

Organizational agility and organizational efficacy of secondary schools in Dupax del Norte Districts: The determining role of school administrators' instructional leadership styles

Manuel, Jigger R.

Nueva Vizcaya State University, Philippines (jigger.manuel001@deped.gov.ph)

Ocampo, Imelda S. ✉

Nueva Vizcaya State University, Philippines (imeldasocampo@gmail.com)



ISSN: 2243-7703
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

OPEN ACCESS

Received: 29 October 2025

Available Online: 12 December 2025

Revised: 8 December 2025

DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2025.25134

Accepted: 10 December 2025

Abstract

This study investigated the determining role of school administrators' instructional leadership styles in relation to organizational agility and organizational efficacy in secondary schools of Dupax del Norte for the academic year 2025–2026. Utilizing a quantitative research design with a descriptive–correlational approach, the study involved secondary school teachers selected through stratified sampling based on school population, with sample size determined using Slovin's formula. Data was gathered using validated and reliable research instruments and analyzed using mean, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, and coefficient of determination. All hypotheses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance. Findings revealed that teachers perceived their schools to have a very good level of organizational agility (grand mean = 4.15), particularly in governance and proactive problem-solving, though continuous learning and innovation require strengthening. Organizational efficacy was rated very good (grand mean = 4.24), with high levels of teamwork and organizational commitment, although innovation and operational systems still need further enhancement. The instructional leadership styles of school administrators were also evaluated as very good (grand mean = 4.47), with coaching and supporting emerging as the strongest dimensions. Correlation analysis disclosed a highly positive and significant relationship between instructional leadership styles and both organizational agility ($r = 0.876$) and organizational efficacy ($r = 0.702$), demonstrating that effective leadership significantly enhances adaptability, responsiveness, and institutional performance. A strong relationship was also found between organizational agility and organizational efficacy ($r = 0.756$), indicating that more agile schools tend to be more effective. Based on these findings, an Organizational Development Intervention Program was designed to strengthen adaptive capacity, operational excellence, and leadership effectiveness to further sustain institutional growth and resilience.

Keywords: instructional leadership styles, organizational agility, organizational efficacy

Organizational agility and organizational efficacy of secondary schools in Dupax del Norte Districts: The determining role of school administrators' instructional leadership styles

1. Introduction

In an increasingly interconnected world, organization development and planning in the education landscape have become critical to ensure that schools in all levels must remain responsive to the needs, adaptive to challenges, and effective in every outcome for the holistic development of every student. Education systems worldwide face common challenges—rapid technological advancements, shifting pedagogical approaches, and evolving policy landscapes—necessitating organizational agility in schools. Institutions that embrace agility can swiftly implement reforms, integrate innovative teaching methodologies, and address emerging global trends such as digital transformation and inclusive education which is the call of times. At the same time, it is the conviction of the present researcher that organizational efficacy remains an important goal for educational institutions, ensuring that schools realize their learning objectives efficiently. This entails improving resource allocation, high academic standards maintenance, and fostering an ethos of collaboration and culture of innovation. Across different contexts, schools must navigate constraints such as funding limitations, socio-political influences, and disparities in access to quality education. Addressing these issues requires a strategic approach to institutional planning, leveraging data-driven decision-making, leadership development, and continuous improvement frameworks.

The researcher being a school administrator himself believes that instructional leadership is a key driver of both agility and efficacy, which has gained global recognition as a critical factor in school effectiveness. Educational leaders like him must not only manage schools efficiently but also cultivate a forward-thinking vision that aligns with global educational priorities, such as sustainability, equity, and digital literacy. In many countries around the world, instructional leaders like principals and head teachers are instrumental in policy implementation, teacher capacity-building, and fostering an environment conducive to lifelong learning among students. It is the main assumption of this present investigation that integrating organizational agility, efficacy, and instructional leadership within a structured organizations like secondary schools in Dupax del Norte District will and can enhance their resilience and adaptability of modern educational challenges. Capitalizing in leadership training, cross-border educational collaborations, and innovation-driven policies will empower institutions to deliver quality education that meets the demands of an evolving global landscape affecting the education sector as an organization itself.

According to Qtairi and Alshoraty (2022), a key characteristic of successful academic organizations like universities is their high level of organizational agility, which allows them to predict, anticipate, and respond to sudden and unexpected changes effectively. This agility enables universities to adjust their strategies, navigate challenges, and overcome threats and risks. It also helps them maximize advantages and seize promising opportunities. Academic organizations facing significant changes work diligently to develop organizational agility and foster faculty members' openness to change. This adaptability allows organizations like school to anticipate and control future events, mitigating potential harms while capitalizing on opportunities.

In today's rapidly evolving landscape, agile schools distinguish themselves through their capacity to proactively navigate and effectively respond to the inherent challenges of a challenging environment. These institutions transcend mere reactive problem-solving, instead fostering a culture of anticipation and prevention. This involves the deliberate adoption of innovative work methodologies, allowing for flexible and adaptable operational frameworks. Crucially, agile schools prioritize reflective practice, encouraging continuous self-assessment across teaching, research, and community service. This dedication to critical analysis cultivates a fundamental shift in mindset, enabling educators to embrace new perspectives and approaches. Ultimately, the

defining characteristic of an agile school is its unwavering openness to change. This encompasses a willingness to adjust strategies, structures, and cultural norms in alignment with evolving needs, ensuring sustained relevance and effectiveness in a dynamic world (Sharp et al., 2020).

Schools' agility is defined by their ability to swiftly integrate technology, staff, and management through a robust communication and information infrastructure. This agility enables them to respond strategically, efficiently, and cohesively to the evolving demands of students in dynamic educational environments (Amos, 2018). Across the globe, schools continually face shifts in their operational landscapes. To maintain a competitive edge, they must proactively mobilize resources and adapt to emerging opportunities. A school's agility is reflected in its flexibility and capacity to restructure, refine, and innovate its practices and processes in response to new challenges and changing educational needs (Menon & Suresh, 2020). On the other hand, in an increasingly complex and dynamic global environment, organizational efficacy has become a critical success factor for educational institutions. It refers to a school's ability to effectively coordinate leadership, resources, staff performance, and strategic decision-making to meet evolving educational goals (Ng, 2018). Schools across the world face numerous challenges—technological disruption, socio-economic inequality, shifting pedagogical expectations—and only those with strong organizational structures can adapt and thrive.

One key driver of organizational efficacy is adaptive leadership. Leaders who promote innovation, collaboration, and resilience are better positioned to navigate rapid changes such as the integration of digital learning tools or remote education mandates. According to Noman et al. (2021), school systems that foster distributed leadership and cultivate collective teacher efficacy tend to perform better in managing reforms and enhancing student outcomes.

Another element is agility in resource management, particularly in diverse educational landscapes. For instance, schools in low-income countries may not have access to the same infrastructure as those in more developed nations, but strategic planning and stakeholder involvement often help bridge gaps (Jamaludin et al., 2020). In contrast, schools in more affluent regions often leverage data analytics, professional development programs, and performance tracking systems to continuously refine their operations (Lee & Yin, 2019). Furthermore, organizational efficacy is not just about internal systems but also external collaboration. Globally effective schools are those that engage with communities, parents, and policy-makers to align educational services with real-world needs (Wong, 2022). This interconnectedness enhances responsiveness to cultural diversity, curriculum relevancy, and inclusive practices.

