SMCC Higher Education Research Journal
ISSN Print: 2449-4402 · ISSN Online: 2467-6322
Volume 8 · January 2021 · H Index = 3 from Publish or Perish

Behavior During Meetings of the Faculty of The College of Engineering and Architecture of The University of the Visayas

AMJED H. ALBEHAIREY
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6006-4960
ahkeey01@gmail.com
Department of Engineering Eastern Visayas State University
Ormoc City Campus Ormoc City, Philippines

JERECO JIMS AGAPITO
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4084-6740
jerecojimsagapito1992@gmail.com
Department of Engineering Eastern Visayas State University
Ormoc City Campus Ormoc City, Philippines

NIMFA O. RODRIGUEZ
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8751-7365
greg31_ph@yahoo.com
Department of Engineering Eastern Visayas State University
Ormoc City Campus Ormoc City, Philippines

FELIX E. ARCILLA JR.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2669-2979
felixarcilla2@gmail.com
Saint Michael College of Caraga, Nasipit Agusan del Norte, Philippines

Gunning Fog Index: 14.60 • Originality: 99% • Grammar Check 99%
Flesch Reading Ease: 33.24 • Plagiarism: 1%

ABSTRACT

Faculty meetings are important gatherings to learn as a community. This study determined the behavior during meetings of the faculty of the College of Engineering

and Architecture of the University of the Visayas during the school year 2018-2019. The descriptive survey method of the research was used in this study. Based on the findings, the College of Engineering faculty promoted the flow of communication among their colleagues. In addition, they suggested procedures for a smooth and open discussion of issues, where free discussion of ideas was encouraged. Refraining from excessive competitive behavior, the CEA faculty drew out the opinions of the other faculty members, especially those new to the department, for they would be encouraged to express their views and thus contribute to the improvement of instruction and operations in the College of Engineering. Moreover, they skillfully handled the discussion so the new faculty members would not feel intimidated by their assertiveness. It was recommended that the faculty arrange the details of the meeting to avoid disagreements. The participants should be informed about the items to be discussed and prepare their questions about the subject matter. Moreover, the faculty should also place the topic in focus, and the presiding officer decides whether the meeting is called for information or for discussion of issues.

KEYWORDS

Behavior, faculty meeting, group discussion, college of engineering and architecture, descriptive, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Faculty meetings are important gatherings to learn and express an opinion in an organization. These are among the few times that the entire staff are together. There are valuable tools of communication (Martin & Bolliger, 2018). During a meeting, important deliberation is made, a concession is finalized, and contributions are presented. Without meetings, it is difficult to agree on matters that are vital to the organization's operation. Despite criticisms leveled against meetings; educational administrators still choose the meetings as a means by which group discussion can take place (Wolthuis et al., 2020). Meetings, aside from being a venue where information is transmitted, can also be a venue to emphasize relationship building, professional development, and problem-solving, and decision making. They call meetings to solicit ideas from the various sectors of the academic community (Stoll et al., 2018). From the participants' ideas, the presiding officer concludes and decides on various courses of action favorable for the school. The idea of each participant becomes a contribution to the decision-making process. Each contributor then becomes a team member that works towards a common goal (Lee et al., 2018). Faculty meeting is an innovative process for the professional and personal growth of the participants and a good avenue to find solutions to many problems, may it be educational or professional (Sprott, 2019).

Effective communication among Dean, Department Chairs, and the faculty is an important component of successful faculty meetings. Effective communication is presided by the Department Chair or the Dean, whoever is the convener of the meeting. Only the convener can ensure that the communication is both received and understood as intended. By allowing faculty the opportunity to communicate before, during, and after meetings, respect and appreciation for the administrator improved. According to Jamil et al. (2018), sharing good news amongst staff members is a great opener to help set a positive tone and encourage faculty to be engaged in the meeting.

