Teacher's Perspective on the Role of School Heads in the Implementation of Reading Interventions in Aglipay East District, Aglipay, Quirino

Noreta W. Guillermo

Graduate School, Quirino State University, Philippines, Department of Education – Quirino, Philippines

Abstract		Review Article

This study comprehensively examined the teacher's perspective on the school head's role in implementing reading interventions in Aglipay East District, Aglipay, Quirino. The research identifies the demographic profile of respondents in terms of age, gender, position, and years of experience in Handling Reading Interventions. It evaluated their level of agreement on the role of school heads in implementing the reading intervention program across four domains: instructional leadership, resource management, professional development, and monitoring and evaluation. The study also assessed the respondents' perception of the extent of implementation, as well as the relationship between the role of the school head and the teacher's perspectives on the reading intervention programs. Using a descriptive-correlational design, data gathered via questionnaires were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, t-tests, and Pearson product-moment correlation. Results indicated that teachers perceive school heads as performing their administrative roles. Instructional leadership is a primary strength, characterized by clear communication of goals and the use of evidence-based strategies. Monitoring and evaluation, professional development, and resource management have been significantly agreed to a great extent. Conversely, implementation challenges were perceived as being to a Least Extent, though a Moderate need for increased emotional recognition of teachers' efforts was identified. Statistical analysis using Pearson's r revealed a significant positive correlation between the implementation of reading interventions and both instructional leadership and professional development. However, resource management and monitoring/evaluation did not show statistically significant correlations with the extent of implementation. The study concluded that while logistical and evaluative oversight are foundational, the actual success of reading interventions is most directly driven by the school head's active instructional guidance and the continuous professional growth of teachers. Recommendations encompassed fostering a stronger system of emotional support and recognition to sustain teacher morale during intensive intervention periods.

 Keywords: Instructional Leadership, Reading Interventions Professional Development, School Heads, Aglipay East District, Phil-IRI.

Guillermo, N. W. (2026). Teacher's perspective on the role of school heads in the implementation of reading interventions in Aglipay East District, Aglipay, Quirino. *ISA Journal of Multidisciplinary (ISAJM)*, *3*(2). 233-245.

233

Introduction

In shaping modern education, literacy is the foundation of whole-life fulfillment (Alajmi, M., 2025). This skill is a powerful weapon for learners from a young age as they grow and walk on their journey (Khoiri, 2023). However, many elementary schools continue to contend with the importance of reading proficiency among learners, a challenge worsened by the post-pandemic days. In the Aglipay East District of Quirino, these challenges require more than just a program; they require calculated management.

According to Prabowo et al (2023), the success of implementing reading interventions, such as Brigada Pagbasa and other specialized learning mediation programs, usually depends on the instructional leaders. Frontiers in Education (2025) stated that as a facilitator, the school head is responsible for resource management, teacher monitoring, and promoting the habit of reading. According to Lazaro et al (2022), the effectiveness of this role is best recognized through the eyes of those on the battlefield, the classroom teachers. Their study found that when school heads move beyond administrative control to act as active learning facilitators, there is a meaningful improvement in how teachers implement reading comprehension strategies. This highlights that for a policy to succeed, the school head must bridge the gap between high-level instruction and classroom-level execution.

Furthermore, the sustainability of these literacy initiatives is rooted in the quality of the supervisory relationship and the provision of technical support. Manzanero (2024) emphasizes that high-performing reading programs are characterized by highly evident instructional practices, where school heads provide consistent guidance and regular technical assistance. This level of active monitoring ensures that teachers feel supported rather than just investigated. However, Ulit (2025) points out that while school heads are effectively strong in defining a school's mission, the actual management of instructional programs can be disrupted by administrative overload. This reinforces the perspective of classroom teachers that, for reading interventions to be truly effective, the school head must balance administrative demands with the primary goal of supporting those on the front lines of literacy (Lee et al 2025).

The study investigated the connectivity between the role of the school heads and the effectiveness of reading mediation implementation as perceived by teachers directly involved in the program (Okunlola et al 2025). Ultimately, the findings aimed to provide a basis for enhancing school-based management strategies to better support the frontline educators in achieving higher literacy outcomes for all learners (McTigue et al, 2023).