It is the main assumption of this study that organizational agility and organizational efficacy can be determined by the prevailing instructional leadership of every school administrator. Instructional leadership has increasingly emerged as a pivotal factor in promoting student achievement and enhancing teaching quality. In the modern educational landscape, school administrators are no longer just managers of operations—they are expected to be visionaries and instructional leaders who shape curriculum, guide teacher development, and create a culture focused on learning (Hallinger, 2018).

Instructional leaders actively engage in the core work of schools: teaching and learning. They support teachers through regular feedback, data-informed decision-making, and fostering professional learning communities. According to Gumus et al. (2018), effective instructional leadership directly influences teacher motivation and instructional practices, thereby boosting student outcomes. The global shift towards performance-based accountability and educational equity has further emphasized the instructional role of principals. As noted by Liu and Hallinger (2021), administrators who demonstrate high instructional leadership capacity are more effective in narrowing achievement gaps, particularly in diverse and underperforming school settings. Furthermore, instructional leadership involves creating an environment where continuous learning is the norm. School leaders must ensure alignment between curriculum, instruction, and assessment. They also model lifelong learning by engaging in professional development and encouraging innovation (Day & Sammons, 2018).

In the context of post-pandemic recovery, the instructional role of school leaders has expanded to include

digital pedagogy, emotional support, and instructional flexibility. Successful leaders demonstrate agility and foresight, adapting instructional strategies to both in-person and virtual learning modalities (Azorin et al., 2020). In this study, instructional leadership is considered as a cornerstone of effective school administration. When administrators lead with an instructional focus—grounded in collaboration, data use, and teacher development—they create conditions that enable sustained school improvement and student success.

The study on organizational agility, organizational efficacy, and instructional leadership of school administrators among secondary schools in Dupax del Norte aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which promotes inclusive, equitable, and quality education for all. By examining how schools adapt to change, manage resources effectively, and provide strong instructional leadership, the research contributes to improving student outcomes and educational equity. Furthermore, this study supports the National Higher Education Research Agenda (NHERA) in the Philippines, particularly in the areas of educational leadership, governance, and innovation. It provides data-driven insights that can inform policy, strengthen leadership training programs, and enhance institutional responsiveness in local contexts. Focusing on Dupax del Norte adds value to localized education development efforts, ensuring that even schools in rural or underserved areas are part of the broader push for sustainable, high-quality education systems that empower both educators and learners in alignment with national and global goals.

This study is anchored on the Nueva Vizcaya State University (NVSU) Research Agenda, particularly under the themes of education quality, leadership, and institutional development. By exploring organizational agility, efficacy, and instructional leadership, the research aims to enhance school performance and promote educational innovation within the province. It also aligns with the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) Research Agenda, specifically in advancing knowledge in organization development and planning. The study contributes to the understanding of leadership dynamics in public schools and supports evidence-based practices that strengthen local educational systems in line with regional and institutional priorities. However, among the secondary schools in Dupax del Norte, there is a notable research gap in understanding how organizational agility, efficacy, and instructional leadership intersect to influence school performance in rural settings like Dupax del Norte. While studies on school leadership and organizational effectiveness have been conducted in urban contexts, limited research exists that focuses on how these factors play out in less-resourced, rural schools. Furthermore, there is insufficient exploration of how school administrators in these areas adapt to challenges like resource scarcity, teacher overload, and socio-economic disparities. Addressing this gap will provide insights tailored to the unique needs of rural schools, ultimately improving educational outcomes.

It is also a common observation by the researcher that secondary schools in Dupax del Norte face a range of local challenges that highlight the need for this study. These local scenarios include limited instructional materials, outdated facilities, and uneven access to technology, which hinder effective teaching and learning. Many schools also struggle with leadership gaps, where administrators lack sufficient training in instructional supervision and strategic management. Frequent class disruptions due to natural disasters, socio-economic disparities among students, and teacher overload from excessive paperwork, extracurricular activities, and tight deadlines further affect school performance. In addition, there is a need for stronger collaboration among stakeholders and more agile responses to educational reforms and curriculum changes. These concerns justify examining organizational agility, efficacy, and instructional leadership.

Given the identified research gaps and the local challenges highlighted, the researcher is motivated to conduct this study to contribute to the existing body of knowledge on organization development and planning. By examining the unique dynamics in secondary schools in Dupax del Norte, this study aims to provide valuable insights that can inform more effective leadership practices and strategic decision-making. Additionally, the findings are intended to assist in the development of policies that address the specific needs of secondary schools in the rural area, ensuring that future educational reforms are both relevant and responsive to local contexts.

2. Related Literature

This research study draws upon the prominent Transformational Theory by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). This theory supports your study's focus on instructional leadership styles—especially coaching, supervising, and delegating. Transformational leaders inspire, motivate, and develop their team members to exceed expectations. In school settings, transformational leadership contributes to a more agile and effective organization, fostering a culture of learning, innovation, and shared vision. In the case of organizational agility and organizational efficacy, these research constructs are anchored on Systems Theory by Bertalanffy (1950), and Senge (1990) when they theorized that schools are seen as open systems where multiple components (leadership, people, resources, structures) interact to achieve organizational goals. Systems theory supports the concept of organizational efficacy and agility, emphasizing how adaptability and continuous learning within a system (school) lead to sustained performance. These theories were discussed separately below on how they support or related to the research variables of this study.

The Transformational Leadership Theory, as introduced by Burns (1978) and further developed by Bass (1985), provides a strong theoretical foundation for understanding and examining the instructional leadership styles of school administrators in Dupax del Norte. This theory emphasizes leaders' ability to inspire and motivate their followers to transcend their self-interest for the good of the organization, fostering a shared vision, high levels of trust, innovation, and personal development. In the context of educational leadership, transformational leadership closely aligns with the instructional leadership functions of directing, coaching, supervising, and delegating—key components under investigation in this study. Transformational leaders encourage professional growth among teachers, promote a collaborative culture, and provide strategic guidance, all of which are critical in enhancing teaching effectiveness and improving student outcomes. By empowering teachers, transformational school administrators are more likely to develop responsive and adaptive educational environments—especially vital in today's rapidly evolving academic and social landscape. Furthermore, transformational leaders model ideal behaviors, set high expectations, and offer intellectual stimulation, which closely mirrors the coaching and supervising dimensions of instructional leadership. The ability to delegate tasks while fostering autonomy also reflects a transformational approach, as it cultivates leadership capacity among teachers and supports school-wide innovation and improvement. In this way, the theory provides a lens to examine how school administrators in Dupax del Norte lead and influence their organizations toward continuous development and excellence. It is always the assumption of the researcher that transformational leadership theory not only underpins the conceptualization of instructional leadership styles in this study but also reinforces the potential impact of such leadership on the agility and efficacy of school organizations.