Nonverbal communication showed by the department chair, or dean can greatly impact the mood of the meeting. Koneya & Barbour (1976), the authors of "Louder Than Words: Nonverbal communication," said that 7% of communication is verbal and the rest nonverbal. They continued that pitch, volume, and rhythm carry 38% of a message, while body language, facial expressions, and the eye movement account for 55%. The non-verbal cues by the convener can be used to communicate beneficial messages that make all participants felt part of the discussion, which in turn, has a positive impact on group dynamics. Participants in the meeting mostly speak during meetings while looking at the convener. Barbour advises the convener to avoid eye contact with one participant while looking at other participants, encouraging the speaker to do the same.

Many College Deans understood that faculty meetings lack value in the eyes of many faculty members. Faculty yawn their way through the items in the agenda. Some faculty members believed that if any clear communication results from those meetings, it takes place in canteens and parking lots long after the meeting has ended (Lawlis, Knox, & Jamieson, 2016). The study's findings of Amidon & Blumberg (1966) on the effects of faculty meetings on teacher morale reinforced teachers' cynical attitude regarding meetings.

In their efforts to contribute ideas to the group during meetings, the participants manifest varied behavior patterns that determine whether they are contributors to the meeting or not. These behavior patterns also determine how they relate to the other participants as the latter also propound ideas regarding work at hand.

The College of Engineering and Architecture of the University of the Visayas conducted two regular general faculty meetings every school year. These are usually held during the first week of every opening of the semester. And aside from the two regular general faculty meetings, the Dean of the College will call special meetings from time to time. The agenda of the meeting differ according to the need of the moment. It was observed that the behavior of the faculty during meetings shifted according to their viewpoints regarding the agenda. The researchers believed that still there is a possibility that participant's behavior may show a pattern that they make their behavior typical of engineers and architects.

This research was conducted to determine how the College of Engineering and Architecture faculty behave during meetings by determining the task behavior pattern and the group maintenance behavior of the faculty during meetings. Engineers and architects are more in problem-solving and prefer to be alone than being in and group and participate in verbal discussion. The findings of this study may confirm or disagree with existing theories on workers' behavior during the meeting and may develop a theory for Engineers. The findings of this study would be a basis to institute change to benefit the staff and the students and probably formulate guidelines to help the convener of the meeting.

FRAMEWORK

This study was anchored on the study of Harris (1989) "The Meeting Behavior Inventory." Harris stated that when personnel gather for a group of encounters, for instance, at projects team meeting, they operate at different levels of communication. Two such patterns are called task behavior and maintenance behavior. The members' input, actions, or activities that contribute to accomplishing the group's mission comprise task behavior. Actions that contribute to improving communication and building morale are maintenance behaviors (Harris, 1989).

Harris (1989) further enumerated and elaborated on five task behavior patterns. The five task behavior patterns are initiating information or opinion–seeking, information or opinion-seeking information are opinion–giving, clarifying, elaborating, and summarizing.

Initiating consists of proposing tasks or goals, defining a group problem, and suggesting a procedure or ideas for solving problems. Information or opinion-seeking consists of requesting facts, seeking relevant information about a group concern, stating a belief, and suggesting ideas. Clarifying or elaborating involves interpreting or reflecting ideas and suggestions, clearing up confusion, asking for suggestions and ideas. Information or opinion–giving includes offering facts, providing relevant information indicating alternatives and issues before the group, and giving examples. Summarizing consists of pulling together related ideas, restating suggestions after the group has discussed them, and offering a decision or conclusion to accept rejection.

Maintenance group behavior patterns consist of encouraging, expressing group feelings, harmonizing, compromising, and gatekeeping. Encouraging means being friendly, warm, and responsive to others, accepting others and their contributions, and regarding others by giving them an opportunity for recognition. Expressing group feelings consist of sensing feelings, mood, and relationships within the group and sharing one's feelings with other members. Harmonizing includes attempting to reconcile disagreements, reducing tension through "pouring oil on troubled waters," and getting people explore their differences, compromising one's own position when one's idea of

status is involved in a conflict; offering to compromise one's own position, admitting error and disciplining oneself to maintain group cohesion. Gatekeeping consists of attempting to keep communication channels open, facilitating the participation of others, and suggesting procedures for sharing an opportunity to discuss group problems.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

This study determined the behavior during meetings of the faculty of the College of Engineering and Architecture of the University of the Visayas during the school year 2018-2019.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

Descriptive survey method was used in this study. The questionnaire was used as an instrument of data collection. The study described what task behavior patterns and group maintenance behavior patterns the College of Technology and Engineering faculty would manifest.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at the College of Engineering and Architecture faculty. The College of Engineering was established in 1965 as the third college of the university.