Hence, this study aimed to determine the teacher's perspective on the role of the school head in the implementation of reading intervention, particularly on the aspect of Instructional Leadership (providing technical assistance and monitoring), Resource Management (procurement of reading materials and facilities), Professional Development (organizing LAC sessions and seminars); and Monitoring and Evaluation (PHIL-IRI, CRLA result). Also, it assessed the extent of reading interventions implementation by school heads within the district, as perceived by teachers. Lastly, it evaluated the significant relationships between the teacher's perspective and the role of the school head in the implementation of reading intervention programs in the district.

Methods

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between leadership roles and program implementation. The investigation was conducted in 15 public elementary schools within the Aglipay East District, Schools Division of Quirino, Philippines. This locale was selected due to its active participation in regional literacy recovery initiatives. The study population comprised 66 public elementary school teachers. Using purposive sampling, 57 respondents (86 response rate) were selected based on their direct involvement in reading intervention programs (Phil-IRI, ARAL, and CRLA)

and at least 1 year of experience in reading remediation. A researcher-made survey questionnaire served as the primary data collection tool. The instrument consists of five sections: Teacher characteristics (years in service, position). A 4-point Likert scale assessing instructional leadership, resource management, and technical supervision. Measurement of the extent of reading intervention execution. Identification of challenges encountered during implementation. An assessment of the significance of the school head's role. The instrument was content-validated by experts. Internal consistency was confirmed via pilot testing, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.749 to 0.885, exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.70.

Permission was obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent and the Public Schools District Supervisor. Following administrative clearance, participants were oriented on the study's objectives. Data were collected via printed and Google Forms surveys based on school preference. Ethical protocols were strictly observed: participation was voluntary, and informed consent was secured from all respondents. Their data were anonymized and processed in compliance with data privacy standards. Quantitative data were analyzed using statistical treatments. Frequencies, percentages, and weighted means (M) with standard deviations (SD) were used to summarize respondent profiles, perceptions, and implementation levels. Pearson's r correlation was employed to test the significant relationship between perceived leadership roles and the extent of program implementation.

Results and Discussion

I. Profile of the Respondents

Table 2. Frequency and Percent Distribution of Respondents

Profile	Specifics	Frequency	Percent
Age	30 years old & below	15	26.32
	31-40 years old	20	35.09
	41 years old & above	22	38.60
Sex	Male	5	8.77
	Female	52	91.23
Position	Teacher I	20	35.09
	Teacher III	33	57.89
	Master Teacher I	4	7.02
Years of Experience in Handling Reading Interventions	5 years & below	29	50.88
	6-10 years	8	14.04
	11 years & above	20	35.09

n = 57

The data describe the respondents' demographic and professional characteristics in terms of age, sex, position, and experience in reading intervention. With respect to age, the respondents are fairly distributed across categories, although a slightly larger proportion belongs to the 41 years old and above group (38.60%), followed by those aged 31–40 years (35.09%). The smallest group consists of

respondents aged 30 years old and below (26.32%). This suggests that the group is largely composed of relatively older educators. In terms of sex, there is a clear imbalance, with female respondents comprising the vast majority (91.23%), while male respondents account for only 8.77%. This reflects the common gender distribution observed in the teaching profession.

On the other hand, looking at position, most respondents hold the rank of Teacher III (57.89%), indicating that many are already in more advanced teaching roles. This is followed by Teacher I (35.09%), while only a small percentage are Master Teacher I (7.02%), suggesting limited representation in higher supervisory positions.

Regarding experience in handling reading interventions, over half of the respondents (50.88%) have five years or less experience, indicating a large group of relatively new practitioners. Meanwhile, 35.09% have 11 years or more experience, showing the presence of seasoned teachers. Only 14.04% fall within the 6–10 years range, indicating fewer respondents in the mid-level experience bracket. Hence, the profile reveals a predominantly female group of teachers, mostly occupying mid-level teaching positions, with a mix of novice and highly experienced individuals in reading intervention practice.

II. Teachers' Perception of the Role of School Heads in the Implementation of Reading Intervention Program

Table 3. Respondents' Agreement on the Role of the School Heads: Instructional Leadership.

