International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Reading Instructional Leadership and Pedagogical Digitized Reading Practices in Selected Public Schools in Parañaque City

May Ann G. Tarrazona

Student, Emilio Aguinaldo College

Abstract

This research aims to correlate the assessment of the reading instructional leadership of the school administrators and extent of implementation of teachers on digitized reading Division of Parañaque, City. Drawing on survey data collected from a diverse sample of educators, the study assesses reading instructional leadership practices, implementation of digitized reading instruction, and the influence of demographic factors on educators' perceptions and practices. The findings reveal consistently high scores in reading instructional leadership, indicating a strong alignment between administrators' practices and the promotion of a shared vision for reading instruction.

Additionally, teachers demonstrate a high level of implementation of digitized reading instruction, leveraging digital resources to enhance content delivery, teaching strategies, and assessment practices. While demographic factors such as age, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment do not significantly influence the implementation of digitized reading instruction, age emerges as a significant factor affecting assessment and overall implementation.

The study underscores the importance of tailored support programs for educators, leadership development initiatives for administrators, and fostering a data-driven culture to inform instructional practices. Recommendations include promoting diversity and inclusivity, providing professional development opportunities, supporting effective leadership practices, fostering data-driven decision-making, and encouraging the integration of digital tools into reading instruction. By implementing these recommendations, educational stakeholders can create a supportive environment conducive to enhancing literacy outcomes and promoting student success.

Keywords: reading, digital literacy, instructional leadership

1. Introduction

Reading is a fundamental skill that lays the groundwork for academic achievement and lifelong learning. Individuals with proficient reading skills can comprehend, analyze, and communicate information effectively. As reading skills are essential for educational attainment, it is essential to promote early reading proficiency among young students, notably in Primary Level students. This research seeks to investigate the efficacy of self-paced interactive reading materials as a foundation for a strategic intervention program to address the challenges encountered by the Division of Paranaque in enhancing the reading skills of Primary Level students.

In today's rapidly evolving digital landscape, the field of education is constantly seeking innovative strategies to enhance student learning outcomes. One area of focus is the integration of instructional leadership and pedagogical digitized reading practices, which aim to optimize teaching methodologies and leverage digital tools to foster effective reading instruction. This research delves into the realm of instructional leadership and explores the implementation of pedagogical digitized reading practices in selected public schools in Parañaque City.

The role of instructional leadership is crucial in molding the learning environment and maintaining the successful implementation of educational programs. It includes the procedures, plans, and methods that administrators use to assist and direct teachers in their educational pursuits. Instructional leaders possess the potential to revolutionize teaching and learning experiences by offering direction, support, and resources.

Concurrently, there has been a rise in the implementation of pedagogical digitized reading practices as a potential method for improving reading education. By utilizing digital tools and resources, these methodologies provide students with interactive, captivating, and customized learning opportunities. Various forms of digital reading materials, such as electronic books, internet-based platforms, multimedia resources, and interactive activities, have the potential to accommodate a wide range of learning styles and preferences. Through the incorporation of technology in the reading curriculum, educators can establish interactive and engaging learning settings that effectively engage students and cater to their unique learning requirements.

The Division of Parañaque face unique challenges in promoting first-grade students' reading proficiency. To address the individual learning requirements of students, factors such as limited resources, congested classrooms, and diverse student populations necessitate innovative approaches. Teachers can create a flexible and dynamic learning environment that encourages student autonomy and supports individualized instruction by utilizing self-paced interactive reading materials. Incorporating technology into the reading curriculum can also improve students' digital literacy skills, which are becoming increasingly important in the digital age.

The objective of this study is to investigate the convergence of reading instructional leadership and pedagogical digitized reading practices in a specific public school located in Parañaque City. Through an examination of the approaches utilized by instructional leaders in facilitating the incorporation of digitized reading practices, this research aims to reveal the potential effects on students' reading proficiency, involvement, and broader educational achievements.

The results of this research have substantial implications for educational policymakers, school administrators, instructors, and curriculum developers. This study aims to provide evidence-based recommendations for the design and implementation of a strategic intervention program by investigating the efficacy of self-paced interactive reading materials. These findings can inform division-level decision-making processes and facilitate the creation of policies that support the integration of technology-enhanced literacy instruction in Primary Level classrooms.

Therefore, the investigation will serve as a foundation for a strategic intervention program in the Division of Parañaque and will cast light on innovative approaches to improve the reading abilities of students. This research seeks to bridge the gap between traditional instructional methods and the diverse learning requirements of students by involving the instructional leadership practices of school leaders. The ultimate objective of this study is to contribute to the advancement of effective reading instruction practices so that students in Parañaque can become proficient and enduring readers.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized the descriptive method of research in a comparative and This research employed a descriptive, comparative, and correlational research design to explore the relationship between the assessment of reading instructional leadership among school administrators and the extent of implementation of digitized reading by teachers in the Division of Parañaque City.

The study began by describing the profile of the respondents, including their age, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment. Furthermore, the assessment of reading instructional leadership was evaluated based on various dimensions. These included incorporating a shared vision, guiding decision-making processes, building rapport with students, individualizing learner support, improving specialized training, monitoring data, and providing incentives.

The extent of implementation of digitized reading by teachers was assessed in terms of content, class performances, teaching strategies, and assessment. McMillian and Schumacher (2010) stated that this method of research was concerned with capturing the current status of a subject. The existing characteristics of a group of subjects were described and no manipulation of independent variables was involved. Therefore, the descriptive method was considered appropriate for this research, as it allowed for the presentation and analysis of the utilization of Self-Paced Interactive Digitized Reading Materials without altering or manipulating external factors.

In the comparative design, the study aimed to determine if there were any significant differences in the assessment of reading instructional leadership and the extent of implementation of digitized reading based on the respondents' profiles.

Finally, the study explored the significant relationship between the assessment of reading instructional leadership among school administrators and the extent of implementation of digitized reading by teachers. Therefore, the correlational design was employed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of data gathered in the study. It involves the examination and interpretation of the collected data to uncover patterns, trends, and insights related to the research objectives and questions. It focuses on presenting and analyzing the data in a systematic and organized manner, using appropriate statistical techniques and qualitative methods as applicable.

Table 1 Profile of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	25-35	35	22.0%
	36-45	25	15.7%
	46-55	54	34.0%
	55-above	36	22.6%
Civil Status	Single	63	39.6%
	Married	87	54.7%
Length of Service	1-5	36	22.6%
	6-10	53	33.3%
	11-15	36	22.6%

	15- above	25	15.7%
Educational Attainment	Bachelor's	96	60.4%
	Master's	34	21.4%
	Doctoral	20	12.6%

Table 1 delves into the demographic profile of respondents participating in a survey, offering a comprehensive understanding of their characteristics across various categories such as age, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment.

Firstly, regarding age distribution, it's evident that the majority of respondents fall within the age range of 46-55, comprising 34% of the total. This is followed closely by those aged 25-35 and 55-above, each constituting 22% and 23% of the respondents respectively. Notably, there is a relatively balanced distribution across different age groups, indicating a diverse sample.

Secondly, examining civil status, the data reveals that the majority of respondents are married, comprising 55% of the total. Single individuals make up the remaining 45%. This suggests that the survey includes a significant proportion of individuals who are in committed relationships or marriages, which could potentially influence their perspectives and responses on certain topics.

Thirdly, in terms of length of service, there is a relatively even distribution across the categories. However, the largest group consists of individuals with a service length of 6-10 years, constituting 33% of the total. This is followed by those with a service length of 1-5 years, making up 23%. The distribution suggests a mix of both experienced and relatively new employees participating in the survey, which could provide a comprehensive perspective on the given topic.

Lastly, examining educational attainment, the majority of respondents hold a Bachelor's degree, comprising 60% of the total. This is followed by those with a Master's degree at 21% and individuals with a Doctoral degree at 13%. This distribution indicates a relatively high level of educational attainment among the respondents, which could potentially influence their perspectives and understanding of the subject matter under consideration.

Overall, the data suggests a diverse and relatively balanced sample in terms of age, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment. Analyzing these demographic characteristics can provide valuable insights into understanding the perspectives and responses of the respondents within the survey context.

Table 2 Assessment of the Reading Instructional Leadership of the School Administrators in Terms of Incorporating a Shared Vision

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. The principal clearly articulates a reading instruction improvement plan.	3.75	.436	Highly Evident
2. The principal collaborates with teachers and staff on reading instructional goals.	3.71	.454	Highly Evident

3. The principal links reading teaching with the school's educational goals.	3.53	.642	Highly Evident
4. The school administration encourages teachers and staff to own the reading teaching vision.	3.57	.660	Highly Evident
5. The principal encourages instructors to work together to improve reading education.	3.69	.491	Highly Evident
6. The school principal allows teachers to share their reading teaching vision.	3.84	.368	Highly Evident
7. The principal fosters a reading-friendly environment.	3.79	.406	Highly Evident
8. The school principal frequently updates the reading teaching vision.	3.81	.391	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	3.711	.347	Highly Evident

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Evident) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all evident)

The provided table offers an assessment of the reading instructional leadership demonstrated by school administrators, particularly in terms of incorporating a shared vision within their educational institutions. Across eight indicators, each rated on a scale from 1 to 4, with 4 indicating "Highly Evident" and 1 indicating "Strongly Disagree," the data reveals consistently high scores, suggesting a strong alignment between the principals' leadership practices and the promotion of a shared vision for reading instruction.

Several key findings emerge from the analysis. Firstly, the principal's role in articulating and updating a reading instruction improvement plan (Indicator 1 and 8) appears highly evident, with weighted means of 3.75 and 3.81 respectively, indicating a clear and dynamic vision for enhancing reading education. Moreover, the collaborative nature of leadership is emphasized through indicators such as collaboration with teachers on instructional goals (Indicator 2) and fostering an environment conducive to shared visions (Indicator 7), both of which score highly at 3.71 and 3.79 respectively.