Research Respondents

The respondents of the study were the 17 regular Engineering faculty members of the College of Engineering and Architecture of the University of the Visayas, indicated the extent to which they manifested task behavior patterns and group maintenance behavior patterns during their meetings.

Research Instruments

This study utilized the meeting behavior inventory by Philip Harris. The inventory facilitated the respondents' identification of their own behavior patterns during meetings.

Data Collection Techniques

Copies of the meeting behavior inventory questionnaire were distributed after the General Faculty meeting during the opening of the first Semester, S.Y. 2018-2019. The respondents can accomplish the inventory at their own pace and submit it on the following day to give them ample time to fill out the survey.

Data Analysis

The accomplished questionnaires were collected, and the responses were tallied. The weights assigned to the scales were noted. The weighted mean of each item was determined.

Ethical Consideration

This part showed the researcher's basic considerations to observe high ethical standards throughout all parts of the study.

Risk-Benefit Assessment

Benefits. The potential benefits of this study were understanding the importance of the meeting and identifying the factors that affect the faculty's behavior in the meeting. The respondents can expand their knowledge that it is difficult to agree if there is a need to improve the school or the organization without meetings.

Risks. Respondents might be afraid to give an opinion of what would be the final decision, which resulted in having a confusing conclusion of the meeting. But the researchers made an assurance the confidentiality of the answers. The respondents were encouraged to fill and rate the questionnaire sincerely and honestly.

Content, Comprehension, and Documentation of the Informed Consent

Participation Status. The respondents were informed that all information reflected in the questionnaire, like the demographic profile of the faculty such as age, gender, employment status, designation, years of stay in school, are used only for this study.

Study Goal. The respondents were informed that the goal of this study was to determine the behavior during meetings of the faculty of the College of Engineering and Architecture of the University of the Visayas.

Type of Data. The respondents were informed of the rating procedure of this study using the weighted mean. The answered questionnaires were collected, and the responses were tallied. The definite interpretation of the scale of the items, the hypothetical mean average, was used.

Procedures. The respondents were informed regarding the process of this study such as sending a letter to the dean, requesting approval of the study, and distributing questionnaires for them to give their response or opinion. They were given five days to answer the questionnaire then, the researchers collected them back. The responses were tallied, analyzed, and interpreted.

Nature of Commitment. When the questionnaires were distributed, the respondents were asked when to collect them back and not distract their daily routine.

Sponsorship. The funding of this is from the researcher's family to comply with the requirements needed.

Participants Selection. The researchers explained to the respondents why they are respondents of the study and how many are needed. They were not informed how they are selected since this study used random sampling.

Potential Risk. The respondents spent their time in answering the questionnaire.

Potential Benefits. This benefitted the dean, the department chairpersons, and the faculty by giving them an idea of handling faculty meetings that will have a good output at least time consumed.

Alternatives. The researchers discussed the alternative procedures and data treatment if it would be advantageous for the study.

Compensation. The researchers were thankful to the respondents for answering the questionnaire with their own free will. No monetary was involved.

Confidentiality pledge. The researchers guaranteed that the responses were kept confidential. The researchers sent a letter to the respondents and requested them to answer the questionnaire. They were also not required to put their names in the survey questionnaire to protect their privacy.

Voluntary Consent. The researchers guaranteed that respondents were not forced to answer but they voluntarily participated.

Right to withdraw and withhold information. The respondents were told that they have the right to withdraw from the study or withhold any specific piece of information.

Authorization to Access Private Information

As reflected in the Letter to the Respondents, the researchers were aware of the rules of the Data Privacy Act of 2012 of the Republic of the Philippines. Only the researchers and the adviser were authorized to receive the information of the study.