Instructional leadership styles are the approaches and actions school administrators take to guide and influence teaching and learning within schools. These styles generally include directing, coaching, supervising, and delegating, with an overarching goal of improving instructional quality and fostering an environment conducive to continuous professional development. The concept of instructional leadership has been extensively developed in recent research, offering valuable insights into how school leaders can effectively impact educational outcomes. According to Anderson and Dearing (2021), instructional leadership involves a blend of directive and supportive behaviors. These leaders provide clear expectations and direction while also creating opportunities for professional growth and collaboration. Anderson and Dearing suggest that instructional leaders must balance the need to direct educational practices with the need to empower teachers through professional development and fostering a positive school climate. They emphasize that effective instructional leadership requires a focus on both administrative duties and the quality of teaching in the classroom.

In their meta-analysis, Kraft, Blazar, and Hogan (2020) highlight the importance of teacher coaching as a critical component of instructional leadership. They argue that leaders who engage in coaching relationships with teachers can directly influence teaching practices, which in turn enhances student performance. Coaching is particularly valuable in supporting teachers' instructional skills, as it involves personalized feedback and sustained collaboration. Kraft et al. note that the effectiveness of coaching depends on the leader's ability to create a trusting

and supportive environment where teachers feel encouraged to experiment with new strategies. Similarly, Wang and Degol (2020) emphasize the importance of teacher collaboration as part of effective instructional leadership. They posit that school leaders who facilitate teacher collaboration create an environment where teachers share best practices, work collectively on instructional improvement, and learn from each other's experiences. In their research, they found that leaders who promote teacher collaboration foster a culture of continuous learning, which is essential for improving student academic outcomes. Moreover, Wang and Degol's study underscores the role of school climate in supporting instructional leadership, suggesting that a positive and collaborative school culture enhances the effectiveness of leadership styles. In this study, instructional leadership styles will be examined through four key dimensions: directing, coaching, supervising, and delegating. These dimensions play a crucial role in shaping how school administrators influence teaching and learning within their schools. Each dimension is supported by established research in the field of educational leadership.

The directing dimension refers to the leader's role in providing clear guidance, setting expectations, and ensuring that instructional goals are achieved. School leaders who excel in directing create a structured environment where teachers understand their roles and responsibilities. According to Robinson, Hohepa, and Lloyd (2021), effective instructional leaders must provide direction while also maintaining a focus on instructional quality and student achievement. This dimension emphasizes the importance of clarity in communication and decision-making, which are integral to maintaining a strong educational foundation. Coaching involves leaders working closely with teachers to enhance their instructional practices through feedback, mentorship, and professional development. This dimension is central to developing teacher efficacy and improving overall teaching quality. As Kraft, Blazar, and Hogan (2020) note, coaching is one of the most effective methods for improving teaching practices, as it fosters a collaborative relationship between the leader and teachers, emphasizing personal growth and reflection. The coaching approach aligns with the concept of transformational leadership, where leaders aim to inspire and elevate their followers' professional capabilities.

The supervising dimension involves the monitoring and evaluation of teachers' performance to ensure alignment with school standards and instructional goals. Wang and Degol (2020) argue that supervising is essential for maintaining accountability and ensuring that teachers meet the expectations set by school leaders. Effective supervision allows for timely intervention, ensuring that challenges are addressed, and teachers receive the support needed to improve their instructional practices. This component reinforces the importance of both accountability and support in the development of effective school leadership. The delegating dimension is about empowering teachers by providing them with the autonomy to make instructional decisions while maintaining oversight and support. Leithwood and Jantzi (2016) highlight that leaders who effectively delegate not only foster trust and professional growth but also build a sense of ownership among their teaching staff. By allowing teachers to take responsibility for their instructional decisions, school leaders encourage innovation and the development of leadership within the school community. Delegation fosters a culture of shared leadership, where teachers play an active role in shaping the educational environment.

The second theory where the two remaining research variables were anchored mentioned earlier is Systems Theory. Organizational agility and organizational efficacy can be effectively understood through the lens of Systems Theory, which views organizations as complex, interconnected systems. According to Senge (1990), organizations, including schools, operate as open systems where multiple elements (such as leadership, processes, and resources) interact and influence one another. This interconnectedness is crucial for fostering both agility and efficacy in school organizations. Systems theory emphasizes that organizational adaptability is not just a response to external stimuli, but also a proactive reorganization of internal structures and processes to enhance performance. In schools, organizational agility enables administrators to respond quickly and effectively to changing educational demands, while organizational efficacy refers to the school's ability to achieve its educational goals through effective internal coordination and resource utilization. As Tushman and O'Reilly (2021) argue, an organization's success is heavily dependent on how well it integrates its internal processes and adapts to external changes. Systems theory underscores that these changes must occur in a coordinated and deliberate manner, where each part of the system adjusts to create a harmonious and efficient whole. Moreover, organizational agility in schools is

about the ability to adapt quickly to new conditions, an idea that is strongly supported by Senge (2020). He notes that for an organization to remain agile, it must foster continuous learning and development. Schools must adopt a systems thinking approach that connects leadership decisions with the broader educational context. This interconnected approach allows schools to pivot rapidly when necessary, whether in response to shifts in curriculum standards, student needs, or technological innovations. Tsang (2020) further reinforces this by suggesting that organizational agility involves not only responsiveness but also the ability to foresee and prepare for potential challenges in the educational landscape. By leveraging Systems Theory, school leaders can create environments that facilitate both adaptability and innovation, ensuring long-term sustainability and growth.

On the other hand, organizational efficacy is the outcome of effective management of internal resources, processes, and structures. Heifetz and Laurie (2020) contend that organizational efficacy hinges on the leadership's ability to align these internal elements with the organization's goals and external challenges. In the context of schools, this means ensuring that teaching strategies, administrative structures, and resources are effectively coordinated to maximize student outcomes. Systems Theory suggests that a school's efficacy depends on how well it integrates and harmonizes its various components. Kast and Rosenzweig (2021) emphasize that schools, like other organizations, must not only be efficient in their operations but also continually evolve to maintain relevance and effectiveness in a rapidly changing environment. The alignment of these internal components, facilitated by school leaders, is critical for achieving high levels of organizational efficacy. Organizational agility refers to an organization's capacity to rapidly adapt to changing conditions, innovate, and remain competitive. It is a crucial capability for schools, enabling them to maintain effectiveness in the face of evolving educational needs and external changes. The dimensions of organizational agility—adaptability and flexibility, continuous learning and innovation, proactive problem-solving, strategic decision-making, and resource utilization—are interconnected elements that contribute to an organization's ability to remain responsive and sustainable.

Adaptability and flexibility are key to organizational agility, allowing schools to quickly adjust their structures, processes, and strategies to meet changing demands, such as shifts in curriculum (Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2018). Continuous learning and innovation help schools stay ahead by constantly improving and adapting. Teece (2018) argues that schools must proactively innovate, adopting new technologies and teaching methods to remain competitive and relevant. Proactive problem-solving involves identifying and addressing potential challenges before they escalate. Voss (2020) notes that proactive schools can tackle issues such as student performance gaps early, ensuring long-term stability and success. Strategic decision-making ensures that schools align their goals with both current and future needs. Zollo and Winter (2019) highlight the importance of making decisions focused on long-term growth and sustainability, guiding schools through periods of change. Finally, resource utilization ensures that schools use available resources efficiently, whether human, financial, or technological. Lengnick-Hall et al. (2020) emphasize that schools with high agility optimize their resources to adapt and respond to new opportunities, particularly in times of budgetary constraints.

