory skills. There was no significant difference between the school heads' OPCRF ratings and teacher perceptions of their supervisory skills, suggesting alignment between official evaluations and teacher experiences. Overall, the findings highlight the diverse strengths of school heads in different KRAs and the successful implementation of BE-LCPs across the schools. They also underscore the need for continued professional development and support for school heads, particularly in areas where they may have received lower ratings or where challenges persist.

6. Recommendations

The study reveals that while school heads in the Surigao del Norte Division demonstrate strong instructional leadership and overall school management skills, there is room for improvement in areas like parental involvement and community partnership. The high level of BE-LCP implementation, particularly in ensuring safe operations, is commendable and should be sustained. However, the lack of a significant relationship between school head supervisory skills and BE-LCP implementation suggests that other factors may influence the successful execution of the plan. Similarly, the alignment between teacher perceptions and OPCRF ratings indicates consistency in evaluating school head performance.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that school heads receive targeted professional development to address areas needing improvement. Strengthening school leadership and management practices, particularly in financial management and strategic planning, is crucial. Enhancing parent and community engagement should also be prioritized through improved communication and collaboration strategies. The successful practices in safe operations should be maintained and shared across schools to promote continuous improvement. Future research could delve into the impact of leadership styles on teacher motivation and student outcomes, as well as the long-term effects of the BE-LCP.

Proposed Enrichment Program for School Heads

The COVID-19 pandemic forced a rapid shift in education, impacting both teaching methods and school leadership. To navigate these challenges, the Department of Education implemented the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP), providing guidance for school heads. This study aims to bolster school administrators' supervisory skills and optimize BE-LCP implementation through a proposed enrichment program. This program will focus on enhancing leadership capabilities, fostering collaboration, and refining crisis management strategies to ensure continued quality education amidst ongoing challenges.

PROPOSED ENRICHMENT PROGRAM MATRIX

Specific Program/ Activity	Key Results Area/Key Dimension	Objectives	Time Frame	Key Person Involved	Resources Needed
Human Resource	Human Resource	To train the school	Before the	Superintendent, Asst.	Teacher's profile

Management Training	Management and Development	head and HR personnel on how to manage school teaching and non-teaching staff.	opening of School Year	Superintendent, Division HR, School heads, School Admin	and inventory, Training Materials, Resource Speaker, Venue
School Safety Training	Learning Environment	To train school head how to keep the school a safe space for learning.	Year Round	School Head and Admin, Division Safety Officer, Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent	Resources Speaker, Training Materials, Venue
School Linkages and Partnership Enhancement Seminar	Parents' Involvement and Community Partnership	To improve school head's skills and abilities in finding linkages and partnership.	After end of School Year	School Head and Admin, Division Personnel, Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent	Resources Speaker, Venue, Training Materials
Capacity Building for Safe Keeping of Learning Resources	Focus on Learning	To help School Head and LR Coordinators learn ways to properly keep Learning Resources for easy access.	Before the opening of School Year	School Head and Admin, LR Coordinator, Division LR Coordinator, Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent	Resources Speaker, Venue, Training Materials
Expanded Child Mapping Activity	Reaching the Most Marginalized	To reach every learner and other school-age children.	Quarterly	School Head School Admin Teachers Parents BLGU	Transportation

References

Bada, H. A., Tengku Ariffin, T. F., & Nordin, H. B. (2020). The Effectiveness of Teachers in Nigerian Secondary Schools: The Role of Instructional Leadership of Principals. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 27(1), 44–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1811899

Biñas, J. P., Siason, N., & Paulino, R. (2023). Quality Micro-decision-making at Selected Philippine Public Secondary Schools: An Iterative Process of Planning and Implementing the Curriculum. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies, 5(5), 44–54. https://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2023.5.5.6

Burton, M. J. G. (2021). Exploring the Role of Gender Difference in Leadership Styles and Performance of the School Heads. https://uijrt.com/articles/v4/i1/UIJRTV4I10002.pdf

DepEd Order No. 12, s. 2020. Adoption of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan for School Year 2020-2021 In Light of the Covid-19 Public Health Emergency. https://www.teacherph.com/adoption-basic-education-learning-continuity-plan-school-year-2020-2021/

DepEd Order No. 66 s. 2007. Revised Guidelines on the Appointment and Promotion of Other Teaching, Related Teaching and Non-Teaching Positions" https://www.teacherph.com/appointment-and-promotion-of-teacher-ii-and-iii/

DepEd Order No. Order no. 42, s. 2017. The Revised Guidelines on Selection, Promotion And Designation of School Heads. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2007/07/DO_s2007_042.pdf

Elfrianto E., Irfan, D., Tanjung, B. (2020). The competency analysis of principal against teachers in conducting distance learning in covid-19 pandemic. http://dx.doi.org/10.30829/tar.v27i1.704

Jones, C., & Forster, C. (2021). Family–school partnerships in the age of covid-19: reasons for optimism amidst a global pandemic. Taylor & Francis Online. 3(2), 135–145. https://doi.org/10.1080/25783858.2021.1927159

Kintanar, G. (2017). Status and Educational Attainment as Predictors of School Principals' Competencies in the Philippine Public Schools http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8281-3827

Rabor, J., Barredo, E., Opinio, K. M., & Carmona, V. (2022). Implementation of Learning Continuity Plan: A Basis for a Sustainable Development Program. JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research, 47(1), 60-85.https://www.philair.ph/index.php/jpair/article/view/570

Sundaniawati Safitri; Sri Mulyati; Wahyudi Wahyudi; Maftuhah Maftuhah; Zahruddin (2021). Madrasah infrastructure management before face-to-face learning in the pandemic. al-tanzim. Journal Management Pendidikan Islam, 5(2), 40-51. https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v5i2.2094

Tan, R. A., Argate, R., & Barcoso, H. L. (2020). Gender Role and Supervisory Styles of Public-School Heads. Journal of World Englishers and Educational Practices, 2(6), 01–12. https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2020.2.6.1

Zarate, M. E. (2007). Understanding Latino Parental Involvement in Education: Perceptions, Expectations, and Recommendations.https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED502065