Confidentiality Procedures

It was indicated in the Letter to the Respondents that all answers were to be kept confidential. All information must be used for the study only and not be shared with other people. It should be shredded after the tally has been done. The names of the respondents were not required.

Debriefing, Communication, and Referrals

The researchers must be polite and show a formal approach when communicating and distributing the questionnaires to the respondents. They must be patient in collecting the responses from the respondents. The researchers also showed gratitude for the respondents' participation in answering the questionnaires.

Conflict of Interest

Since the researchers were not faculty but interested in knowing about participants' behavior during meetings, a third party was requested to distribute the questionnaires. He was given instructions not to pressure the teachers in answering the questionnaire. The respondents can preserve their rights to withdraw or voluntarily participate and answer. The respondents should be given time to answer.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Engineering Faculty's Initiating Behavior during Meetings

Behavior Patterns	Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Equivalence
Proposing Task or Goals	3.70	often
Defining a group problem	3.12	occasionally
Suggesting procedures for working on projects	3.18	occasionally
Suggesting solutions to problems	3.35	occasionally
Factor Average	3.34	occasionally

Table 1 shows Engineering Faculty's Initiating Behavior during Meetings. This shows the factor average of 3.34; initiating behavior patterns are occasionally shown by the College of Engineering faculty. However, they often show some initiating behavior patterns such as proposing tasks or goals with a descriptive equivalence of often.

From these findings, it could be inferred that the College of Engineering faculty were more concerned with giving suggestions for working on new pursuits which the departments would undertake instead of proposing tasks or goals. They used meetings as a clearinghouse of ideas to suggest courses of action that could best accomplish some projects they intended to undertake (Dematthews, 2015).

Table 2: Engineering Faculty Information or Opinion Seeking Behavior during Meetings

Behavior Patterns	Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Equivalence
Requesting Facts	3.11	Occasionally
Seeking relevant information	2.94	occasionally
Asking for suggestions	3.00	occasionally
Soliciting ideas about projects	3.29	occasionally
Factor Average	3.09	occasionally

Table 2 presents the data on the information or opinion-seeking behavior of the faculty. The factor average of 3.09 denotes that the faculty occasionally manifested this type of behavior pattern. All indicators in the "information or opinion seeking behavior have the descriptive equivalence of occasionally.

From these findings, it could be inferred that the faculty were occasionally concerned with inquiring from one another regarding the facts that they discussed during the meetings. They were occasionally concerned with acquiring knowledge about the issues at hand and the procedures for implementing the projects of the college (McLaughlin, 2013).

Table 3. College of Engineering Faculty's Information or Opinion –Giving Behavior during Meetings

Behavior Patterns	Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Equivalence
Offering Facts	3.18	occasionally
Providing relevant information group concern	3.12	occasionally
Stating a belief	3.59	often
Giving suggestions or ideas	3.47	often
Factor Average	3.34	occasionally

Table 3 contains data on the information or opinion–giving behavior during meetings. As indicated by the factor average of 3.34, the College of Engineering faculty occasionally showed information or opinion-giving behavior patterns. Nevertheless, stating a belief and giving suggestions or ideas were often manifested by the faculty with a weighted mean of 3.59 and 3.47, respectively.

These findings reveal that the Engineering faculty were occasionally concerned with providing facts and information regarding issues that they occasionally considered important for the department. According to Carpenter (2018), teachers expressed greater appreciation and greater feelings of being valued the closer they felt to their colleagues.

Table 4. Extent of College of Engineering Faculty's Clarifying or Elaborating Behavior Patterns during Meetings

Behavior Patterns	Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Equivalence
Interpreting or reflecting ideas	3.18	occasionally
Clearing up confusion	3.59	often
Indicating alternatives and issues before the group	3.59	often
Giving examples	3.24	occasionally
Factor Average	3.40	occasionally

Table 4 reveals the data regarding the extent of clarifying or elaborating behavior patterns by the faculty. This type of task behavior pattern was occasionally shown by the faculty, as indicated by the average of 3.40. Specifically, they occasionally manifested behavior patterns of interpreting or reflecting ideas, as revealed by the weighted mean of 3.18; giving examples, as shown by the weighted mean of 3.24, while clearing up confusion and indicating alternatives and issues before the group both have weighted mean of 3.59 often manifested behavior.