Organizational efficacy on the other hand as research construct, refers to an organization's ability to achieve its goals effectively and efficiently, utilizing its resources to their fullest potential. In the context of schools, organizational efficacy is vital in driving educational success. It encompasses several dimensions, including leadership efficacy, team efficacy, organizational commitment efficacy, operational efficacy, and innovative efficacy. Each dimension plays a significant role in contributing to the overall success and performance of the school. Organizational efficacy includes key dimensions such as leadership efficacy, team efficacy, organizational commitment efficacy, operational efficacy, and innovative efficacy. Leadership efficacy refers to school leaders' ability to guide the organization toward achieving goals by inspiring and motivating staff, creating a conducive learning environment, and making strategic decisions (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2019). High leadership efficacy enables school leaders to implement changes successfully.

Team efficacy is the belief that teams can achieve their objectives, fostering collaboration and problem-solving among staff (Gully et al., 2018). It enhances the quality of teaching and improves student outcomes when educators work cohesively. Organizational commitment efficacy reflects the commitment of staff to the school's mission and

goals, driving their motivation and effort toward school success (Meyer et al., 2018). It is particularly vital in challenging times. Operational efficacy focuses on managing internal operations efficiently to achieve organizational objectives, including optimizing teaching schedules and resource use (Huang & Li, 2019). High operational efficacy ensures smooth daily functioning and better educational outcomes. Finally, innovative efficacy refers to the ability to introduce new ideas and technologies to enhance performance, fostering a culture of innovation to improve teaching methods and student engagement (Crossan, Lane, & White, 2021). Schools with high innovative efficacy are better positioned to adopt new approaches and technologies that support both students and teachers.

Based on the theories and concepts presented, it is the assumption of this study that the instructional leadership styles of school administrators play a significant role in determining the organizational agility and organizational efficacy of secondary schools in Dupax del Norte. It is hypothesized that administrators' leadership styles, including directing, coaching, supervising, and delegating, directly influence how schools adapt to changes, innovate, solve problems, make strategic decisions, and utilize resources effectively. Furthermore, it is assumed that instructional leadership styles foster a school culture that enhances collaboration, commitment, and operational efficiency, thereby improving the overall organizational performance and responsiveness to both internal and external challenges in the educational environment.

3. Methodology

Research Design. The study employed a quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design to examine the influence of school administrators' instructional leadership styles on organizational agility and organizational efficacy in public secondary schools in Dupax del Norte District, Schools Division of Nueva Vizcaya. This design enabled the systematic collection of numerical data and the examination of relationships among variables without manipulation. The approach aligned with the study's objective of determining how leadership practices shape schools' responsiveness to change and their ability to achieve institutional goals.

Research Environment. The investigation was conducted in Dupax del Norte I and II Districts, a culturally diverse and geographically varied area in southern Nueva Vizcaya. The locale includes rural and semi-urban communities with differing levels of access to resources. Five secondary schools—Belance High School, Bugkalot High School, Lamo National High School, Munguia National High School, and Dupax del Norte National High School—served as research sites, offering a representative cross-section of institutional contexts in terms of culture, infrastructure, and leadership practices.

Respondents. The respondents were 115 secondary school teachers selected from a total population of 162 for the school year 2025–2026. Using the Slovin formula, the sample ensured adequate representation across all participating schools.

Sampling Procedure. A stratified random sampling technique was used, with each school treated as a distinct stratum. This ensured proportional representation and enhanced the accuracy and generalizability of findings. Ethical standards were upheld through informed consent, confidentiality, voluntary participation, and secure data handling.

Research Instruments - Three standardized and validated questionnaires were utilized:

(1) **Instructional Leadership Styles Survey Questionnaire** (Canivel, 2010; $\alpha = 0.875$), assessing leadership behaviors using a 5-point frequency scale;

(2) **Organizational Agility Descriptive Questionnaire** (Rahman, 2022; $\alpha = 0.916$), measuring adaptability, innovation, and governance on a 5-point agreement scale; and

(3) **Organizational Efficacy Survey Form** (Fuentes, 2018; $\alpha = 0.857$), assessing leadership, team, operational, and innovative efficacy using a similar 5-point scale.

Each tool employed clearly defined score ranges and qualitative interpretations for analysis.

Data Gathering Procedure. Data collection began with official approval from the Schools Division Superintendent and coordination with district supervisors. Participants received an orientation before answering the questionnaires. Completed responses were tallied, encoded, and subjected to statistical analysis to ensure accuracy and alignment with the study's objectives.

Statistical Treatment. Data were analyzed using the mean to determine levels of leadership style, organizational agility, and organizational efficacy. Pearson's r was used to test correlations among variables, interpreted using Garrett's scale. The coefficient of determination assessed the extent to which instructional leadership styles predicted organizational agility and efficacy. All statistical tests were evaluated at the 0.05 level of significance.

4. Results and Discussion

Problem 1. What is the perception of the public elementary school teachers of the instructional coaching leadership practices of their school heads along the dimensions of partnership-based collaboration, data-driven instructional improvement, reflective practices and professional growth, emotional intelligence and relational trust, equity-centered coaching, instructional leadership alignment?

Table 2

Mean and qualitative description of the school heads instructional coaching leadership practices as perceived by the teacher respondents (n=92)

Instructional Coaching Leadership Practices	Area Mean	Qualitative Description
Partnership-Based Collaboration	4.59	Excellent
Data-Driven Instructional Improvement	4.47	Very Good
Reflective Practices and Professional Growth	4.48	Very Good
Emotional Intelligence and Relational Trust	4.53	Excellent
Equity-Centered Coaching	4.53	Excellent
Instructional Leadership Alignment	4.54	Excellent
Grand Mean	4.52	Excellent

Table 2 presents the mean scores and qualitative descriptions of the school heads' instructional coaching leadership practices as perceived by the teacher respondents in the Kayapa East District. The computed grand mean of 4.52, described as excellent, indicates that school heads consistently demonstrate a high level of competence and effectiveness in performing their instructional coaching leadership roles. This finding suggests that teachers perceive their school heads as strong instructional leaders who foster collaboration, trust, and continuous professional growth within their schools. Among the six dimensions, partnership-based collaboration obtained the highest mean of 4.59, described as excellent, revealing that school heads highly prioritize shared decision-making, teamwork, and mutual accountability in guiding teachers toward improved instructional practices. This underscores the collaborative culture and open communication between school heads and teachers.

Instructional leadership alignment ranked second with a mean of 4.54, described as excellent, showing that school heads effectively align their coaching practices with the school's instructional goals and standards. Close behind are equity-centered coaching and emotional intelligence and relational trust, both with a mean of 4.53 and described as excellent, indicating that school heads demonstrate fairness, empathy, and trust-building skills that create a supportive environment conducive to teacher growth. Meanwhile, reflective practices and professional growth obtained a mean of 4.48, described as very good, suggesting that while school heads encourage reflective teaching and continuous learning, there remains room for further enhancement in facilitating structured reflection opportunities. Finally, data-driven instructional improvement received the lowest mean of 4.47, described as very good, implying that although data-informed decision-making is practiced, it may not yet be maximized across all instructional areas.