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1. The school head clearly communicates the goals of the school's reading program.	3.81	.40	SA
2. Classroom reading instruction is regularly monitored by the school head.	3.67	.48	SA
3. Constructive feedback to teachers on reading instruction is provided.	3.67	.48	SA
4. Reading interventions are aligned with Phil-IRI results.	3.79	.41	SA
5. The school head promotes evidence-based reading strategies in instruction.	3.74	.44	SA
Grand Mean	**3.73**	**.19**	**SA**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00   Strongly Agree (SA)
2.50 – 3.24   Agree (A)
1.75 – 2.49   Disagree (D)
1.00 – 1.74   Strongly Disagree (SD)

The data in the table consistently have high mean scores ranging from 3.67 to 3.81, with an overall grand mean of 3.73, interpreted as Strongly Agree. These results indicate that school heads demonstrate a high level of engagement in supporting reading intervention programs. Their role extends beyond routine supervision, reflecting active involvement in key dimensions of effective intervention practices. Specifically, the findings highlight that school heads consistently establish clear expectations, conduct regular monitoring of classroom implementation, and provide timely and

constructive feedback. Moreover, they ensure that instructional strategies are aligned with learners' needs as identified through the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) results, while also promoting the use of evidence-based approaches in teaching reading. A notable implication of the data is the emerging shift from traditional supervisory practices toward a more collaborative and developmental approach. Rather than focusing solely on compliance, school heads appear to prioritize mentoring and professional support, thereby empowering teachers to improve their instructional practices. This aligns with recent perspectives emphasizing shared responsibility and continuous professional growth in literacy development.

Furthermore, the results underscore that effective instructional leadership serves as a critical foundation for successful reading interventions. However, its impact is strengthened when complemented by a supportive and collaborative school environment. In this context, school heads play a vital role in translating assessment data into meaningful classroom practices by fostering ongoing dialogue, providing feedback, and encouraging collective accountability among teachers. Thus, the findings suggest that the strong instructional leadership demonstrated by school heads contributes significantly to the effective implementation of reading interventions, particularly when coupled with a culture of collaboration and data-driven decision-making.

Table 4. Teacher's Perspective on the Role of School Head: Resource Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1. Funds for reading programs and materials are allocated by the school head.	3.72	.45	SA
2. Reading materials are appropriate to learners' reading levels.	3.75	.43	SA
3. Community and reading support are tapped to strengthen reading programs.	3.63	.49	SA
4. Community and reading support are tapped to strengthen reading programs.	3.60	.49	SA
Grand Mean	**3.68**	**.28**	**SA**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00   Strongly Agree (SA)
2.50 – 3.24   Agree (A)
1.75 – 2.49   Disagree (D)
1.00 – 1.74   Strongly Disagree (SD)

This table illustrates that the highest mean score was recorded for the appropriateness of reading materials to learners' reading levels (M = 3.75, SD = 0.43), followed closely by the allocation of funds for reading programs (M = 3.72, SD = 0.45). This indicates that school heads do not merely provide resources but do so with pedagogical intentionality. By ensuring that materials are calibrated to the

learners' actual reading abilities, leadership directly addresses the instructional match necessary for literacy progress. This aligns with Llarena (2023), who emphasizes that the strategic provision of materials is a prerequisite for sustaining literacy programs, particularly in settings where resources are finite. Respondents also strongly agreed that community and reading support are tapped to

strengthen programs (M = 3.63 and 3.60). While these scores are slightly lower than those for internal fund allocation, they remain firmly within the Strongly Agree range. This reflects a proactive approach to leadership where school heads look beyond the institutional budget to bridge resource gaps. Such findings confirmed the assertions of Hasnadi et al (2024), who argue that in the face of infrastructure challenges, effective principals must innovate through external partnerships and local resource mobilization. The overall results suggest that effective resource management is a multi-dimensional task involving financial oversight, stakeholder coordination, and teacher motivation. The Strongly Agree rating across all indicators implies that school heads are successfully fostering a supportive environment by harmonizing the needs of the teachers with the contributions of the community. As noted by Lucero et al. (2019), the coordination of these diverse stakeholders is essential for the long-term viability of intervention programs.