These findings reveal that in just half of the cases, the College of Engineering faculty expounded the subject matter well to clarify the issues which the group discussed during meetings. They occasionally warded off confusion among the group members

by explaining their side on the issues involved in the discussion (Jamil et al., 2018). Moreover, Brookfield & Preskill (2012) stated that all the group members have a chance to speak, express their own ideas and feelings freely, pursue and finish out their thoughts, and clarify issues.

Table 5. Extent of College of Technology and Engineering Faculty's Summarizing Behavior Patterns during Meetings

Behavior Patterns	Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Equivalence
Consolidating related ideas	3.47	often
Restating ideas after they had been discussed	3.47	often
Offering decisions	3.53	often
Offering conclusions	3.48	often
Factor Average	3.48	often

Table 5 contains data regarding the summarizing behavior patterns of the College of Engineering faculty during meetings.

It indicates that the college faculty often manifested behavior patterns indicative of summarizing, as denoted by the factor average of 3.48. The following summarizing patterns were noted among the members of the faculty: consolidating related ideas, as revealed by the weighted mean of 3.47; restating ideas after they had been discussed, as indicated by the weighted mean of 3.47; offering decision, as disclosed by the weighted mean of 3.53 and offering conclusions, as disclosed by the weighted mean of 3.48.

From these findings, it could be inferred that in most cases, the college of engineering faculty made a recapitulation of the ideas presented to them to refresh the participants' minds concerning the issues at hand. The listeners could focus on the core of the subject matter being discussed. According to Brookfield (2017), our behavior is of critical significance in all aspects of our lives–from maintaining our relationships to getting our jobs done and the way we act and respond to our colleagues.

Table 6. Extent of College of Engineering Faculty's Expressing Group Feelings during Meetings

Behavior Patterns	Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Equivalence
Sensing the feelings of other group members regarding the issues at hand	3.24	Occ
Sensing the mood of other group members	3.29	Occ
Understanding the relationships among the discussions	3.7	O
Sharing one's own feelings regarding the issues	3.47	O
Factor Average	3.42	O

Table 6 presents data on the behavior patterns of CEA faculty in the aspect of expressing group feelings and shows that patterns of behavior under this dimension were often manifested, as revealed by the factor average of 3.42. Specifically, the CEA faculty occasionally sensed the feelings or other group members regarding the issues at hand, as revealed by the weighted mean of 3.24; occasionally shared the mood of other group members, as indicated by the weighted mean of 3.29; often understood the relationships among the participants; as indicated by the weighted mean of 3.7; and often shared their own feelings regarding the issues as revealed by the weighted mean of 3.47.

These findings show that the CEA faculty showed sympathy to the other members of the group in most cases. They gave importance and support to the feelings of the other group members. According to Darling-Hammond (2020), sympathy can also be a route to academic and career success because it helps people understand and work with others.

Table 7. Extent of College of Engineering Faculty's Manifestation of Harmonizing Behavior during Meetings

Behavior Patterns	Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Equivalence
Attempting to reconcile the disagreements	3.29	Occ
Reducing tensions	3.18	Occ
Getting people to explore their differences	3.06	Occ
Factor Average	3.17	Occ

Table 7 presents data on the extent to which the CEA faculty manifested harmonizing behavior patterns during meetings and reveals that they occasionally manifested patterns of behavior indicative of this dimension, as shown by the factor average of 3.17. Specifically, they occasionally attempted to reconcile disagreements as revealed by the weighted mean of 3.29, reduced tension, as shown by the weighted mean of 3.18, and got people to explore the differences, as revealed by the weighted mean of 3.06.

These findings show that in half of the cases, the CEA faculty exerted effort to pacify emotions during meetings. These behavior patterns were therefore manifested to a limited extent. According to Glinow et al. (2004), managing your emotions in the workplace, meetings, and negotiations is an important prerequisite for successful meetings. If you can control your emotions, it will be easier for you to lead the negotiation or discussion to the desired goal.