Overall, the results affirm that the school heads in Kayapa East District exhibit excellent instructional coaching leadership, particularly in fostering collaboration, trust, and equity, thereby contributing positively to teacher development and instructional quality.

Problem 2. What is the perception of the respondents of their reflective practices along the dimension of self-assessment and awareness, evidence-based reflection, collaborative reflection, critical thinking and problem solving, and continuous professional growth orientation?

Table 3

Mean and qualitative description of the teachers' reflective practices (n=92)

Teachers' Reflective Practices	Area Mean	Qualitative Description
Self-Assessment and Awareness	4.54	Very High
Evidenced-Based Reflection	4.63	Very High
Collaborative Reflection	4.54	Very High
Critical Thinking and Problem Solving	4.41	High
Continuous Professional Growth Orientation	4.47	High
Grand Mean	4.52	Very High

The data in Table 3 reveal that the teachers' reflective practices obtained a grand mean of 4.52, described as very high. This result indicates that teachers in Kayapa East District consistently engage in reflective activities that enhance their instructional performance, professional judgment, and continuous improvement. The finding implies that reflective practice is deeply embedded in their professional culture, promoting self-awareness, collaboration, evidence-based reflection, and a commitment to ongoing learning. Among the dimensions, evidence-based reflection obtained the highest mean of 4.63, described as very high. This indicates that teachers consistently use data, feedback, and classroom evidence to analyze their instructional effectiveness and inform teaching decisions. This finding reflects a strong culture of data-informed reflection where teachers base their professional growth on concrete outcomes rather than assumptions. According to Schön (2020), evidence-based reflection allows practitioners to bridge theory and practice by interpreting their experiences in light of empirical data, leading to more precise instructional improvement. Similarly, Hattie and Clarke (2020) emphasized that reflection grounded in evidence enhances teacher efficacy and fosters a learning mindset that values results-oriented teaching.

Both self-assessment and awareness and collaborative reflection obtained an equal mean of 4.54, both described as very high. This finding suggests that teachers demonstrate a strong sense of professional awareness and are actively involved in reflective collaboration with peers and instructional leaders. High self-assessment and awareness indicate that teachers regularly evaluate their instructional performance, identify personal strengths and areas for development, and take responsibility for their learning journey. As stated by Rodgers (2020), reflective self-awareness empowers teachers to make intentional instructional decisions aligned with their values and goals. On the other hand, collaborative reflection signifies that teachers frequently engage in collegial dialogue, sharing experiences, and co-analyzing teaching challenges. Farrell and Ives (2021) highlighted that collaborative reflection creates a community of practice where shared insights contribute to collective professional growth and innovation.

Continuous professional growth orientation obtained a mean of 4.47, described as high. This suggests that teachers are strongly motivated to engage in learning opportunities and apply reflective insights to enhance their competencies, though such engagement may vary depending on access to development programs. According to Avalos (2020), teachers' commitment to professional growth is sustained when reflective practices are integrated into ongoing coaching, mentoring, and professional learning communities. This dimension indicates that teachers in the district maintain a strong orientation toward improvement but may benefit from structured institutional support to sustain long-term growth.

The lowest dimension, critical thinking and problem-solving, obtained a mean of 4.41, described as high. This result implies that while teachers practice reflective thinking and problem-solving, it is somewhat less frequent compared to other reflective dimensions. It suggests the need for greater emphasis on developing analytical reflection, where teachers not only describe experiences but also critically evaluate their assumptions and decisions.

Larrivee (2020) argued that critical reflection transforms teaching from routine practice to deliberate inquiry, enabling teachers to address complex instructional problems with creativity and informed judgment.

The above results reveal that teachers in Kayapa East District possess a very high level of reflective practice, characterized by strong evidence-based reflection, self-awareness, and collaboration. These findings suggest that reflective practice serves as a cornerstone of their professional identity, empowering them to adapt, innovate, and continuously enhance their instructional effectiveness in alignment with the district’s educational goals.

Problem 3. Is there a significant relationship between the dimensions of instructional coaching leadership practices of school heads and teachers’ reflective practices as perceived by the teacher-respondents?

The results of the correlation analysis revealed a moderate and very significant relationship between instructional coaching leadership practices of school heads and teachers’ reflective practices, as indicated by the overall correlation coefficient of 0.673 ($p = 0.001$). This suggests that effective instructional coaching by school heads is closely associated with a higher level of reflective practice among teachers. The findings align with the view that instructional leadership focused on coaching enhances teachers’ ability to reflect critically on their instructional decisions and promote professional growth (Carver-Thomas et al., 2021). Among the individual dimensions, Instructional Leadership Alignment exhibited the strongest correlation with teachers’ reflective practices, with a coefficient of 0.710, categorized as a strong and very significant correlation. This underscores the importance of aligning school-wide instructional goals with teachers’ professional development and reflective habits, reinforcing findings by Liu and Hallinger (2022) that leadership alignment strengthens teachers' reflective engagement and instructional consistency.

Table 4

Correlation coefficient between the dimensions of instructional coaching leadership practices and teachers’ reflective practices (n=92)

Instructional Coaching Leadership Practices	Correlation Coefficient	Remarks
Partnership-Based Collaboration	0.638 (<i>moderate correlation</i>)	Very Significant
Data-Driven Instructional Improvement	0.546 (<i>moderate correlation</i>)	Very Significant
Reflective Practices and Professional Growth	0.602 (<i>moderate correlation</i>)	Very Significant
Emotional Intelligence and Relational Trust	0.639 (<i>moderate correlation</i>)	Very Significant
Equity-Centered Coaching	0.643 (<i>moderate correlation</i>)	Very Significant
Instructional Leadership Alignment	0.710 (<i>strong correlation</i>)	Very Significant
Overall Correlation	0.673 (<i>moderate correlation</i>)	Very Significant

Level of Significance: 0.05 p-value: 0.001

Other dimensions manifested moderate yet very significant correlations. These include Equity-Centered Coaching ($r = 0.643$) and Emotional Intelligence and Relational Trust ($r = 0.639$). These results highlight the crucial role of equitable and trust-based coaching relationships in enhancing reflective practice, as also emphasized by Brown (2020), who noted that relational trust fosters a reflective and collaborative culture in schools. Similarly, Partnership-Based Collaboration ($r = 0.638$), Reflective Practices and Professional Growth ($r = 0.602$), and Data-Driven Instructional Improvement ($r = 0.546$) all showed moderate but significant correlations. These findings reveal that when school heads use coaching methods grounded in partnership, data utilization, and reflective dialogue, teachers are more likely to internalize reflective practices, a pattern supported by Lopez and Camargo (2021). The results affirm that the instructional coaching leadership exhibited by school heads plays a vital role in shaping and strengthening teachers’ reflective practices, deepening both their instructional awareness and professional competence.

Problem 4. Based on the significant findings of the study, what educational management intervention could be crafted by the researcher to enhance/sustain the instructional coaching leadership practices of school heads and teachers’ reflective practice?