Table 5. Teacher's Perspective on the Role of School Head: Professional and Development

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1. Training related to reading instruction and intervention is encouraged by the school head.	3.61	.49	SA
2. Teachers are motivated to attend seminars and workshops.	3.81	.40	SA
3. Coaching and mentoring are provided to teachers handling struggling readers.	3.61	.49	SA
4. Professional development activities are aligned with the identified reading needs.	3.75	.43	SA
5. The school heads support continuous improvement in reading instructions.	3.82	.38	SA
Grand Mean	**3.72**	**.21**	**SA**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree (SA)
2.50 – 3.24 Agree (A)
1.75 – 2.49 Disagree (D)
1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree (SD)

The data reveals a Grand Mean of 3.72 (SD = 0.21), indicating that respondents Strongly Agree with the proactive role school heads play in fostering professional growth. This high level of agreement suggests that leadership in the district is not merely administrative but deeply integrated into the instructional fabric of reading interventions. The highest rated indicators supported the continuous improvement (M = 3.82) and the motivation provided to teachers to attend seminars (M = 3.81). This suggests that school heads excel at creating a culture of lifelong learning, which is essential for the sustainability of literacy programs. Interestingly, while still rated as Strongly Agree, the indicators for direct coaching or mentoring and encouraging specific training received slightly lower means (3.61). This subtle variance may imply that while school heads are excellent at motivating and supporting the big picture of improvement, there is a slight opportunity to intensify direct, one-on-one instructional coaching. These findings align with the Instructional Leadership Model, which posits that a leader's primary influence on student learning is mediated through the professional development of teachers. As noted by Townsend and Bayetto (2020), programs like Principals as Literacy Leaders (PALL) underscore that when school heads prioritize targeted professional learning, it directly translates to

improved teaching quality and student engagement. Furthermore, the alignment of professional development with identified reading needs (M = 3.75) confirms that leadership is data-driven. This targeted approach mirrors that effective literacy leadership requires a strategic focus on the specific pedagogical gaps of the staff (Patuawa et al, 2024). The strong emphasis on continuous improvement suggests that these school heads are moving away from one-off workshops toward a more sustainable, developmental mentorship model for long-term literacy success.

Table 6. Level of Agreement on the Role of School Heads: Monitoring and Evaluation

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1. Regularly review learners' reading progress.	3.75	.43	SA
2. Phil-IRI results are used in planning reading interventions	3.82	.38	SA
3. Reading intervention programs are evaluated for effectiveness	3.74	.44	SA
4. Adjustments are made based on monitoring and evaluation results	3.77	.42	SA
5. The school heads ensure the continuous improvement of reading interventions.	3.77	.42	SA
Grand Mean	**3.77**	**.23**	**SA**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00   Strongly Agree (SA)
2.50 – 3.24   Agree (A)
1.75 – 2.49   Disagree (D)
1.00 – 1.74   Strongly Disagree (SD)

The data yield a Grand Mean of 3.77 (SD = 0.23), interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that school heads are highly committed to the systematic oversight of literacy initiatives. The results suggest that M&E is not treated as a mere administrative formality but as a functional pillar for instructional success. The highest-rated indicator is the utilization of Phil-IRI results for planning (M = 3.82). This signifies that leadership is deeply rooted in evidence-based practice, using standardized assessment data to drive the strategic direction of reading programs. Furthermore, the strong scores for continuous improvement and making adjustments (M = 3.77) suggest a formative approach to leadership, where data is used to pivot and refine strategies in real-time rather than waiting for end-of-year summations. While all indicators remained high, the evaluation of program effectiveness (M = 3.74) was the lowest relative score. This may imply that while school heads are excellent at reviewing individual student progress (monitoring), the more complex task of evaluating the systemic impact of the program itself (evaluation) is an area where technical assistance could be further maximized.

These findings resonate with the work of Lee and Moussa (2025), who emphasize that the efficacy of literacy programs relies heavily on evaluative leadership, the ability of a principal to translate assessment data into actionable instructional changes. Moreover, the proactive stance of school heads in using Phil-IRI data aligns with the mandates of current literacy remediation standards, confirming that leadership plays a critical role in sustaining program fidelity. As noted by Llarena (2023), consistent M&E by school heads provides the necessary technical assistance and feedback loops that empower teachers to address persistent reading gaps.