Table 8. Extent of College of Engineering Faculty's Manifestation of Comprising Behavior during Meetings

Behavior Patterns	Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Equivalence
Offering to comprise one's position in the event of conflict	3.18	Occ
Admitting errors in judgment	3.18	Occ
Maintaining self-discipline for the sake of the group	3.70	O
Factor Average	3.35	Occ

Table 8 presents data on the extent to which the CEA faculty manifested harmonizing behavior patterns during meetings and reveals that they occasionally manifested patterns of behavior indicative of this dimension, as shown by the factor average of 3.17. Specifically, they occasionally attempted to reconcile disagreements as revealed by the weighted mean of 3.29, reduced tension, as shown by the weighted mean of 3.18, and got people to explore the differences, as revealed by the weighted mean of 3.06.

These findings show that the faculty were willing to give concessions to their colleagues in most cases in the event of a conflict. In case of the committed mistakes, they were willing to admit their shortcomings. According to Hemmati et al. (2002), compromising behavior includes the ability to communicate and keep the dialogue open, the ability to find an answer that is fair to both parties, the ability to give up part of what you want, and the ability to assign value to all aspects of the issue.

Table 9. College of Engineering Faculty's Manifestation of Gate-Keeping Behavior during Meetings

Behavior Patterns	Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Equivalence
Keeping communication channel open	3.70	O
Facilitating the participation of others in the discussion	3.47	O
Suggesting discussion procedures	3.41	O
Factor Average	3.53	O

Table 9 shows the data on the CEA faculty gate-keeping behavior patterns during meetings. As revealed by the factor average of 3.53, gatekeeping was often manifested by the faculty. Specifically, they kept communication channels open, as shown by the weighted mean of 3.70; facilitated the participation of others in the discussion, as indicated by the weighted mean of 3.47; and suggested discussion procedures, as revealed by the weighted mean of 3.41.

These findings show that the College of Engineering faculty promoted the flow of communication among their colleagues. They suggested procedures for a smooth and

open discussion of issues, where free discussion of ideas was encouraged. Refraining from excessive competitive behavior, the CEA faculty drew out the opinions of the other faculty members, especially those new to the department, so that they would be encouraged to express their opinions and thus contribute to the improvement of instruction and operations in the College of Engineering. In most cases, they skillfully handled the discussion so the new faculty members would not feel intimidated by their assertiveness. Teachers' beliefs, opinions, practices, and attitudes are important for understanding and improving educational processes. They are closely linked to teachers' strategies for coping with challenges in their daily professional lives and general well-being (Dacanay et al., 2019). They are encouraged to collaborate in the learning environment and influence student motivation and achievement (Vasquez, Arcilla, & Apare, 2018).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the College of Engineering faculty promoted the flow of communication among their colleagues. In addition, they suggested procedures for a smooth and open discussion of issues, where free discussion of ideas was encouraged. Refraining from excessive competitive behavior, the CEA faculty drew out the opinions of the other faculty members, especially those new to the department, for they would be encouraged to express their views and thus contribute to the improvement of instruction and operations in the College of Engineering. Moreover, they skillfully handled the discussion so the new faculty members would not feel intimidated by their assertiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the result, it was recommended that the faculty arrange the meeting details to avoid disagreements. The participants should be informed about the items to be discussed and prepare their questions upon the subject matter. The faculty should also place the topic in focus, and the presiding officer decides whether the meeting is called for information or the discussion of issues. The problems should be discussed if the purpose was problem-solving to avoid waste of time. Controlling the meeting is one of the most important tools to have a successful meeting. The presiding officer should take note of the following, he or she must now allow anyone to dominate the meeting, the discussion should be encouraged. It should focus on the subject matter, not on personalities. For clarifying issues, the participants are reminded that they should clarify points they cannot understand. They should also not ask for an adjournment of the meeting unless they did not understand everything (McLaughlin, 2013).