In designing the educational management intervention, the researcher identified the benchmark statements

with the lowest mean scores across each research construct, which served as the foundation for crafting a targeted training program for school heads and teachers. Specifically, in the domain of instructional coaching leadership practices, the following areas emerged as priorities for improvement: (1) the consistent engagement of teachers by school heads in collaborative dialogue aimed at enhancing instructional practices; (2) the use of diverse data sources by school heads to address instructional challenges effectively; (3) the provision of strategies that support teachers' ongoing personal and professional growth; (4) the cultivation of emotionally supportive and respectful professional relationships between school heads and teachers; (5) the guidance provided by school heads in recognizing and addressing potential biases in teaching practices; and (6) the alignment of individual teacher goals with the overarching objectives established by school leadership. These identified gaps underscore the critical components to be addressed in the intervention to strengthen instructional leadership and foster reflective practice among teachers.

5. Conclusions

- The school heads in the Kayapa East District exhibit exemplary instructional coaching leadership practices. This indicates strong leadership capacities, especially in fostering collaboration, aligning instructional goals, and promoting equity and trust.
- Teachers in the district demonstrated a very high level of reflective practice, showcasing a strong culture of self-awareness, evidence-based decision-making, and collaboration. The findings affirm that teachers actively engage in reflection to improve their instructional performance, with evidence-based reflection emerging as the most practiced dimension.
- The moderate and highly significant correlation between instructional coaching leadership and teachers' reflective practices confirms that effective coaching leadership significantly influences reflective engagement among teachers. The strong link between instructional leadership alignment and teacher reflection underscores the importance of coherent school-wide goals and strategic leadership in fostering reflective teaching practices.
- The study highlighted specific performance gaps in both instructional coaching leadership and teachers' reflective practices, as identified by the lowest-rated benchmark statements. Addressing these through a targeted educational management intervention—designed to enhance collaborative dialogue, evidence-based decision-making, professional growth, and reflective teaching—is essential for strengthening the professional ecosystem within the district.

Recommendations

- School heads may elevate their instructional coaching leadership by adopting a more strategic, data-driven approach that integrates regular classroom observations, personalized feedback, and mentorship. By cultivating a culture of shared leadership and professional trust, school heads can empower teachers to embrace innovation, reflective inquiry, and continuous improvement in their instructional practices.
- Teachers may deepen their reflective practices by embedding systematic reflection into their teaching routines through reflective journals, action research, and collaborative learning communities. By consistently analyzing their instructional decisions and student outcomes, teachers can foster self-awareness, refine pedagogical strategies, and strengthen their overall instructional competence.
- To reinforce the connection between school leadership and teacher performance, school heads may continue to align individual teacher goals with school-wide instructional objectives. Creating shared visioning sessions, co-developing action plans, and fostering communities of practice will further support reflective engagement and instructional coherence.
- A comprehensive intervention plan must be implemented to address specific areas of need, such as

enhancing collaborative dialogue, promoting bias awareness, and supporting creative problem-solving among teachers. Tailored training that responds directly to these gaps should be regularly monitored and evaluated for effectiveness.

- Both school leaders and teachers may sustain their professional growth through continuous coaching, mentoring, and reflective practice, supported by seminars and peer learning. Replicating the study in other contexts and exploring variables like teacher motivation, digital competence, or leadership styles may broaden insights into factors shaping effective leadership and reflective practice.

6. References

- Aguilar, E. (2018). *The art of coaching: Effective strategies for school transformation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Aguilar, E. (2019). *Coaching for equity: Conversations that change practice*. Jossey-Bass.
- Apuke, O. D. (2017). Quantitative research methods: A synopsis approach. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter)*, 6(11), 40–47. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0040336>
- Avalos, B. (2020). *Teacher professional learning and development in schools as a framework for improving teaching and learning*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 92, 103072.
- Avalos-Bevan, B., & Crespo, C. (2021). Teachers' collaborative reflection as a practice of professional learning: Insights from Chile. *Professional Development in Education*, 47(2-3), 400-415. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2019.1694054>
- Bates, R., & Morgan, G. (2021). Teachers' engagement with professional development: A systematic review. *Journal of Education and Professional Development*, 14(2), 45–60.
- Bautista, M. L. (2022). Integration of reflective practice in teacher education programs: A curriculum analysis. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 12(1), 45–58.
- Bautista, R. P. (2022). Challenges encountered by instructional coaches in delivering coaching leadership among public secondary school teachers in Iloilo. *Philippine Journal of Instructional Leadership*, 10(2), 55–72.
- Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2019). *Feedback in higher and professional education: Understanding it and doing it well*. Routledge.
- Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (2013). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning*. Routledge.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & McKee, A. (2019). *Becoming a resonant leader: Develop your emotional intelligence, renew your relationships, sustain your effectiveness*. Harvard Business Press.
- Brackett, M. A., & Cipriano, C. (2020). *Emotionally intelligent leadership: Promoting social and emotional learning in schools*. *Educational Leadership*, 78(2), 20–27.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2018). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2020). *Teaching for critical thinking: Tools and techniques to help students question their assumptions* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2020). *How to give effective feedback to your students* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
- Brown, J., & Weber, R. (2020). Collaborative leadership and teacher reflection: A pathway to effective instruction. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 18(3), 56–73.
- Brown, M. (2020). Building trust to support teacher reflection in instructional coaching. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 18(2), 45–60.
- Brown, P., Lomas, T., & Eperjesi, F. (2022). *Emotionally intelligent leadership and trust in schools: Building supportive professional relationships*. *School Leadership & Management*, 42(1), 34–50.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bush, T. (2020). *Instructional leadership and leadership for learning: Global and South African perspectives*. *Education as Change*, 24(1), 1–18.
- Carver-Thomas, D., Hyler, M., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2021). Effective leadership through instructional coaching: A pathway for reflective teaching. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 29(15), 1–27.