III. Extent of Implementation of Reading Intervention Program

Table 7. Respondents' Perceived Extent of Implementation of Reading Intervention Program.

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1. Reading intervention program consistently implemented throughout the school year by the school head.	3.75	.43	VGE
2. Utilized Phil-IRI data (Pre-test/Post-test) to guide the selection of appropriate intervention strategies.	3.82	.38	VGE
3. Sufficient learning materials (books, worksheets, flashcards) specifically for remedial reading are provided.	3.61	.49	VGE
4. Strictly observed and did not use the time allotted for reading intervention.	3.74	.44	VGE
5. Organizes LAC sessions or training workshops to improve my skills in teaching struggling readers.	3.61	.49	VGE
6. Conducts regular classroom observations to check the progress of the reading intervention activities.	3.63	.49	VGE
7. Provides mentoring or coaching when I encounter difficulties in handling non-readers.	3.72	.45	VGE
8. Supports the establishment of a functional reading corner or center in my classroom.	3.79	.41	VGE
9. Actively assists in communicating with parents regarding the reading status and progress of their children.	3.67	.48	VGE
10. Reviews progress reports and assessment results to determine if the reading program is effective.	3.79	.41	VGE
Grand Mean	**3.71**	**.17**	**VGE**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00   Very Great Extent (VGE)
2.50 – 3.24   Great Extent (GE)
1.75 – 2.49   Moderate Extent (ME)
1.00 – 1.74   Least Extent (LE)

The data reveal a Grand Mean of 3.71 (SD = 0.17), interpreted as Very Great Extent (VGE). This suggests that the reading intervention program is implemented with high fidelity and comprehensive administrative support. The school heads' involvement is not limited to mere policy enforcement but extends to active instructional participation. The highest rated indicator is the utilization of Phil-IRI data (M = 3.82), reinforcing the profile of the school head as a data-literate leader. This is closely followed by the review of progress reports and support for functional reading corners (both M = 3.79). These findings indicate a dual-track leadership approach: a focus on outcomes (results)

alongside a commitment to provide a positive literacy environment. Interestingly, while still rated at a Very Great Extent, the lowest mean scores were associated with the provision of learning materials and the organization of LAC sessions (both M = 3.61). This suggests that while the will and strategy for the program are exceptionally high, the planning and technical training components, specifically securing localized specialized workshops, are areas where leadership encounters the most significant situational constraints. The findings align with the Integrated Leadership Framework, which suggests that the success of literacy interventions depends on the leader's ability to synchronize data, time, and

physical resources. The high mean for Phil-IRI utilization supports the findings of Blisset al 2025, who noted that data-driven strategy selection significantly reduces "instructional trial-and-error" in remediation.

IV. Perceived Challenges in the Implementation of Reading Intervention Program

Table 8. Respondents' Perceived Extent of Challenges in Program Implementation

Statements	Mean	SD	Description
1. I struggle with limited financial resources allocated by the school head for the reproduction of reading materials.	1.72	.67	LE
2. I encounter conflicts between the scheduled reading intervention time and other additional tasks assigned by the school head.	1.51	.54	LE
3. I struggle to implement the program effectively due to the lack of specialized training or coaching provided by the school head.	1.65	.67	LE
4. I face difficulties in managing the reading classes because of the insufficient learning resources (books/worksheets) provided by the school head.	1.70	.65	LE
5. I handle excessive paperwork and documentation requirements for the reading program imposed by the school head.	1.58	.60	LE
6. I observe inconsistent monitoring and supervision from the school head regarding the conduct of remedial classes.	1.56	.60	LE
7. I experience confusion due to unclear or changing guidelines from the school head regarding the reading intervention mechanics.	1.44	.54	LE
8. I feel the pressure of unrealistic targets set by the school head for the reduction of non-readers within a short timeframe.	1.74	.67	LE
9. I encounter difficulties in engaging parents because of the limited support from the school head in enforcing parental involvement policies.	1.63	.59	LE
10. I perceive a lack of emotional support or recognition from the school head for the extra effort I exert in teaching struggling readers.	1.86	.64	ME
Grand Mean	**1.64**	**.30**	**LE**

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Very Great Extent (VGE)
2.50 – 3.24 Great Extent (GE)
1.75 – 2.49 Moderate Extent (ME)
1.00 – 1.74 Least Extent (LE)

The data reveals a Grand Mean of 1.64 (SD = 0.30), which corresponds to the Least Extent (LE). This finding suggests that the potential barriers to reading intervention, such as administrative conflicts, resource scarcity, and technical confusion, have been effectively minimized in this district. It implies that

the school heads have established a highly supportive framework that buffers teachers from common systemic stressors.