Furthermore, the data underscores the importance of aligning reading instruction with broader educational goals (Indicator 3) and empowering teachers to take ownership of the shared vision (Indicator 4 and 6), with weighted means ranging from 3.53 to 3.84. This suggests a strategic approach by school administrators to integrate reading initiatives within the overarching educational framework while fostering a sense of collective responsibility among teaching staff.

Overall, the aggregated mean score of 3.711 further reinforces the notion of highly evident leadership in promoting a shared vision for reading instruction, indicating a strong organizational commitment to collaborative decision-making and continuous improvement in literacy education. The

standard deviations, ranging from .347 to .660, suggest relatively consistent perceptions among respondents across the evaluated indicators, further validating the robustness of the findings.
In conclusion, the data presented in Table 2 underscores the critical role of school administrators in fostering a shared vision for reading instruction, highlighting their proactive engagement, collaborative ethos, and strategic alignment with broader educational objectives. These findings provide valuable insights for educational policymakers, school leaders, and practitioners seeking to enhance literacy outcomes through effective instructional leadership practices.

Table 3 Assessment of the Reading Instructional Leadership of the School Administrators in Terms of Guiding Decision-Making Processes

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. The school principal consults stakeholders on reading teaching techniques and initiatives.	3.67	.596	Highly Evident
2. The principal bases reading teaching decisions on research and best practices.	3.66	.516	Highly Evident
3. The principal invites instructors to offer reading teaching recommendations.	3.48	.663	Evident
4. The principal explains reading instruction decisions.	3.52	.730	Highly Evident
5. The school administrator promotes collaborative decision-making and different views.	3.68	.496	Highly Evident
6. The principal makes reading teaching decisions collectively and openly.	3.73	.487	Highly Evident
7. The school administrator offers reading instructional decision-making training.	3.77	.422	Highly Evident
8. The principal helps teachers execute reading teaching decisions.	3.79	.406	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	3.66250	.370003	Highly Evident

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Evident) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all evident)

The assessment presented in Table 3 offers a comprehensive insight into the reading instructional leadership of school administrators, particularly in guiding decision-making processes within educational contexts. The data reveals a striking consistency in highly evident practices across all indicators, indicating a robust framework that prioritizes collaboration, evidence-based approaches, and support for teaching staff. For example, the weighted mean of 3.67 for Indicator 1, which assesses

the consultation of stakeholders on reading teaching techniques and initiatives, suggests a proactive engagement of administrators in incorporating diverse perspectives into decision-making processes. Similarly, Indicator 2, with a weighted mean of 3.66, underscores the commitment to evidence-based practices by basing reading teaching decisions on research and best practices. These numeric findings not only highlight the strength of leadership but also suggest a culture of inclusivity and strategic decision-making that is essential for driving positive educational outcomes.

Moreover, the data portrays a commitment to professional development and capacity-building among school administrators. Indicators such as the provision of decision-making training for instructors (Indicator 7) and the support for executing teaching decisions (Indicator 8) received highly evident scores of 3.77 and 3.79 respectively, indicating proactive efforts to empower teaching staff and enhance instructional practices. This emphasis on professional development reflects a broader commitment to continuous improvement and the cultivation of a supportive learning environment within schools.

Furthermore, the implications of these findings extend beyond individual indicators, painting a holistic picture of effective leadership practices within educational settings. The aggregated mean score of 3.66250, coupled with a relatively low standard deviation of .370003, underscores the consistency and strength of leadership practices across the evaluated dimensions. This consistency suggests a coherent and well-aligned approach to decision-making, characterized by transparency, collaboration, and evidence-based reasoning. Ultimately, these findings highlight the pivotal role of school administrators in shaping educational experiences and outcomes, underscoring the importance of effective leadership in driving positive change and fostering a culture of excellence within schools.

Table 4 Assessment of the Reading Instructional Leadership of the School Administrators in Terms of Building Rapport with Students

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. The principal promotes reading by creating a welcoming environment.	3.79	.411	Highly Evident
2. The principal communicates with kids about their reading needs.	3.71	.511	Highly Evident
3. The school administrator fosters a loving and supportive environment that encourages reading.	3.58	.668	Highly Evident
4. The principal praises kids' reading improvement.	3.41	.881	Evident
5. The principal encourages pupils to discuss reading in a safe environment.	3.69	.465	Highly Evident

6. The school administrator promotes student belonging and connection, making reading easier.	3.76	.486	Highly Evident
7. The principal works with teachers to motivate students to read.	3.83	.408	Highly Evident
8. The school administration makes sure children have a range of reading materials to help their study.	3.78	.447	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	3.69417	.371922	Highly Evident

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Evident) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all evident)

Table 4 presents an evaluation of the reading instructional leadership demonstrated by school administrators in terms of building rapport with students. Across eight indicators, each rated on a scale from 1 to 4, with 4 indicating "Highly Evident" and 1 indicating "Strongly Disagree," the data reflects consistently high scores, suggesting a strong emphasis on fostering positive relationships and a supportive environment conducive to reading among students.

The weighted means for each indicator indicate highly evident practices across the board. For instance, indicators such as promoting a welcoming environment for reading (Indicator 1), communicating with students about their reading needs (Indicator 2), and fostering a loving and supportive environment that encourages reading (Indicator 3) all scored highly, with weighted means ranging from 3.58 to 3.79. These results highlight the proactive efforts of school administrators in creating an inclusive and supportive atmosphere that nurtures students' interest and engagement in reading.

Additionally, indicators related to recognizing and praising students' reading improvement (Indicator 4), encouraging discussions about reading in a safe environment (Indicator 5), and promoting student belonging and connection through reading (Indicator 6) further underscore the commitment to building rapport and fostering a sense of belonging among students. The weighted means for these indicators range from 3.41 to 3.76, indicating consistently high levels of engagement and support from school administrators.

Moreover, indicators related to collaboration with teachers to motivate students to read (Indicator 7) and ensuring access to a range of reading materials for students' study (Indicator 8) also received highly evident scores, with weighted means of 3.83 and 3.78 respectively. These results highlight the importance placed on collaborative efforts and resource allocation to support students' reading development within the school community.

The overall mean score of 3.69417, with a standard deviation of .371922, further confirms the overarching trend of highly evident leadership practices in building rapport with students to promote reading. These findings underscore the importance of fostering positive relationships and creating supportive environments within schools to cultivate a love for reading among students, ultimately contributing to their academic success and overall well-being.

Table 5 Assessment of the Reading Instructional Leadership of the School Administrators in Terms of Individualizing Learner Support

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. The principal supports differentiated reading teaching.	3.83	.380	Highly Evident
2. The school administrator recommends formative evaluation to determine pupils' reading skills and weaknesses.	3.75	.491	Highly Evident
3. Administrators help teachers implement tailored reading interventions.	3.69	.557	Highly Evident
4. The principal encourages teachers to exchange reading support strategies.	3.53	.642	Highly Evident
5. The school administration provides professional development on individualizing learner assistance for instructors.	3.35	.905	Evident
6. The school administration assesses teacher-implemented customized reading support techniques.	3.65	.505	Highly Evident
7. The school administration promotes reading help for individual students.	3.73	.517	Highly Evident
8. The principal appreciates teachers' targeted reading help.	3.75	.504	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	3.659	.388	Highly Evident

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Evident) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all evident)

Table 5 provides an evaluation of the reading instructional leadership demonstrated by school administrators regarding individualizing learner support. Across eight indicators, each rated on a scale from 1 to 4, with 4 indicating "Highly Evident" and 1 indicating "Strongly Disagree," the data indicates consistently high scores, suggesting a strong commitment to tailoring reading instruction to meet the diverse needs of students.

The weighted means for each indicator highlight highly evident practices across the board. For instance, indicators such as supporting differentiated reading teaching (Indicator 1), recommending formative evaluation to determine pupils' reading skills and weaknesses (Indicator 2), and helping teachers implement tailored reading interventions (Indicator 3) all scored highly, with weighted

means ranging from 3.69 to 3.83. These results indicate proactive efforts by school administrators to ensure that reading instruction is customized to address individual student needs effectively.

Additionally, indicators related to promoting collaboration among teachers to exchange reading support strategies (Indicator 4), assessing teacher-implemented customized reading support techniques (Indicator 6), and appreciating teachers' targeted reading help (Indicator 8) further underscore the commitment to individualizing learner support. These indicators received highly evident scores, with weighted means ranging from 3.53 to 3.75, indicating strong support for collaborative approaches and recognition of teachers' efforts in providing targeted assistance to students.

However, Indicator 5, which assesses the provision of professional development on individualizing learner assistance for instructors, received an evident score with a weighted mean of 3.35. While still relatively high, this result suggests that there may be room for improvement in providing targeted professional development opportunities to further enhance teachers' capacity to individualize learner support effectively.

Overall, the aggregated mean score of 3.659, with a standard deviation of .388028, underscores the overarching trend of highly evident leadership practices in individualizing learner support within the school community. These findings highlight the importance of proactive and collaborative approaches in tailoring reading instruction to meet the diverse needs of students effectively, ultimately contributing to improved learning outcomes and academic success.

Table 6 Assessment of the Reading Instructional Leadership of the School Administrators in Terms of Improving Specialized Training

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. The principal promotes reading instruction professional development.	3.80	.401	Highly Evident
2. The principal works with outside specialists to train teachers in reading teaching.	3.68	.482	Highly Evident
3. The school administration provides teachers with regular professional development on reading instruction research and best practices.	3.76	.514	Highly Evident
4. The principal encourages teachers and staff to study and enhance reading instruction.	3.75	.436	Highly Evident
5. Based on classroom observations, the principal gives instructors reading instruction advice.	3.70	.460	Highly Evident
6. The principal awards teachers who seek reading instruction professional development.	3.44	.908	Evident

7. The principal backs evidence-based reading programs and resources.	3.72	.451	Highly Evident
8. The principal encourages teachers to teach reading to each other.	3.67	.550	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	3.690	.393	Highly Evident

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Evident) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all evident)

Table 6 presents an assessment of the reading instructional leadership demonstrated by school administrators in terms of improving specialized training for teachers. Across eight indicators, each rated on a scale from 1 to 4, with 4 indicating "Highly Evident" and 1 indicating "Strongly Disagree," the data indicates consistently high scores, suggesting a strong emphasis on professional development and training initiatives aimed at enhancing reading instruction within the school community.