- Chen, B., Cheng, X., Kizilcec, R. F., & Xie, K. (2020). The effects of learning analytics dashboards on self-regulated learning. *Internet and Higher Education, 47*, 100728. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2020.100728>
- Cirocki, A., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2021). *Reflective practice for professional development of teachers: Current trends and future directions*. Language Teaching Research, 25(6), 759–778.
- Clarà, M. (2015). What is reflection? Looking for clarity in an ambiguous notion. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(3), 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114552028>
- Cook, T., & Blythe, S. (2021). *Collaborative professional learning: A practical guide for teachers and schools*. Sage Publications.
- Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (2022). *Cognitive coaching: Developing self-directed leaders and learners*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Danielson, C. (2021). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2020). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2020). *Data-driven leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2020). *Professional collaboration with purpose: Teacher learning to improve student outcomes*. Routledge.
- Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2020). *Professional collaboration with purpose: Teacher learning to improve student outcomes*. Routledge.
- David, L. J. (2024). Instructional coaching leadership and inclusive teaching practices among elementary teachers in Davao City. *Journal of Philippine Inclusive Education, 8*(1), 33–50.
- Day, C. (2020). *A passion for teaching: The role of emotion in professional learning and development*. Routledge.
- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2020). *Resilient teachers, resilient schools: Building and sustaining quality in testing times*. Routledge.
- De Guzman, E. M. (2020). The influence of instructional coaching leadership on the professional development of novice teachers in Cebu City. *Philippine Journal of Educational Development, 11*(1), 44–61.
- Del Campo, S. R. (2018). Effectiveness of instructional coaching leadership in enhancing instructional competence of public elementary teachers in Laguna. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education, 9*(1), 22–39.
- Dela Cruz, R. G. (2019). Reflective practice and classroom management: A mixed-methods study among public secondary teachers in Davao City. *Mindanao Journal of Educational Research, 8*(2), 112–130.
- DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017. (Philippines Department of Education).
- Donohoo, J., Hattie, J., & Eells, R. (2018). The power of collective efficacy. *Educational Leadership, 75*(6), 40–44.
- DuFour, R., & Fullan, M. (2021). *Cultures built to last: Systemic PLCs at work*. Solution Tree Press.
- Dweck, C. S. (2020). *Mindset: The new psychology of success* (Updated ed.). Random House.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2021). *Psychological safety: The key to effective team learning in schools*. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 8, 23–43.
- Facione, P. A. (2020). *Critical thinking: What it is and why it counts*. The California Academic Press.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2021). *Reflective practice in teacher education: A guide for early career teachers*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Farrell, T. S. C., & Ives, J. (2021). *Exploring teacher reflection: A collaborative narrative inquiry*. Reflective Practice, 22(1), 67–80.
- Fullan, M. (2019). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. Jossey-Bass.
- Galloway, M. K., & Ishimaru, A. M. (2020). *Leading equity-minded change in schools: The role of school*

- leaders in dismantling systemic inequities*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(5), 779–814.
- Galloway, M. K., & Ishimaru, A. M. (2021). Equitable leadership coaching: Disrupting traditional power structures in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(2), 301–332. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20961855>
- Garcia, P. T. (2023). Perceptions of public-school principals on their dual role as instructional and coaching leaders in Zamboanga City. *Mindanao Educational Review*, 15(2), 77–94.
- Garza, R., Burns, B., & Oduro, G. (2020). *Teacher leadership and professional collaboration: Empowering teachers for school improvement*. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(6), 1056–1072.
- Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gelfuso, A., & Dennis, D. V. (2019). Reflection as a complex and dynamic process: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 70(2), 188–200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118761094>
- Ghaye, T. (2020). *Reflective practice: A guide for teachers and students*. Routledge.
- Gilbert, M. (2022). Emotional trust in instructional coaching: Implications for reflective teaching. *Educational Inquiry*, 13(1), 89–104.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2021). *Primal leadership: Unleashing the power of emotional intelligence* (2nd ed.). Harvard Business Review Press.
- Gooden, M. A., & Dantley, M. E. (2021). *Centering race and equity in leadership preparation programs*. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 16(1), 55–75.
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). How Principals Affect Students and Schools: A Systematic Synthesis of Two Decades of Research. *The Wallace Foundation*.
- Grove, K. (2019). *Instructional leadership: Creating practice out of theory*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652>
- Hallinger, P. (2021). *A conceptual framework for systematic reviews of research on instructional leadership*. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(5), 704–733.
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, R. (2022). Instructional leadership alignment and teacher development: A reflective perspective. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(4), 497–514.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2020). *Leading professional learning: How successful leaders transform learning cultures and improve student achievement*. Teachers College Press.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2018). Leading Professional Learning: School Leadership and Teacher Development in Changing Times. *School Leadership & Management*, 38(2), 110–118.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). *Coaching and mentoring for professional development in schools*. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 3–7.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). *Leading for professional learning: What successful principals do to support teaching practice*. Corwin Press.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2021). *Leading schools in disruptive times: How to thrive amid uncertainty*. SAGE Publications.
- Harrison, L., & Tarli, H. (2020). Reflective coaching for professional growth in education. *Professional Development in Education*, 46(2), 210–224.
- Hattie, J. (2020). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hattie, J., & Clarke, S. (2020). *Visible learning: Feedback*. Routledge.
- Henson, R. K., & Tosh, K. L. (2022). Transforming classroom practice: The power of evidence-informed experimentation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 111, 103612.
- Hirsh, S., Brancard, R., & Farris-Berg, K. (2021). *Becoming a learning system: A process for systemic change*. Learning Forward.
- Ishimaru, A. M., & Takahashi, S. (2021). *Equity-focused leadership: A framework for leading inclusive and culturally responsive schools*. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(7), 1045–

1064.

- Jones, A., & Willis, D. (2020). Cultivating equity in instructional coaching: Reflective pathways to inclusion. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 53(4), 416–433.
- Jose, P. S. (2018). Exploring reflective practice among public elementary school teachers: Implications for professional growth. *Philippine Normal University Research Journal*, 10(1), 23–39.
- Kennedy, A., & Lees, J. (2021). The role of instructional partnerships in fostering reflective practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 104, 103357.
- Kennedy, M. M., & Laurillard, D. (2021). Professional learning and teacher change: The missing link. *Journal of Teacher Development*, 27(3), 265–284.
- Khalifa, M. (2020). *Culturally responsive school leadership*. Harvard Education Press.
- Khalifa, M., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2020). *Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature*. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(4), 507–535.
- Killion, J., & Harrison, C. (2019). *Taking the lead: New roles for teachers and school-based coaches* (2nd ed.). Learning Forward.
- Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction*. Corwin Press.
- Knight, J. (2018). *The impact cycle: What instructional coaches should do to foster powerful improvements in teaching*. Corwin Press.
- Knight, J. (2020). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction*. Corwin Press.
- Knight, J. (2021). *The impact cycle: What instructional coaches should do to foster powerful improvements in teaching*. Corwin Press.
- Knight, J., van Nieuwerburgh, C., & Campbell, J. (2019). Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 12(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17521882.2018.1532400>
- Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2015). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.
- Kraft, M. A., & Blazar, D. (2018). Taking teacher coaching to scale. *Education Next*, 18(4), 68–74.
- Kraft, M. A., & Gilmour, A. F. (2019). Revisiting the Widget Effect: Teacher Evaluation Reforms and the Distribution of Teacher Effectiveness. *Educational Researcher*, 48(4), 247–262.
- Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(4), 547–588.
- Kumar, S., & Green, A. (2021). Reflective practice through an equity lens: The role of instructional coaching. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 47(5), 691–706.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2021). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: A critical race perspective. *Harvard Educational Review*, 91(2), 163–189.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2021). *Culturally relevant pedagogy: Asking a different question*. Teachers College Press.
- Larrivee, B. (2020). *Authentic classroom management: Creating a learning community and building reflective practice*. Pearson.
- Larrivee, B. (2020). *Cultivating teacher renewal: Guarding against stress and burnout*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lee, H. J. (2018). Instructional coaching leadership and teacher collaboration in South Korean middle schools. *Asian Journal of Educational Leadership*, 6(1), 55–70.
- Lee, H. J. (2018). Reflective practice and critical thinking: An intervention study in Seoul primary schools. *Asian Journal of Educational Psychology*, 6(1), 55–70.
- Leithwood, K., & Azah, V. N. (2019). Characteristics of Effective Leadership Networks: The Fundamentals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(2), 339–374.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 201–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565829>
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2020). Educational leadership and student outcomes: A meta-analysis update. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2), 322–349.