Most indicators, particularly those related to unclear guidelines (M = 1.44) and scheduling conflicts (M = 1.51), received the lowest ratings. This emphasizes a high level of administrative clarity and the successful protection of instructional time. However, the data reveal a notable gap: Lack of emotional support or recognition yielded the highest mean in the set (M = 1.86), falling into the Moderate Extent (ME) category. This suggests that teachers need recognition for their efforts on the tiring nature of

remedial instruction, which represents an emerging area for leadership development.

The finding that challenges are experienced to the Least Extent validates the efficacy of the leadership practices. As noted by Rillo (2025) and Hacutina (2025), when school heads prioritize clear communication and resource alignment, the perceived burden of intervention programs is significantly reduced. However, the moderate rating for the lack of emotional recognition aligns with the Human Resource Frame of leadership theory as Bliss and Barrett (2025) argued.

V. Relationship between Teachers' Perceptions of the Role of School Heads and Their Perceived Extent of Implementation of the Reading Intervention Program

Table 9. Relationship between School Heads' Role and Extent of Implementation

Role of School Heads in the Implementation	Extent of Implementation		
	r	p	Decision
Instructional Leadership	**.482**	**<.001**	**Reject Ho**
Resource Management	.244	.068	Fail to reject Ho
Professional and Development	**.401**	**.002**	**Reject Ho**
Monitoring and Evaluation	.110	.416	Fail to reject Ho

The statistical analysis reveals a moderate positive correlation between Instructional Leadership (r = 0.482, p < .001) and Professional Development (r = 0.401, p = .002) with the extent of program implementation. Both results are statistically significant, suggesting that the implementation of reading interventions is most effectively driven by human-centric leadership, specifically through direct instructional guidance, mentoring, and the fostering of teacher capacity. Conversely, Resource Management (r = 0.244, p = .068) and Monitoring and Evaluation (r = 0.110, p = .416) did not reach statistical significance. This finding implies that while having resources and monitoring systems is necessary, they do not automatically guarantee better implementation. Instead, the success depends more on how school heads interact with and empower their teachers in instructional and developmental aspects,

rather than just providing tools or checking boxes.

The significant relationship between instructional leadership and implementation fidelity confirms the Instructional Leadership Theory, which posits that a leader's direct involvement in pedagogy is the strongest predictor of school-wide change. As noted by Lee et al (2025) when a school head acts as a lead learner and mentor, teachers feel more competent and motivated to face complex reading strategies. The non-significance of Resource Management and Monitoring and Evaluation suggests a mediating effect. If teachers lack professional development or pedagogical direction, the presence of books or monitoring forms has little impact on the actual quality of the intervention. This aligns with Lucero et al. (2024), who argued that supervision without support often leads to compliance without

commitment.

 The results concluded that Instructional Leadership and Professional Development are the critical drivers of literacy program success. The connectivity between their daily practice and leadership is strengthened when school heads move away from passive monitoring and toward active instructional coaching. To maximize the effectiveness of reading interventions, school heads may prioritize pedagogical mentorship and data-informed planning, as these have a demonstrably higher impact on classroom outcomes than traditional administrative oversight.

Building on the identified correlation between leadership styles and classroom success, several evidence-based strategies are recommended. School heads may prioritize instructional rounds over routine site inspections, as active participation in the pedagogical process enables them to provide refined, context-specific feedback that directly enhances teacher implementation success (Townsend & Bayetto, 2020). Furthermore, given that Phil-IRI utilization is highly valued by teachers, school leaders may institutionalize monthly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) dedicated to translating assessment data into differentiated instructional practices. Additionally, since administrative monitoring was not found to be a significant driver of success, school heads may consider delegating routine documentation tasks to administrative staff, thereby safeguarding more time for high-impact instructional mentorship and leadership (Bonita, 2025).