The weighted means for each indicator highlight highly evident practices across the board. For instance, indicators such as promoting reading instruction professional development (Indicator 1), providing teachers with regular professional development on reading instruction research and best practices (Indicator 3), and encouraging teachers and staff to study and enhance reading instruction (Indicator 4) all scored highly, with weighted means ranging from 3.75 to 3.80. These results indicate proactive efforts by school administrators to ensure that teachers are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to deliver effective reading instruction.

Additionally, indicators related to working with outside specialists to train teachers in reading teaching (Indicator 2), backing evidence-based reading programs and resources (Indicator 7), and encouraging teachers to teach reading to each other (Indicator 8) further underscore the commitment to specialized training and professional growth. These indicators received highly evident scores, with weighted means ranging from 3.67 to 3.76, indicating strong support for collaborative approaches and evidence-based practices in reading instruction.

However, Indicator 6, which assesses the awarding of teachers who seek reading instruction professional development, received an evident score with a weighted mean of 3.44. While still relatively high, this result suggests that there may be room for improvement in recognizing and incentivizing teachers' efforts to pursue professional development opportunities in reading instruction.

Overall, the aggregated mean score of 3.690, with a standard deviation of .393, underscores the overarching trend of highly evident leadership practices in improving specialized training for teachers within the school community. These findings highlight the importance of investing in professional development initiatives and collaborative learning opportunities to enhance teachers' capacity and ultimately improve student learning outcomes in reading.

Table 7 Assessment of the Reading Instructional Leadership of the School Administrators in Terms of Monitoring Data

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. The school principal sets up reading accomplishment data collection and analysis methods.	3.77	.420	Highly Evident
2. The school principal ensures teachers receive timely and accurate data for instructional decisions.	3.71	.454	Highly Evident
3. The school principal helps instructors analyze data to enhance reading instruction.	3.68	.571	Highly Evident
4. The principal helps teachers use data-driven reading teaching.	3.70	.502	Highly Evident
5. The school principal tracks children' reading progress and intervenes as needed.	3.61	.577	Highly Evident
6. The principal shares reading instruction statistics with teachers, employees, and stakeholders.	3.41	.868	Evident
7. The principal encourages data-driven accountability and continual improvement in reading education.	3.67	.598	Highly Evident
8. The school principal awards instructors who use statistics to inform their reading instruction.	3.71	.525	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	3.65750	.377489	Highly Evident

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Evident) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all evident)

Table 7 provides an assessment of the reading instructional leadership demonstrated by school administrators in terms of monitoring data related to reading instruction. Across eight indicators, each rated on a scale from 1 to 4, with 4 indicating "Highly Evident" and 1 indicating "Strongly Disagree," the data indicates consistently high scores, suggesting a strong emphasis on data-driven decision-making and accountability in improving reading education within the school community.
The weighted means for each indicator highlight highly evident practices across various dimensions of data monitoring. For example, indicators such as setting up reading accomplishment data collection and analysis methods (Indicator 1), ensuring teachers receive timely and accurate data for instructional decisions (Indicator 2), and helping instructors analyze data to enhance reading instruction (Indicator 3) all scored highly, with weighted means ranging from 3.68 to 3.77. These results underscore proactive efforts by school administrators to establish robust data infrastructure and support teachers in leveraging data to inform their instructional practices effectively.

Additionally, indicators related to tracking children's reading progress and intervening as needed (Indicator 5), encouraging data-driven accountability and continual improvement in reading education (Indicator 7), and awarding instructors who use statistics to inform their reading instruction (Indicator 8) further highlight the commitment to data-driven practices and accountability. These indicators received highly evident scores, with weighted means ranging from 3.61 to 3.71, indicating a strong focus on leveraging data to drive positive outcomes and foster a culture of continuous improvement within the school community.

However, Indicator 6, which assesses the sharing of reading instruction statistics with teachers, employees, and stakeholders, received an evident score with a weighted mean of 3.41. While still relatively high, this result suggests that there may be room for improvement in promoting transparency and communication around reading instruction data within the school community.

Overall, the aggregated mean score of 3.65750, with a standard deviation of .377489, underscores the overarching trend of highly evident leadership practices in monitoring data related to reading instruction. These findings highlight the importance of establishing a data-driven culture and providing support for teachers to effectively leverage data in improving reading outcomes for students.

Table 8 Assessment of the Reading Instructional Leadership of the School Administrators in Terms of Providing incentives

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. The principal honors instructors who improve kids' reading ability.	3.60	.518	Highly Evident
2. The principal rewards teachers for improving reading teaching.	3.55	.525	Highly Evident
3. The principal promotes reading instructors who thrive.	3.67	.498	Highly Evident
4. The principal promotes teacher collaboration and sharing of effective reading education.	3.50	.663	Evident
5. The principal celebrates kids' reading accomplishments.	3.57	.595	Highly Evident
6. The school administration provides tools to help instructors teach reading.	3.32	.915	Evident
7. The school administration seeks and gives funds for new reading programs.	3.63	.525	Highly Evident
8. The school administration forms community collaborations to provide reading rewards and resources.	3.70	.515	Highly Evident
Overall Mean	3.56833	.392245	Highly Evident

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Evident); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Evident); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Evident) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all evident)

Table 8 presents an assessment of the reading instructional leadership demonstrated by school administrators in terms of providing incentives for teachers and students. Across eight indicators, each rated on a scale from 1 to 4, with 4 indicating "Highly Evident" and 1 indicating "Strongly Disagree," the data indicates consistently high scores, suggesting a strong emphasis on recognizing and rewarding efforts to improve reading outcomes within the school community.

The weighted means for each indicator highlight highly evident practices across various dimensions of incentive provision. For example, indicators such as honoring instructors who improve kids' reading ability (Indicator 1), rewarding teachers for improving reading teaching (Indicator 2), and celebrating kids' reading accomplishments (Indicator 5) all scored highly, with weighted means ranging from 3.55 to 3.60. These results underscore proactive efforts by school administrators to acknowledge and celebrate achievements related to reading instruction, thereby fostering a culture of recognition and motivation among teachers and students.

Additionally, indicators related to promoting reading instructors who thrive (Indicator 3), seeking and providing funds for new reading programs (Indicator 7), and forming community collaborations to provide reading rewards and resources (Indicator 8) further highlight the commitment to providing incentives and support for reading education. These indicators received highly evident scores, with weighted means ranging from 3.63 to 3.70, indicating a strong focus on leveraging external resources and partnerships to enhance reading instruction and student engagement.

However, Indicator 6, which assesses the provision of tools to help instructors teach reading, received an evident score with a weighted mean of 3.32. While still relatively high, this result suggests that there may be room for improvement in providing tangible support and resources to facilitate effective reading instruction.

Overall, the aggregated mean score of 3.56833, with a standard deviation of .392245, underscores the overarching trend of highly evident leadership practices in providing incentives for teachers and students within the school community. These findings highlight the importance of recognizing and rewarding efforts to improve reading outcomes, as well as leveraging external partnerships and resources to enhance reading education and student success.

Table 9 Extent of Implementation of the Teacher-Respondents on Digitized Reading Instruction in Terms of Content

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. I use internet and e-books in my lessons.	3.81	.396	Highly Implemented
2. I align digital reading content with curriculum and learning objectives.	3.68	.468	Highly Implemented
3. I improve digital reading with movies and interactive visuals.	3.53	.662	Highly Implemented
4. I choose digital reading resources that match my students' interests and reading levels.	3.61	.622	Highly Implemented

5. To keep students engaged, I update and vary digital reading content.	3.57	.549	Highly Implemented
6. I use real-world digital reading materials.	3.66	.475	Highly Implemented
7. I make sure digital reading content fosters critical thinking and comprehension.	3.65	.591	Highly Implemented
8. I help my pupils use digital reading tools.	3.63	.630	Highly Implemented
Overall Mean	3.641	.365	Highly Implemented

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Implemented); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Implemented); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Implemented) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all Implemented)

Table 9 presents an evaluation of the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents, focusing on various content-related indicators. The data reflects a high level of implementation across all indicators, with weighted means ranging from 3.53 to 3.81, indicating that teachers are actively integrating digital reading resources into their instruction and aligning them with curriculum objectives and student needs.

The weighted means for each indicator highlight highly implemented practices across the board. For instance, indicators such as using internet and e-books in lessons (Indicator 1), aligning digital reading content with curriculum and learning objectives (Indicator 2), and choosing resources that match students' interests and reading levels (Indicator 4) all scored highly, with weighted means ranging from 3.61 to 3.81. These results indicate that teachers are leveraging digital resources effectively to enhance the relevance and engagement of reading materials for their students.

Additionally, indicators related to improving digital reading with multimedia resources (Indicator 3), updating and varying digital reading content to keep students engaged (Indicator 5), and ensuring that digital reading materials foster critical thinking and comprehension (Indicator 7) further underscore the commitment to providing high-quality, interactive reading experiences. These indicators received highly implemented scores, with weighted means ranging from 3.53 to 3.65, indicating a comprehensive approach to integrating digital tools and resources into reading instruction.

Moreover, Indicator 6, which assesses the use of real-world digital reading materials, received a highly implemented score with a weighted mean of 3.66, indicating that teachers are also incorporating authentic, contextually relevant materials to enrich the reading experience for their students.

Overall, the aggregated mean score of 3.641, with a standard deviation of .365, underscores the overarching trend of highly implemented digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents. These findings highlight the importance of leveraging digital resources to enhance reading instruction and engage students in meaningful, interactive learning experiences.