- Li, X., & Peters, J. (2020). Data-informed coaching and the development of reflective teaching practices. *Journal of Educational Research*, 113(4), 301–312.
- Li, Z., Zou, W., & Li, X. (2021). Teachers' self-awareness and their reflective practice: The mediating role of emotional intelligence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 671534. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.671534>
- Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2022). Leading teacher reflection through aligned instructional practices. *Journal of School Leadership*, 32(3), 236–254.
- Lopez, L., & Camargo, S. (2021). The role of data-driven and collaborative coaching in teaching reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 100, 103291.
- Mandinach, E. B., & Gummer, E. S. (2021). What does it mean for teachers to be data literate? Understanding data use for teaching improvement. Teachers College Press.
- Mandinach, E. B., & Schildkamp, K. (2020). Data-based decision making in education: Challenges and opportunities. Teachers College Press.
- Marsh, J. A., & Farrell, C. C. (2021). How leaders cultivate teachers' data use for instructional improvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(3), 401–435.
- Matsumura, L. C., Garnier, H. E., & Spybrook, J. (2019). Using observational data to study instructional quality: Challenges and opportunities. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 31(2), 209–232. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-019-09301-2>
- McMillan, J. H. (2020). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Mena-Marcos, J. J., García-Rodríguez, M. L., & Taveras, J. D. (2020). The use of reflective journals in teacher education: A systematic review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 88, 102963. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102963>
- Merriam, S. B., & Bierema, L. L. (2014). *Adult learning: Linking theory and practice*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Mezirow, J. (2018). Transformative learning theory. In Illeris, K. (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning* (pp. 114–128). Routledge.
- Miller, K., & Jackson, L. (2020). Aligning instructional leadership to foster collaborative reflection. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(6), 1033–1050.
- Mitchell, R., & Sutton, P. (2021). Teacher empowerment and professional learning communities: Leadership practices that make a difference. *Journal of Educational Change*, 22(4), 487–506.
- Navarro, J. M. (2024). Reflective practice and inclusive education: Insights from Cebu public school teachers. *Journal of Philippine Educational Leadership*, 15(1), 77–95.
- Netolicky, D. M. (2020). *Transformational professional learning: Making a difference in schools*. Routledge.
- Nguyen, T. (2022). Fostering reflective professional learning through leadership support. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 11(2), 78–89.
- Nguyen, T. L. (2023). The impact of instructional coaching leadership on English language teachers' performance in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. *Vietnamese Journal of Language Education*, 14(3), 105–120.
- O'Connor, P., Hill, A., Kaya, M., & Martin, B. (2020). The measurement of emotional intelligence: A critical review of the literature and recommendations for educators. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1116.
- Park, B., & Shin, J. (2021). The role of emotional intelligence in instructional leadership and reflective practice. *School Leadership & Management*, 41(1-2), 97–113.
- Patterson, J. L., & Patterson, J. A. (2018). *Healthy, resilient, and sustainable schools: Aligning systems to promote student well-being and academic success*. ASCD.
- Perera, A., & John, P. (2022). Data-use and reflective teaching: A coaching perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 44(1), 135–152.
- Ponomareva, S., & Bolotov, V. (2021). Professional development of teachers: New approaches to support and evaluate. *Education and Self Development*, 16(3), 9–23. <https://doi.org/10.26907/esd.16.3.02>
- Queirós, A., Faria, D., & Almeida, F. (2017). Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research methods. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 3(9), 369–387. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.887089>
- Quinn, D., & Hoffman, J. (2020). Developing collaborative professionalism in schools: Lessons from research and practice. *Teachers and Teaching*, 26(5–6), 365–381.
-

- Ramos, A. P. (2021). Longitudinal analysis of reflective practice in novice teachers' professional development. *Philippine Journal of Educational Studies*, 9(2), 102–118.
- Ramos, A. P. (2023). The effects of instructional coaching leadership on student achievement in mathematics among Grade 10 students in Pampanga. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 13(2), 88–104.
- Reeves, T. D., & Honig, M. I. (2022). Supporting data-informed instructional leadership: Building teacher and leader capacity. *Journal of Educational Change*, 23(2), 167–187.
- Robinson, V. M. J. (2020). Leading teacher learning: The relational trust and alignment framework. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(2), 107–124.
- Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674.
- Rodgers, C. (2020). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers College Record*, 122(5), 1–32.
- Rodgers, C. (2020). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers College Record*, 122(5), 1–32.
- Santos, E. V. (2020). Reflective dialogues as catalysts for pedagogical innovation: A phenomenological study. *Philippine Journal of Educational Innovations*, 7(1), 35–50.
- Santos, M. C. (2019). Instructional coaching leadership and teacher self-efficacy among senior high school teachers in Quezon City. *Metro Manila Journal of Educational Studies*, 7(1), 41–59.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Schildkamp, K., & Poortman, C. L. (2020). Data-informed decision making in education: A call for action. *Educational Research Review*, 31, 100364.
- Schön, D. A. (2018). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Routledge. (Original work published 1983)
- Schön, D. A. (2020). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Routledge.
- Sweeney, D. (2016). *Student-centered coaching: The moves*. Corwin Press.
- Sweeney, D., & Harris, D. (2020). *The essential guide for student-centered coaching: What every K–12 coach and school leader needs to know*. Corwin Press.
- Sweeney, D., & Mausbach, A. (2018). *Leading student-centered coaching: Building principal and coach partnerships*. Corwin Press.
- Tanaka, M. (2022). Japanese elementary teachers' experiences in instructional coaching programs in Tokyo. *Journal of Asian Educational Practices*, 10(2), 66–82.
- Tanaka, M. (2023). Reflective practice in multicultural classrooms: A case study of international school teachers in Japan. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 25(3), 140–157.
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2020). A review of research on professional learning communities: What do we know? *Educational Leadership Review*, 21(1), 7–23.
- Villanueva, J. D. (2021). Instructional coaching practices of master teachers serving as instructional leaders in Nueva Ecija. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 12(1), 72–89.
- Villanueva, K. A. (2023). Reflective practice as a mediator between emotional intelligence and instructional competence: Evidence from Philippine higher education. *Asian Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 14(1), 88–105.
- Walpole, S., & McKenna, M. (2021). *How coaching transforms teaching and learning: Research-based practices for instruction and leadership*. Guilford Press.
- Wang, L. (2020). Instructional coaching leadership and digital pedagogy integration among Beijing high school teachers. *Chinese Journal of Educational Technology Leadership*, 5(2), 66–80.
- Wang, Y. (2020). Technology integration and reflective practice among Beijing high school teachers. *Chinese Journal of Educational Technology Integration*, 5(2), 66–80.
- Wayman, J. C., & Jimerson, J. B. (2020). Teacher and principal perceptions of the use of data for instructional improvement. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 67, 100904.
- Williams, D., & Simmons, F. (2023). Reflective dialogues in instructional leadership: Shaping professional

- growth. *Professional Reflection in Education*, 20(1), 12–27.
- Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (2019). *Reflective Teaching: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Zhang, Y., & Stephens, C. (2021). Using student achievement data to guide teacher reflection. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 29(52), 1–25.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2020). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 59(4), 70–81.