LITERATURE CITED

Amidon, E., & Blumberg, A. (1966). Principal And Teacher Perceptions of School Faculty Meetings. Retrieved on November 12, 2020, from https://bit.ly/3zjPKaR

Brookfield, S. D. (2017). Becoming a critically reflective teacher. John Wiley & Sons. Retrieved on November 12, 2020, from https://bit.ly/3eHh5vL

Brookfield, S. D., & Preskill, S. (2012). Discussion as a way of teaching: Tools and techniques for democratic classrooms. John Wiley & Sons. Retrieved on November 10, 2020, from https://bit.ly/3iwkpej

Carpenter, D. (2018). Intellectual and physical shared workspace: Professional learning communities and the collaborative culture. International Journal of Educational Management. Retrieved on November 12, 2020, from https://bit.ly/3Bo8IPu

Dacanay, C. G., Otida, A. G., Panganduyon, C., & Arcilla Jr, F. E. (2019). Challenges Experienced by the Student Teachers of Philippine College Foundation During Their Practice Teaching. Retrieved on November 12, 2020, from https://bit.ly/3emCPgu

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97-140. Retrieved on November 12, 2020, from https://bit.ly/3hVtYUU

Dematthews, D. E. (2015). Clearing a path for inclusion: Distributing leadership in a high performing elementary school. Journal of School Leadership, 25(6), 1000-1038. Retrieved on November 10, 2020 from https://bit.ly/3fcw5m0

Glinow, M. A. V., Shapiro, D. L., & Brett, J. M. (2004). Can we talk, and should we? Managing emotional conflict in multicultural teams. Academy of Management review, 29(4), 578-592. Retrieved on November 12, 2020, from https://bit.ly/3roMqZc

Harris, P. R. (1989). High performance leadership: Strategies for maximum career productivity. Scott Foresman. Retrieved on November 10, 2020 from https://bit.ly/3fCBmCA

Hemmati, M., Dodds, F., Enayati, J., & McHarry, J. (2002). Multi-stakeholder processes for governance and sustainability: beyond deadlock and conflict. Routledge.

Retrieved on November 12, 2020, from https://bit.ly/3hPuGDk

Lawlis, T., Knox, M., & Jamieson, M. (2016). School canteens: A systematic review of the policy, perceptions and use from an Australian perspective. Nutrition & Dietetics, 73(4), 389-398. Retrieved on November 10, 2020 from https://bit.ly/3oIV0kd

Lee, A., Poch, R., Smith, A., Delehanty Kelly, M., & Leopold, H. (2018). Intercultural pedagogy: A faculty learning cohort. Education Sciences, 8(4), 177. Retrieved on November 11, 2020 from https://bit.ly/3vhbNgK

Jamil, F. M., Linder, S. M., & Stegelin, D. A. (2018). Early childhood teacher beliefs about STEAM education after a professional development conference. Early Childhood Education Journal, 46(4), 409-417. Retrieved on November 10, 2020, from https://bit.ly/3yCqE7Q

McLaughlin, M. W. (2013). Implementation as mutual adaptation: Change in classroom organization. In Curriculum Studies Reader E2 (pp. 174-184). Routledge. Retrieved on November 11, 2020 from https://bit.ly/3bMG2V8

Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. Online Learning, 22(1), 205-222. Retrieved on November 10, 2020 from https://bit.ly/3fDsHjf

Sprott, R. A. (2019). Factors that foster and deter advanced teachers' professional development. Teaching and Teacher Education, 77, 321-331. Retrieved on November 10, 2020 from https://bit.ly/3bNHJSl

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Thomas, S., Wallace, M., Greenwood, A., & Hawkey, K. (2018). Professional learning communities: Source materials for school leaders and other leaders of professional learning. https://bit.ly/3vh7CBB

Wolthuis, F., Hubers, M. D., de Vries, S., & van Veen, K. (2020). More than mundane matters: an exploration of how schools organize professional learning teams. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 1-20. Retrieved on November 10, 2020 from https://bit.ly/3ueNRtc

Vasquez, O. B., Arcilla Jr, F. E., & Apare, B. J. (2018). Academic Achievement in the Licensure Examination for Teachers of Education Graduates. IAMURE International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 17(1), 1-1.