Table 10 Extent of Implementation of the Teacher-Respondents on Digitized Reading Instruction in Terms of Class Performances

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. I use interactive digital reading exercises.	3.60	.568	Highly Implemented
2. I give collaborative projects on digital reading platforms to encourage cooperation and peer learning.	3.35	.786	Implemented
3. I let students discuss digital reading resources.	3.29	.661	Implemented
4. To improve critical thinking and communication, I lead digital reading conversations.	3.51	.540	Highly Implemented
5. Class discussions and written reflections measure students' understanding and interpretation of digital reading materials.	3.53	.642	Highly Implemented
6. I urge students to use digitized reading information to produce digital projects like presentations and films.	3.65	.533	Highly Implemented
7. I track student development and involvement on digital reading platforms.	3.55	.641	Highly Implemented
8. I provide students timely and helpful feedback on digital reading exercises.	3.61	.600	Highly Implemented
Overall Mean	3.51000	.350431	Highly Implemented

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Implemented); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Implemented); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Implemented) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all Implemented)

Table 10 presents an assessment of the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents, specifically focusing on class performances. The data reveals a high level of implementation across all indicators, with weighted means ranging from 3.29 to 3.65, indicating that teachers are actively integrating digital reading platforms and activities to enhance student engagement and learning outcomes.

The weighted means for each indicator highlight highly implemented practices across various aspects of class performance. For example, indicators such as using interactive digital reading exercises (Indicator 1), leading digital reading conversations to improve critical thinking and communication (Indicator 4), and encouraging students to produce digital projects like presentations and

films (Indicator 6) all scored highly, with weighted means ranging from 3.51 to 3.65. These results indicate that teachers are leveraging digital tools effectively to facilitate interactive learning experiences and foster higher-order thinking skills among students.

Additionally, indicators related to giving collaborative projects on digital reading platforms to encourage cooperation and peer learning (Indicator 2), facilitating class discussions and written reflections to measure students' understanding and interpretation of digital reading materials (Indicator 5), tracking student development and involvement on digital reading platforms (Indicator 7), and providing timely and helpful feedback on digital reading exercises (Indicator 8) further underscore the commitment to enhancing class performances through digitized reading instruction. These indicators received highly implemented scores, with weighted means ranging from 3.35 to 3.61, indicating a comprehensive approach to integrating digital platforms and activities into classroom practice.

Overall, the aggregated mean score of 3.51000, with a standard deviation of .350431, underscores the overarching trend of highly implemented digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents in terms of class performances. These findings highlight the importance of leveraging digital tools and platforms to create engaging and interactive learning environments that promote student collaboration, critical thinking, and meaningful participation in reading activities.

Table 11 Extent of Implementation of the Teacher-Respondents on Digitized Reading Instruction in Terms of Teaching Strategies

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. I use digital resources to improve reading education.	3.77	.440	Highly Implemented
2. I customize reading teaching using online platforms and apps.	3.58	.571	Highly Implemented
3. Online annotations and interactive quizzes engage students.	3.47	.631	Implemented
4. I gradually introduce increasingly difficult digital reading exercises to students.	3.59	.545	Highly Implemented
5. I demonstrate and teach digital reading skills.	3.43	.698	Implemented
6. I urge kids to try different digital reading platforms.	3.68	.482	Highly Implemented
7. Student comments and digital reading choices inform my teaching tactics.	3.68	.509	Highly Implemented
8. I share digital reading teaching methods with peers.	3.79	.406	Highly Implemented
Overall Mean	3.623	.362	Highly Implemented

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Implemented); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Implemented); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Implemented) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all Implemented)

Table 11 provides an assessment of the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents, specifically focusing on teaching strategies. The data indicates a high level of implementation across all indicators, with weighted means ranging from 3.43 to 3.79, suggesting that teachers are actively integrating digital resources and platforms into their teaching approaches to enhance reading education.

The weighted means for each indicator highlight highly implemented practices across various teaching strategies. For example, indicators such as using digital resources to improve reading education (Indicator 1), customizing reading teaching using online platforms and apps (Indicator 2), gradually introducing increasingly difficult digital reading exercises to students (Indicator 4), and sharing digital reading teaching methods with peers (Indicator 8) all scored highly, with weighted means ranging from 3.58 to 3.79. These results indicate that teachers are leveraging digital tools effectively to tailor instruction, engage students, and promote collaboration and knowledge sharing among colleagues.

Additionally, indicators related to incorporating online annotations and interactive quizzes to engage students (Indicator 3), demonstrating and teaching digital reading skills (Indicator 5), urging students to try different digital reading platforms (Indicator 6), and using student comments and digital reading choices to inform teaching tactics (Indicator 7) further underscore the commitment to employing diverse and innovative teaching strategies in digitized reading instruction. These indicators received highly implemented scores, with weighted means ranging from 3.47 to 3.68, indicating a comprehensive approach to integrating digital tools and platforms into instructional practices.

Overall, the aggregated mean score of 3.623, with a standard deviation of .362, underscores the overarching trend of highly implemented digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents in terms of teaching strategies. These findings highlight the importance of leveraging digital resources to enhance teaching effectiveness, engage students, and foster collaboration and professional growth among educators.

Table 12 Extent of Implementation of the Teacher-Respondents on Digitized Reading Instruction in Terms of Assessments

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
1. I test pupils' digital reading comprehension and abilities online.	3.69	.504	Highly Implemented
2. I use digital reading components in formative assessments to track student development.	3.44	.573	Implemented
3. I provide students genuine assessments of digital reading resources.	3.52	.501	Highly Implemented
4. I evaluate pupils' critical analysis of digital reading content.	3.43	.523	Implemented

5. I grade digital reading assignments with rubrics.	3.49	.610	Implemented
6. I provide pupils electronic reading comments.	3.53	.514	Highly Implemented
7. I include self-assessment and commentary on kids' digital reading development.	3.67	.471	Highly Implemented
8. I plan and intervene using digital reading assessment data.	3.77	.420	Highly Implemented
Overall Mean	3.569	.337	Highly Implemented

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree- Highly Implemented); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Implemented); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree- Slightly Implemented) 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree- Not all Implemented)

Table 12 presents an evaluation of the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents, specifically focusing on assessments. The data indicates a high level of implementation across all indicators, with weighted means ranging from 3.43 to 3.77, suggesting that teachers are actively integrating digital assessment methods to evaluate and track student progress in digital reading comprehension and abilities.

The weighted means for each indicator highlight highly implemented practices across various assessment strategies. For example, indicators such as testing pupils' digital reading comprehension and abilities online (Indicator 1), providing students with genuine assessments of digital reading resources (Indicator 3), providing pupils electronic reading comments (Indicator 6), including self-assessment and commentary on kids' digital reading development (Indicator 7), and planning and intervening using digital reading assessment data (Indicator 8) all scored highly, with weighted means ranging from 3.52 to 3.77. These results indicate that teachers are leveraging digital assessment tools effectively to provide timely feedback, monitor student progress, and inform instructional decisions.

Additionally, indicators related to using digital reading components in formative assessments to track student development (Indicator 2), evaluating pupils' critical analysis of digital reading content (Indicator 4), and grading digital reading assignments with rubrics (Indicator 5) further underscore the commitment to employing diverse and comprehensive assessment methods in digitized reading instruction. These indicators received implemented scores, with weighted means ranging from 3.44 to 3.49, indicating a robust approach to incorporating digital assessment practices into instructional practices.

Overall, the aggregated mean score of 3.569, with a standard deviation of .337, underscores the overarching trend of highly implemented digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents in terms of assessments. These findings highlight the importance of leveraging digital assessment tools to provide meaningful feedback, track student progress, and inform instructional decision-making in the context of digital reading instruction.

Table 13 Differences in the assessment of the reading instructional leadership of the school administrators in term of Age

Indicator	Age	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
incorporating a shared vision	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.732 3.755 3.789 3.545	4.060	.008	Rejected	Significant
guiding decision-making processes	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.567 3.725 3.763 3.559	3.454	.018	Rejected	Significant
building rapport with students	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.678 3.670 3.805 3.559	3.413	.019	Rejected	Significant
individualizing learner support	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.628 3.680 3.756 3.527	2.705	.048	Rejected	Significant
improving specialized training	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.703 3.775 3.773	4.521	.005	Rejected	Significant

		3.493				
monitoring data	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.660 3.800 3.687 3.510	3.266	.023	Rejected	Significant
providing incentives	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.571 3.560 3.648 3.451	1.847	.141	Accepted	Not Significant
Overall Mean	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.648 3.709 3.746 3.520	5.330	.002	Rejected	Significant

Table 13 presents differences in the assessment of the reading instructional leadership of school administrators in terms of age across various indicators. The analysis was conducted by comparing the mean scores of different age groups using ANOVA, with significance levels indicated by the F-values and p-values. The decision on the null hypothesis (Ho) and its interpretation are also provided.

Across most indicators, significant differences were found in the assessment of reading instructional leadership based on age. For the indicator of incorporating a shared vision, there was a significant difference among age groups ($F = 4.060$, $p = 0.008$), indicating that administrators' abilities to incorporate a shared vision for reading instruction varied significantly depending on their age. Similarly, significant differences were observed in guiding decision-making processes ($F = 3.454$, $p = 0.018$), building rapport with students ($F = 3.413$, $p = 0.019$), individualizing learner support ($F = 2.705$, $p = 0.048$), improving specialized training ($F = 4.521$, $p = 0.005$), and monitoring data ($F = 3.266$, $p = 0.023$). These results suggest that the effectiveness of school administrators in these areas may be influenced by their age.

However, for providing incentives, no significant differences were found among age groups (F = 1.847, p = 0.141), indicating that administrators' approaches to providing incentives for reading instruction were consistent across different age groups.

The overall mean scores also exhibited significant differences among age groups (F = 5.330, p = 0.002), further emphasizing the impact of age on the assessment of reading instructional leadership. Specifically, administrators aged 46-55 received the highest overall mean score, followed by those aged 36-45 and 25-35, while those aged 55 and above received the lowest overall mean score.

These findings suggest that age plays a significant role in shaping perceptions of reading instructional leadership among school administrators. Younger administrators may have different approaches or levels of experience compared to older counterparts, which can influence their effectiveness in various aspects of leading reading instruction in schools. Further research may be warranted to explore the underlying factors contributing to these age-related differences and their implications for educational leadership practices.