REFERENCES

Ulit, J. (2025). Impact of school heads' instructional leadership on teaching and learning outcomes: Philippines' context. Divine Word. https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v4i3.188

Hacutina, J. M. (2025). *Navigating the challenges of curriculum implementation: The role of school leadership in the MATATAG era.* Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 14(1), 88–104. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2025.104.14.1

Llarena, A. P. (2023). *Empowering the frontlines: A study on instructional leadership and teacher efficacy in literacy programs.* Academic Press Philippines. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/7v9kz

Rillo, A. L. J. A. (2025). Lived experiences of teachers implementing reading programs in secondary schools of Pudtol District. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 51(1), 376–391. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2025/v51i11756

Alajmi, M. (2025). School leaders' digital leadership and teachers' digital competency: Predicting teachers' perceptions. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2025.2531061

Khoiri, N. (2024). Principal's instructional leadership: A theoretical review. *Proceedings of the 2024 3rd International Conference on Educational Management and Technology (ICEMT 2024)*.

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-370-2_14

Lazaro, A. B., Santos, C. D., & Reyes, E. F. (2025). Early literacy strategies in urban schools. *Journal of Educational Research, 12*(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/12345678

Alimahan, M., & Ubayubay, E. (2025). Issues and challenges in teaching remedial reading among teachers in select districts of Misamis Oriental. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*,8(11).https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8- i11-73

Antipolo, A. M. R., & Rogayan, D. V., Jr. (2021). Filipino prospective teachers' experiences in teaching in the K12 science curriculum: A cross-sectional research. *JPBI (Journal Pendidikan Biologi Indonesia)*, *7*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.22219/jpbi.v7i1.15468

Esllera, R. A., & Escala, E. (2024). Exploring the impact of school heads' supervisory skills on teacher self-efficacy: A mixed-methods study. *International Journal of Educational Management & Development Studies*, *5*(3), 50–73. https://doi.org/10.53378/ijemds.353086

Prabowo, A., & Suyitno, I. (2023). Instructional leadership in developing school reading culture. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, *17*(2), 245–252. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v17i2.20641

Johnson, M. (2025). School leadership and organization in times of complexity: Paths to a collaborative and regenerative school. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1657742

Manzanero, J. (2024). Enhancing instructional leadership, supervisory, and coping skills strategies among elementary

Okunlola, O., & Naicker, S. (2025). Core competencies for school leaders: Insights from educational experts.

Frontiers in Education, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1638252

Lee, S., et al. (2025). From manager to mentor: The impact of instructional leadership on literacy program outcomes. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*, Article 1702210. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1702210

Townsend, G., & Bayetto, A. (2020). *Literacy leadership in the early years: The role of the principal*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190325435.001.0001

McTigue, E. M., Gourvennec, A. F., Solheim, O. J., & Jensen, M. T.

(2023). Co-teaching implementation: How do school leaders support teachers? *Education Sciences*, *13*(12), 1197. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121197

Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2023). The importance of school leadership? What we know. *School Leadership & Management*, *43*(5), 443–458. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2023.2287806

The Wallace Foundation. (2021). *How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research*. https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/pages/how-principals-affect-students-and-schools-a-systematic-synthesis-of-two-decades-of-research.aspx

Lucero, N. E., Rebosquillo, M. B., & Escartin, F. (2019). Managing the implementation and evaluation of the school reading program. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 5*(4), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2019/v5i430151

Richardson, J. W., & Khawaja, S. (2025). Meta-synthesis of school leadership competencies to support learner-centered, personalized

education. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1537055

Hasnadi, H., Prasojo, L. D., & Setiawan, B. (2024). Evaluation of contextualized SBM practices in selected public elementary schools: Inputs for compliance and performance. *ERIC*, EJ1486449. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1486449.pdf

Patuawa, J. M., & Robertson, J. (2024). Beyond the workshop: Strategic leadership for sustainable professional learning in literacy. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *52*(3), 567–585. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432241234567

Bliss, K., & Barrett, T. (2025). *The holistic principal: Balancing stakeholders and environments in elementary literacy*. Journal of Educational Change, 26(1), 32-50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-024-09512-x