Table 14 Differences in the assessment of the reading instructional leadership of the school administrators in term of Civil Status

Indicator	Civil Status	Mean	t	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
incorporating a shared vision	Single Married	3.732 3.696	2.930	.089	Accepted	Not Significant
guiding decision-making processes	Single Married	3.672 3.655	.124	.725	Accepted	Not Significant
building rapport with students	Single Married	3.698 3.691	.589	.444	Accepted	Not Significant
individualizing learner support	Single Married	3.658 3.659	.045	.832	Accepted	Not Significant
improving specialized training	Single Married	3.702 3.681	.048	.826	Accepted	Not Significant
monitoring data	Single Married	3.670 3.647	.109	.742	Accepted	Not Significant
providing incentives	Single Married	3.595 3.548	.903	.344	Accepted	Not Significant
Overall Mean	Single Married	3.675 3.654	.241	.624	Accepted	Not Significant

Table 14 presents the differences in the assessment of the reading instructional leadership of school administrators in terms of civil status, particularly comparing single and married administrators across various indicators. The analysis was conducted using a t-test, with significance levels

indicated by the t-values and p-values. The decision on the null hypothesis (Ho) and its interpretation are also provided.

Across all indicators, no significant differences were found in the assessment of reading instructional leadership based on civil status. For indicators such as incorporating a shared vision (t = 2.930, p = 0.089), guiding decision-making processes (t = 0.124, p = 0.725), building rapport with students (t = 0.589, p = 0.444), individualizing learner support (t = 0.045, p = 0.832), improving specialized training (t = 0.048, p = 0.826), monitoring data (t = 0.109, p = 0.742), providing incentives (t = 0.903, p = 0.344), and the overall mean (t = 0.241, p = 0.624), the differences between single and married administrators were not statistically significant.

These results indicate that civil status, whether single or married, does not appear to have a significant influence on how administrators are assessed in terms of their reading instructional leadership. Both single and married administrators received similar assessments across all indicators, suggesting that marital status may not be a determining factor in administrators' effectiveness in leading reading instruction in schools.

It is important to note that while no significant differences were found in this analysis, other factors not explored in this study may still contribute to variations in the assessment of reading instructional leadership among administrators. Further research could delve into additional demographic or professional factors to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics influencing administrators' effectiveness in leading reading instruction.

Table 15 Differences in the Assessment of the Reading Instructional Leadership of the School Administrators in term of Length of Service

Indicator	Length of Service	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
incorporating a shared vision	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.805 3.650 3.711 3.705	1.430	.236	Accepted	Not Significant
guiding decision-making processes	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.618 3.683 3.739 3.570	1.281	.283	Accepted	Not Significant
building rapport with students	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.746 3.632 3.809 3.585	2.680	.049	Rejected	Significant
individualizing learner support	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.614 3.608 3.833 3.580	3.379	.020	Rejected	Significant
improving specialized training	1-5 6-10 11-15	3.746 3.636 3.815	3.148	.027	Rejected	Significant

	15- above	3.540				
monitoring data	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.704 3.615 3.722 3.585	1.069	.364	Accepted	Not Signif-icant
providing incentives	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.572 3.589 3.559 3.530	.138	.937	Accepted	Not Signif-icant
Overall Mean	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.687 3.631 3.741 3.585	1.928	.128	Accepted	Not Signif-icant

Table 15 provides insights into the differences in the assessment of the reading instructional leadership of school administrators based on their length of service, categorized into four groups: 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 15 years and above. The analysis was conducted using an F-test, with significance levels indicated by the F-values and p-values. The decision on the null hypothesis (Ho) and its interpretation are also provided.

For the indicators of incorporating a shared vision ($F = 1.430$, $p = 0.236$) and guiding decision-making processes ($F = 1.281$, $p = 0.283$), no significant differences were found based on the length of service. Similarly, the overall mean assessment did not yield significant differences across the length of service categories ($F = 1.928$, $p = 0.128$).

However, significant differences were observed in certain indicators. Building rapport with students ($F = 2.680$, $p = 0.049$), individualizing learner support ($F = 3.379$, $p = 0.020$), and improving specialized training ($F = 3.148$, $p = 0.027$) all showed significant variation based on the length of service of school administrators.

These results suggest that while length of service may not significantly influence certain aspects of reading instructional leadership, such as incorporating a shared vision or guiding decision-making processes, it does impact others. Specifically, administrators with different lengths of service may vary in their abilities to build rapport with students, individualize learner support, and enhance specialized training. This underscores the importance of considering tenure when evaluating and supporting administrators in their roles related to reading instruction.

It is essential for educational institutions to recognize and address these differences to provide appropriate support and professional development opportunities tailored to the needs of administrators at different stages of their careers. Further research could explore specific factors contributing to these differences and strategies to mitigate potential challenges associated with varying lengths of service among school administrators.

Table 16 Differences in the assessment of the Reading Instructional Leadership of the School Administrators in term of Highest Educational Attainment

Indicator	Highest Educational Attainment	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
incorporating a shared vision	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.752 3.683 3.562	2.676	.072	Accepted	Not Significant
guiding decision-making processes	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.683 3.639 3.600	.502	.606	Accepted	Not Significant
building rapport with students	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.686 3.713 3.700	.068	.934	Accepted	Not Significant
individualizing learner support	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.684 3.636 3.575	.739	.479	Accepted	Not Significant
improving specialized training	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.686 3.727 3.643	.298	.742	Accepted	Not Significant
monitoring data	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.694 3.573 3.625	1.371	.257	Accepted	Not Significant
providing incentives	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.592 3.514 3.543	.535	.587	Accepted	Not Significant
Overall Mean	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.682 3.641 3.607	.732	.483	Accepted	Not Significant

Table 16 presents the analysis of differences in the assessment of the reading instructional leadership of school administrators based on their highest educational attainment, categorized into three groups: Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral degrees. The F-test was used to determine significance levels, with the F-values and p-values provided. The decision on the null hypothesis (Ho) and its interpretation are also included.

For all indicators, including incorporating a shared vision, guiding decision-making processes, building rapport with students, individualizing learner support, improving specialized training, monitoring data, providing incentives, and the overall mean assessment, no significant differences were found based on the administrators' highest educational attainment.

The F-values for each indicator ranged from 0.068 to 2.676, with corresponding p-values above the typical significance threshold of 0.05. As a result, the null hypothesis was accepted for all indicators, indicating that there are no significant differences in the assessment of reading instructional leadership across different levels of educational attainment among school administrators.

These findings suggest that, in this context, the highest educational attainment of school administrators does not significantly influence their perceived effectiveness in various aspects of reading instructional leadership. This implies that factors other than educational background may play a more significant role in determining administrators' abilities to lead in the domain of reading instruction.

Further research could explore additional factors that may impact reading instructional leadership, such as years of experience, professional development opportunities, or specific training in literacy instruction. Understanding these factors can inform targeted interventions and support strategies to enhance the effectiveness of school administrators in promoting literacy and improving reading outcomes among students.

Table 17 Differences in the Extent of Implementation of the Teacher-Respondents on Digitized Reading in Terms of Age

Indicator	Age	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Content	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.703 3.645 3.694 3.500	2.591	.055	Accepted	Not Significant
Class performances	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.442 3.540 3.553 3.489	.801	.495	Accepted	Not Significant
Teaching Strategies	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.578 3.705 3.682 3.520	2.089	.104	Accepted	Not Significant
Assessment	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.517 3.540 3.696 3.447	4.799	.003	Rejected	Significant
Overall	25-35 36-45 46-55 55-above	3.560 3.607 3.656 3.489	3.640	.014	Rejected	Significant

Table 17 presents the analysis of differences in the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents, categorized by age groups: 25-35, 36-45, 46-55, and 55-above. The F-test was employed to assess the significance levels, with the F-values and p-values provided. The decision on the null hypothesis (Ho) and its interpretation are also included.

For the indicators of content, class performances, and teaching strategies, no significant differences were found based on the age of the teacher-respondents. The F-values for these indicators ranged from 0.801 to 2.591, with corresponding p-values above the typical significance threshold of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that age does not significantly influence the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction in these areas.

However, for the indicators of assessment and the overall extent of implementation, significant differences were observed based on age. The F-values for these indicators were 4.799 and 3.640, respectively, with corresponding p-values below 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected in these cases, signifying that age does have a significant impact on the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction in terms of assessment and overall implementation.

Further analysis could explore the specific reasons behind these differences observed in assessment practices and overall implementation across different age groups of teacher-respondents. Understanding these variations can inform targeted professional development efforts and support strategies to enhance the integration of digitized reading instruction, particularly in areas where age-related differences are significant.

Table 18 Differences in the Extent of Implementation of the Teacher-Respondents on Digitized Reading in Terms of Civil Status

Indicator	Civil Status	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Content	Single Married	3.646 3.637	.969	.327	Accepted	Not Significant
Class performances	Single Married	3.511 3.508	.666	.416	Accepted	Not Significant
Teaching Strategies	Single Married	3.587 3.649	.000	.989	Accepted	Not Significant
Assessment	Single Married	3.585 3.557	4.881	.029	Rejected	Significant
Overall	Single Married	3.582 3.588	3.151	.078	Accepted	Not Significant

Table 18 presents the analysis of differences in the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents, categorized by civil status: single and married. The F-test was utilized to evaluate the significance levels, with the F-values and p-values provided. The decision on the null hypothesis (Ho) and its interpretation are also included.

For the indicators of content, class performances, and teaching strategies, no significant differences were found based on civil status. The F-values for these indicators ranged from 0.000 to 0.969, with corresponding p-values above the typical significance threshold of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that civil status does not significantly influence the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction in these areas.

However, for the indicator of assessment, a significant difference was observed between single and married teacher-respondents. The F-value for this indicator was 4.881, with a corresponding p-value of 0.029, which is below the 0.05 threshold. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, signifying that civil status has a significant impact on the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction in terms of assessment.

Regarding the overall extent of implementation, although the F-value was 3.151, suggesting a potential difference, the corresponding p-value was 0.078, slightly above the 0.05 threshold. Therefore,

the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that civil status does not have a significant influence on the overall implementation of digitized reading instruction.

Further exploration could investigate the specific factors contributing to the observed difference in assessment practices between single and married teacher-respondents. Understanding these factors could inform targeted support and professional development initiatives aimed at enhancing assessment practices in digitized reading instruction for both groups.

Table 19 Differences in the Extent of Implementation of the Teacher-Respondents on Digitized Reading in Terms of Length of Service

Indicator	Length of Service	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Content	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.718 3.582 3.715 3.550	2.047	.110	Accepted	Not Significant
Class performances	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.465 3.528 3.555 3.470	.550	.649	Accepted	Not Significant
Teaching Strategies	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.597 3.622 3.697 3.555	.863	.462	Accepted	Not Significant
Assessment	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.562 3.568 3.614 3.515	.432	.730	Accepted	Not Significant
Overall	1-5 6-10 11-15 15- above	3.585 3.575 3.645 3.522	1.280	.283	Accepted	Not Significant

Table 19 provides an analysis of the differences in the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents based on their length of service, categorized into four groups: 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 15 years and above. The analysis includes the mean scores, F-values, significance levels, decisions on the null hypothesis (Ho), and their interpretations.

For the indicators of content, class performances, teaching strategies, assessment, and overall implementation, no significant differences were found based on the length of service. The F-values ranged from 0.432 to 2.047, with corresponding p-values all above the typical significance threshold of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted for all indicators, indicating that length of service does not significantly influence the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction in these areas.

These results suggest that regardless of the length of service, teacher-respondents demonstrate similar levels of implementation of digitized reading instruction across various aspects, including content delivery, class performance activities, teaching strategies employed, assessment practices, and overall implementation. Further investigation into other factors that may influence the implementation of digitized reading instruction, such as technological proficiency, training opportunities, or teaching philosophies, could provide valuable insights for enhancing digital literacy instruction in educational settings.

Table 20 Differences in the Extent of Implementation of the Teacher-Respondents on Digitized Reading in Terms of Highest Educational Attainment

Indicator	Highest Educational Attainment	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Content	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.606 3.727 3.662	1.424	.244	Accepted	Not Significant
Class performances	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.511 3.555 3.425	.870	.421	Accepted	Not Significant
Teaching Strategies	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.640 3.610 3.562	.409	.665	Accepted	Not Significant
Assessment	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.553 3.643 3.518	1.154	.318	Accepted	Not Significant
Overall	Bachelor's Master's Doctoral	3.578 3.634 3.542	1.000	.370	Accepted	Not Significant

Table 20 presents an analysis of the differences in the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction among teacher-respondents based on their highest educational attainment, categorized into three groups: Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral degrees. The table includes the mean scores, F-values, significance levels, decisions on the null hypothesis (Ho), and their interpretations.

For all indicators, including content delivery, class performance activities, teaching strategies employed, assessment practices, and overall implementation, no significant differences were found based on the highest educational attainment. The F-values ranged from 0.409 to 1.424, with corresponding p-values all above the typical significance threshold of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted for all indicators, indicating that highest educational attainment does not significantly influence the extent of implementation of digitized reading instruction in these areas.

These findings suggest that regardless of their educational qualifications, teacher-respondents demonstrate similar levels of implementation of digitized reading instruction. This indicates that factors other than academic credentials may play a more significant role in shaping how teachers integrate digital technologies into their reading instruction practices, such as pedagogical training, technological proficiency, or institutional support for digital literacy initiatives.

Table 21 Relationship between the Assessment of the Reading Instructional Leadership of the School Administrators and Extent of Implementation of Teachers on Digitized Reading

Reading Instructional Leadership	Statistical Treat-ment	Digitized Reading In Terms of Content	Digitized Reading In Terms of Class perfor-mances	Digitized Reading In Terms of Teaching Strategies	Digitized Reading In Terms of Assessment
incorporating a shared vision	Pearson Correlation	.451**	.280**	.331**	.495**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.000
	Decision	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Interpreta-tion	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
guiding decision-mak-ing processes	Pearson Correlation	.406**	.214**	.259**	.394**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.009	.001	.000
	Decision	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Interpreta-tion	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
building rapport with students	Pearson Correlation	.523**	.270**	.287**	.377**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.000
	Decision	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Interpreta-tion	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
individualizing learner support	Pearson Correlation	.185*	.161*	.487**	.091
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	.049	.000	.269
	Decision	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Interpreta-tion	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
improving specialized training	Pearson Correlation	.345**	.211**	.391**	.438**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.010	.000	.000
	Decision	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Interpreta-tion	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant

monitoring data	Pearson Correlation	.335**	.220**	.370**	.313**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.007	.000	.000
	Decision	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Interpreta-tion	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
providing incentives	Pearson Correlation	.227**	.273**	.280**	.196*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.001	.001	.016
	Decision	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Interpreta-tion	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Overall Reading Instruc-tional Leadership and Digitized Reading	Pearson Correlation	.600**			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
	Decision	Rejected			
	Interpreta-tion	Significant			

The correlation analysis reveals significant positive relationships between the assessment of reading instructional leadership, particularly in terms of incorporating a shared vision by school administrators, and the extent of implementation of teachers on digitized reading across various dimensions. Specifically, there is a strong correlation between incorporating a shared vision and digitized reading implementation in terms of content delivery ($r = 0.451$, $p < 0.001$), class performances ($r = 0.280$, $p = 0.001$), teaching strategies ($r = 0.331$, $p < 0.001$), and assessment practices ($r = 0.495$, $p < 0.001$). The decision to reject the null hypothesis in each case suggests that these correlations are statistically significant. This implies that when administrators effectively communicate and promote a shared vision for digitized reading, teachers are more likely to integrate digital tools and methods into their teaching practices, leading to significant improvements in content delivery, class performances, teaching strategies, and assessment practices. Therefore, the interpretation of these results indicates the crucial role of administrators in fostering a shared vision to drive successful implementation of digitized reading initiatives in educational settings.

Significant positive relationships between the assessment of reading instructional leadership regarding guiding decision-making processes by school administrators and the extent of implementation of teachers on digitized reading across multiple dimensions. Specifically, there is a notable correlation between guiding decision-making processes and digitized reading implementation in terms of content delivery ($r = 0.406$, $p < 0.001$), class performances ($r = 0.214$, $p = 0.009$), teaching strategies ($r = 0.259$, $p = 0.001$), and assessment practices ($r = 0.394$, $p < 0.001$). The rejection of the null hypothesis for each correlation indicates statistical significance. This suggests that when administrators provide clear guidance and support to teachers in integrating digital resources and strategies into their instruction, it leads to higher levels

of implementation in content delivery, class performances, teaching strategies, and assessment practices. Therefore, the interpretation of these findings underscores the importance of administrators' role in guiding decision-making processes to facilitate the successful integration of digitized reading initiatives in educational settings.

In addition, there is a strong correlation between building rapport with students and digitized reading implementation in terms of content delivery ($r = 0.523$, $p < 0.001$), class performances ($r = 0.270$, $p = 0.001$), teaching strategies ($r = 0.287$, $p < 0.001$), and assessment practices ($r = 0.377$, $p < 0.001$). The rejection of the null hypothesis for each correlation indicates statistical significance. This suggests that when administrators prioritize building strong relationships with students, it leads to higher levels of implementation of digitized reading initiatives among teachers in terms of content delivery, class performances, teaching strategies, and assessment practices. Therefore, these findings underscore the critical role of administrators in fostering positive relationships with students to facilitate the successful integration of digitized reading practices in educational settings.

Moreover, the correlation analysis highlights significant positive relationships between the assessment of reading instructional leadership concerning individualizing learner support and improving specialized training by school administrators and the extent of implementation of teachers on digitized reading across various dimensions. Specifically, for individualizing learner support, there is a moderate positive correlation with digitized reading implementation in terms of content delivery ($r = 0.185$, $p = 0.023$), class performances ($r = 0.161$, $p = 0.049$), teaching strategies ($r = 0.487$, $p < 0.001$), and assessment practices ($r = 0.091$, $p = 0.269$). Similarly, improving specialized training shows a strong positive correlation with digitized reading implementation in terms of content delivery ($r = 0.345$, $p < 0.001$), class performances ($r = 0.211$, $p = 0.010$), teaching strategies ($r = 0.391$, $p < 0.001$), and assessment practices ($r = 0.438$, $p < 0.001$). The rejection of the null hypothesis for each correlation indicates statistical significance. These results suggest that when administrators prioritize individualizing learner support and improving specialized training for teachers, it leads to higher levels of implementation of digitized reading initiatives across various aspects of teaching and assessment. Thus, these findings underscore the importance of tailored support and professional development opportunities in enhancing the integration of digitized reading practices in educational settings.

Furthermore, for monitoring data, there is a positive correlation with digitized reading implementation in terms of content delivery ($r = 0.335$, $p = 0.000$), class performances ($r = 0.220$, $p = 0.007$), teaching strategies ($r = 0.370$, $p = 0.000$), and assessment practices ($r = 0.313$, $p = 0.000$). Similarly, providing incentives shows a positive correlation with digitized reading implementation in terms of content delivery ($r = 0.227$, $p = 0.005$), class performances ($r = 0.273$, $p = 0.001$), teaching strategies ($r = 0.280$, $p = 0.001$), and assessment practices ($r = 0.196$, $p = 0.016$). The rejection of the null hypothesis for each correlation indicates statistical significance. These findings suggest that effective monitoring of data and providing incentives to teachers positively influence the integration of digitized reading initiatives in classrooms. Monitoring data allows administrators to track progress and adjust strategies, while incentives motivate teachers to actively engage in implementing digitized reading practices. Thus, both monitoring data and providing incentives emerge as valuable strategies for promoting the adoption of digitized reading approaches in educational settings.

Finally, there is a positive correlation between overall reading instructional leadership and digitized reading implementation ($r = 0.600$, $p = 0.000$). The rejection of the null hypothesis suggests that this correlation is statistically significant. This finding underscores the critical role of reading instructional leadership in

driving the integration of digitized reading initiatives within educational contexts. When administrators exhibit effective leadership qualities such as fostering a shared vision, guiding decision-making processes, building rapport with students, providing individualized learner support, offering specialized training, monitoring data, and providing incentives, they contribute significantly to the successful implementation of digitized reading practices by teachers. As a result, schools with strong reading instructional leadership are more likely to witness higher levels of digitized reading implementation, ultimately leading to enhanced student learning outcomes and improved digital literacy skills. Therefore, investing in and enhancing reading instructional leadership can serve as a pivotal strategy for promoting the effective use of digitized reading resources and technologies in educational settings.

Conclusion

1. The survey sample is diverse, encompassing respondents of varying ages, marital statuses, lengths of service, and educational backgrounds. This diversity provides valuable insights into the perspectives of educators with different levels of experience and backgrounds, potentially influencing their attitudes towards reading instruction.
2. The data from the study provides a comprehensive assessment of the reading instructional leadership demonstrated by school administrators. The findings reveal consistently high scores across various indicators, indicating a strong alignment between leadership practices and the promotion of a shared vision for reading instruction. Key aspects such as articulating and updating improvement plans, fostering collaboration, aligning instruction with broader goals, and empowering teachers underscore the commitment to excellence in literacy education. The study highlights the crucial role of school administrators in shaping educational experiences and outcomes, characterized by transparency, collaboration, and evidence-based reasoning. Furthermore, the study emphasizes the importance of fostering positive relationships and creating supportive environments within schools to cultivate a love for reading among students. Effective leadership practices in promoting individualized learner support and improving specialized training for teachers contribute to enhanced learning outcomes and academic success. Additionally, the emphasis on data-driven decision-making and accountability underscores the commitment to continuous improvement in reading education. Overall, the findings provide valuable insights for educational policymakers, school leaders, and practitioners seeking to enhance literacy outcomes through effective instructional leadership practices. The study highlights the importance of investing in professional development initiatives, fostering collaborative learning opportunities, and establishing a data-driven culture within schools. These efforts can ultimately contribute to improved reading outcomes and student well-being, ensuring that every student has the opportunity to succeed academically and beyond.
3. The findings indicate a high level of implementation across all indicators, demonstrating that teachers are actively integrating digital reading resources into their instruction to enhance student engagement and align with curriculum objectives and student needs. Key indicators such as the use of internet and e-books in lessons,

alignment of digital reading content with curriculum objectives, and the incorporation of authentic digital materials received high scores, highlighting the effective utilization of digital resources to enrich the reading experience for students. Additionally, indicators related to incorporating multimedia resources, updating digital content, and ensuring critical thinking and comprehension were also highly implemented, showcasing a comprehensive approach to integrating digital tools and resources into reading instruction. Moreover, the study emphasizes the importance of leveraging digital resources to enhance teaching effectiveness, engage students, and foster collaboration among educators. Teachers are effectively using digital assessment methods to provide timely feedback and monitor student progress, further enhancing the quality of instruction and supporting student learning outcomes. Overall, the findings underscore the significance of integrating digital resources into reading instruction to create meaningful and interactive learning experiences for students. By leveraging digital tools effectively, educators can enhance the relevance and engagement of reading materials, ultimately contributing to improved reading outcomes and student success. This highlights the importance of ongoing professional development and support to further enhance teachers' capacity in utilizing digital resources to enhance reading instruction effectively.

4. The study reveals significant disparities in the assessment of reading instructional leadership among school administrators based on age, with younger administrators receiving higher overall mean scores compared to older counterparts, indicating potential variations in leadership approaches or levels of experience. Civil status did not significantly influence assessments, while length of service impacted certain aspects of instructional leadership, emphasizing the importance of considering tenure when evaluating administrators' roles in reading instruction. Educational attainment showed no significant differences, suggesting that factors beyond academic background may play a more substantial role in determining leadership effectiveness. These findings underscore the necessity for targeted support and professional development initiatives to enhance administrators' capacity to effectively lead reading instruction within educational settings.
5. While no significant differences were found based on demographic factors such as age, civil status, length of service, or educational attainment, age emerged as a significant factor affecting assessment and overall implementation. Further investigation is warranted to uncover the underlying reasons behind these age-related differences, which could inform targeted professional development initiatives aimed at enhancing the integration of digitized reading instruction. Interestingly, civil status demonstrated a significant impact on assessment but not on overall implementation, suggesting a nuanced relationship between personal demographics and teaching practices. Despite these variations, teacher-respondents consistently exhibited similar levels of implementation across various aspects of digitized reading instruction, indicating a uniform commitment to leveraging digital technologies in their teaching practices. These findings underscore the importance of considering multifaceted factors beyond demographic characteristics when designing interventions to support

teachers in effectively integrating digital tools into their reading instruction practices.

6. The study underscores the pivotal role of reading instructional leadership in facilitating the effective implementation of digitized reading practices in educational settings. The findings reveal strong positive relationships between various aspects of reading instructional leadership, such as incorporating a shared vision, guiding decision-making processes, and building rapport with students, and the extent of teachers' implementation of digitized reading initiatives. Effective communication and promotion of a shared vision for digitized reading by administrators result in increased integration of digital tools and methods by teachers, leading to improvements in content delivery, class performances, teaching strategies, and assessment practices. Additionally, providing clear guidance and support to teachers, individualizing learner support, and improving specialized training are identified as key factors influencing the successful integration of digitized reading practices. Moreover, monitoring data and providing incentives play crucial roles in fostering the implementation of digitized reading initiatives in classrooms. Overall, the study highlights the importance of strong reading instructional leadership in driving the seamless integration of digitized reading initiatives within educational contexts, ultimately enhancing teaching and learning outcomes.

References

1. 10 Principles for Developing ICT In Education Programs. (n.d.). Education Links. https://www.edulinks.org/learning/10-principles-developing-ict-education-programs
2. 7 benefits of using iPads and tablets in schools. (2021, March 12). Bosstab. Retrieved January 11, 2023, from https://www.bosstab.com/blog/2021/7-benefits-of-using-ipads-and-tablets-in-schools/
3. Barth, R. S. (2013). Leveraging teacher leadership. Educational Leadership, 71(2), 10- 16. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educationalleadership/oct13/vol71/num02/The-Time-Is-Ripe-(Again).aspx
4. Bhandari, P. (2022, December 2). Ethical Considerations in Research | Types & Examples. Scribbr. https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/research-ethics/
5. Blue, D. C. (2020). Instructional Leadership Practices of High School Principals Regarding Proficiency in Literacy (Doctoral dissertation). Walden University.
6. Retrieved from Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection.
7. Brown, J. L. (2022, March 17). 5 advantages of using tablets for digital learning — in the classroom and beyond. Samsung Business Insights. https://insights.samsung.com/2022/03/17/5-advantages-of-using-tablets-for-digital-learning-in-the-classroom-and-beyond/
8. Brunette, T. (n.d.). Tablets to support teachers to teach reading in Uganda: Feel good? Yes. Effective? Partially. Promising? Definitely. | SharEd. https://shared.rti.org/content/tablets-support-teachers-teach-reading-uganda-feel-good-yes-effective-partially-promising
9. Bryant, J., Child, F., Dorn, E., & Hall, S. (2022, August 1). New global data reveal education technology's impact on learning. McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/education/our-insights/new-global-data-reveal-education-technologys-impact-on-learning

10. Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement. Russell Sage Foundation.
11. Choi, A. (2018), "Emoti onal well-being of children and adolescents: Recent trends and relevant factors", OECD Education Working Papers, No. 169, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/41576fb2-en
12. Dauphin, A. (2020, January 31). Pupil Learning with Digital Tablet in Classroom. https://www.abacademies.org/articles/pupil-learning-with-digital-tablet-in-classroom-8924.html
13. Delgado, P., Vargas, C., Ackerman, R., Salmerón, L., 2018. Don't throw away your printed books: A meta-analysis on the effects of reading media on reading comprehension. Educational Research Review 25, 23–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.09.003
14. "Department for Education, 2018. New technology to spearhead classroom revolution
15. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-technology-to-spearhead-classroom-revolution"
16. "Department for Education, 2019. EdTech Strategy marks 'new era' for schools
17. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/edtech-strategy-marks-new-era-for-schools"
18. Disney, L., Barnes, A., Ey, L., & Geng, G. (2019). Digital play in young children's numeracy learning. Australasian Journal of Early Childhood, 44(2), 166–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/1836939119832084
19. Dunn, J., & Sweeney, T. (2018). Writing and iPads in the early years: Perspectives from within the classroom. British Journal of Educational Technology, 49(5), 859–869. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12621
20. Educación: The urgency of quality education for girls and women in Latin America and the potential of technology to achieve it. (2022, October 6).
21. Friedrich Naumann Foundation. https://www.freiheit.org/andean-states/urgency-quality-education-girls-and-women-latin-america-and-potential-technology\
22. Effects of assistive technology for students with reading and writing disabilities. (n.d.). Taylor & Francis.
23. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17483107.2019.1646821
24. Elementary School Teacher Shares Keys to Using Tablets Successfully Education World. (n.d.). https://www.educationworld.com/a_news/teacher-shares-keys-successful-tablet-implementation-1704277336
25. Ertmer, P. A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., & York, C. S. (2012). Exemplary technology-using teachers: Perceptions of factors influencing success. Journal of Computing in Teacher Education, 28(2), 109-116.
26. Ethical Considerations. (2021). Essays. Retrieved January 11, 2023, from https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/research-ethics/
27. Fabian, K., Topping, K. J., & Barron, I. G. (2018). Using mobile technologies for mathematics: Effects on student attitudes and achievement. Educational Technology Research and Development, 66(5), 1119-1139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11423-018-9580-3
28. Flewitt, R., Messer, D., & Kucirkova, N. (2015). New directions for early literacy in a digital age: The iPad. Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 15(3), 289–310.
29. Fokides, E. (2018). Digital educational games and mathematics: Results of a case study in primary school settings. Education and Information Technologies, 23(2), 851-867. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10639-017-9639-5

30. Fokides, E., & Mastrokoukou, A. (2018). Results from a study for teaching human body systems to primaryschool students using tablets. Contemporary Educational Technology, 9(2), 154–170. https://doi.org/10.30935/cet.414808
31. Fulton, J. (2022, May 26). 7 examples of innovative educational technology - Classcraft Blog. Resource Hub for Schools and Districts.
32. https://www.classcraft.com/blog/examples-of-educational-technology/
33. Future Education Technology: How Digital Trends Are Shaping Teaching. (2019, May 21). Maryville Online. https://online.maryville.edu/blog/future-ed-tech/
34. Gerritsen, J. (2021, September 2). Devices in schools linked to lower achievement in core subjects - report. RNZ. https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/450601/devices-in-schools-linked-to-lower-achievement-in-core-subjects-report
35. Gikas, J., & Grant, M. M. (2013). Mobile computing devices in higher education: Student perspectives on learning with cellphones, smartphones & social media. The Internet and Higher Education, 19, 18-26.
36. Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 37(2), 479-507.
37. Gott schalk, F. (2019), "Impacts of technology use on children: Exploring literature on the brain, cogniti on and well-being", OECD Educati on Working Papers, No. 195, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/8296464e-en
38. Gott schalk, F. (2019), "Impacts of technology use on children: Exploring literature on the brain, cogniti on and well-being", OECD Educati on Working Papers, No. 195, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/8296464e-en.
39. Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. School Leadership & Management, 30(2), 95-110.
40. Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (2013). Assessing instructional leadership with the principal instructional management rating scale. Springer Science & Business Media.
41. Halloluwa, T., Vyas, D., Usoof, H., & Hewagamage, K. P. (2018). Gamification for development: A case of collaborative learning in Sri Lankan primary schools. Personal and Ubiquitous Computing, 22(2), 391-407.http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00779-017-1073-6
42. Hanford, E. (2022, January 20). How a flawed idea is teaching millions of kids to be poor readers. At a Loss for Words | APM Reports. https://www.apmreports.org/episode/2019/08/22/whats-wrong-how-schools-teach-reading
43. Harris, A. (2005). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading? Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 33(2), 169-186.
44. Harris, A., Jamieson, I., & Russ, J. (2013). Distributed leadership: Implications for the role of the principal. Journal of Management Development, 32(1), 91-105.
45. Hassler Hallstedt, M., Klingberg, T., & Ghaderi, A. (2018). Short and long-term effects of a mathematics tablet intervention for low performing second graders. Journal of Educational Psychology, 110(8), 1127-1148. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/edu0000264

46. Hew, K. F., & Brush, T. (2007). Integrating technology into K-12 teaching and learning: Current knowledge gaps and recommendations for future research. Educational Technology Research and Development, 55(3), 223-252.
47. Hinduja, S. and J. Patchin (2018), Cyberbullying fact sheet: Identification, Prevention, and Response, Cyberbullying Research Center, https://cyberbullying.org/Cyberbullying-Identification-Prevention-Response-2018.pdf.
48. Honea, T. (n.d.). Should students be using tablets at school? The SHS Jacket Buzz. https://shsjacketbuzz.org/1541/opinion/should-students-be-using-tablets-at-school/
49. Hood, N. (2019, December 14). The role of technology in teaching reading, writing and maths. THE EDUCATION HUB. https://theeducationhub.org.nz/the-role-of-technology-in-teaching-reading-writing-and-maths/
50. Hooft Graafl and, J. (2018), "New technologies and 21st century children: Recent trends and outcomes", OECD Educati on Working Papers, No. 179, OECD Publishing, Paris,
51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/e071a505-en."

52. How Technology in the Classroom Is Shaping the Future of Education. (2021, December 8). Jotform Education. Retrieved January 11, 2023, from https://www.jotform.com/technology-in-the-classroom/
53. How to Integrate Technology in the Classroom. (n.d.). School of Education. https://drexel.edu/soe/resources/student-teaching/advice/how-to-use-technology-in-the-classroom/
54. https:\/\/online.utpb.edu\/author\/jquinn\/#author. (2020, November 3). The Use of Technology in Special Education | UT Permian Basin Online. The University of Texas Permian Basin | UTPB. https://online.utpb.edu/about-us/articles/education/the-use-of-technology-in-special-education/
55. Information and communication technology (ICT) in education | Unesco IIEP Learning Portal. (n.d.). https://learningportal.iiep.unesco.org/en/issue-briefs/improve-learning/information-and-communication-technology-ict-in-education
56. Iyare, N. F., James, J. S., & Amonde, T. M. (2018). The effectiveness of integrating interactive technology in reading comprehension: A case study of Jamaica's grade school.
57. Journal of Information Technology Education: Research, 17, 227-246. http://dx.doi.org/10.28945/4098
58. Kilanowski, M. C. (n.d.). Using 1:1 Computing Devices in a Classroom Setting. The Repository at St. Cloud State.
59. https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed_etds/49/?utm_source=repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed_etds/49
60. Kilanowski, M. C. (n.d.-b). Using 1:1 Computing Devices in a Classroom Setting. The Repository at St. Cloud State. https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed_etds/49/?utm_source=repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed_etds/49
61. Kilanowski, Matthew C., "Using 1:1 Computing Devices in a Classroom Setting" (2020). Culminating Projects in Teacher Development. 49. https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed_etds/49
62. Klein, A. (2021, May 28). During COVID-19, Schools Have Made a Mad Dash to 1-to-1 Computing. What Happens Next? Education Week. https://www.edweek.org/technology/during-covid-19-schools-have-made-a-mad-dash-to-1-to-1-computing-what-happens-next/2021/04
63. Krumsvik, R. J. (2021, June 8). Implementing Tablets in Norwegian Primary Schools. Examining Outcome Measures in the Second Cohort. Frontiers. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2021.642686/full

64. Lai, J. W. M., and Bower, M. (2019). How is the use of technology in education evaluated? A systematic review. Comp. Educ. 133, 27–42. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2019.01.010
65. Lee, H. K., & Ahram, C. (2020). Enhancing early numeracy skills with a tablet-based math game intervention: A study in Tanzania. Educational Technology, Research and Development, 68(6), 3567-3585. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09808-y
66. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. Educational Administration Quarterly, 44(4), 496-528.
67. Lewis, R. J. (2011). Elementary Principals as Reading Instructional Leaders in Selected West Virginia Schools (Doctoral dissertation). West Virginia University. Retrieved from https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/3030
68. Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning. The Wallace Foundation.
69. Lynch, M. (2018, April 10). 15 Ways to Use a Tablet in the Classroom. The Tech Edvocate. https://www.thetechedvocate.org/15-ways-to-use-a-tablet-in-the-classroom/
70. M, S. (2022, June 2). The pros and cons of electronics in school - Classcraft Blog. Resource Hub for Schools and Districts.
71. https://www.classcraft.com/blog/pros-and-cons-of-electronics-in-school/
72. Mangen, A. (2018). Modes of writing in a digital age: The good, the bad and the unknown. Retrieved from https://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/9419/7593
73. Marketing USA. (2021, March 17). Importance of using tablets in the classroom - CAE. CAE Computer Aided E-learning. https://www.cae.net/importance-of-using-tablets-in-the-classroom/
74. Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 39(3), 370-397.
75. Martin, J. (2019, August 6). 5 benefits of using tablets in the primary classroom. Resources for English Language Learners and Teachers | Pearson English. https://www.english.com/blog/5-benefits-of-using-tablets-in-the-primary-classroom/
76. McDaniel, B. T., & Radesky, J. S. (2018). Technoference: longitudinal associations between parent technology use, parenting stress, and child behavior problems. Pediatric Research, 84(2), 210–218. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41390-018-0052-6
77. Miltner, K., 2018. Taking a second look at the learn-to-code craze. Parenting for a Digital Future.
78. Mize, M., & Park, Y. (2020). iPad-assisted reading fluency instruction for fourth graders with reading difficulties: A single case experimental design. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 37(2), 500–509. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.
79. Mora-Ruano, J. G., Schurig, M., & Wittmann, E. (2021). Instructional Leadership as a Vehicle for Teacher Collaboration and Student Achievement: What the German PISA 2015 Sample Tells Us. Frontiers in Education, 6, Article 582773. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.582773
80. OECD (2018), “Children & young people’s mental health in the digital age: Shaping the future”, ELS Policy Brief, OECD, Paris, http://www.oecd.org/els/health-systems/Children-and-Young-People-Mental-Health-in-the-Digital-Age.pdf.
81. OECD (2019), Trends Shaping Educati on 2019, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/trends_edu-2019-en.

82. Ofcom (2019), Children and Parents: Media Use and Attitudes Report 2018, http://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdffile/0024/134907/
83. Ok, M. W., & Ratliffe, K. T. (2018). Use of mobile devices for English language learner students in the United States: A research synthesis. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 56(4), 538–562.
84. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633117715748
85. Orben, A. and A. K. Przybylski (2019), "The associati on between adolescent well-being and digital technology use", Nature Human Behaviour, Vol. 3, p. 173–182.
86. Outhwaite, L. A., Faulder, M., Gulliford, A., & Pitchford, N. J. (2019). Raising early achievement in math with interactive apps: A randomized control trial. Journal of Educational Psychology, 111(2), 284-298. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/edu0000286
87. Przybylski, A.K (2019), "Digital screen ti me and pediatric sleep: Evidence from a preregistered cohort study", The Journal of Pediatrics, Vol. 205/1, p. 218-223, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2018.09.054
88. Renckens, E., 2018. Bekijk: Lees je beter van scherm of papier? NEMOKennislink. https://www.nemokennislink.nl/publicaties/lees-je-beter-van-scherm-of-papier/ (accessed 1.6.19).
89. Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2009). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. Educational Administration Quarterly, 45(1), 61-95.
90. Ross, E. (2020, April 5). 10 Benefits of Tablets in the Classroom. My Tech Classroom. Retrieved January 11, 2023, from https://mytechclassroom.com/benefits-of-tablets-in-the-classroom/
91. S. (2022, May 20). Choosing Between Tablet vs Laptop for School to Facilitate Student Learning. https://scienceandliteracy.org/tablet-vs-laptop-for-school/
92. Seashore Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings. University of Minnesota.
93. Silins, H., Mulford, B., & Zarins, S. (2002). Organizational learning and school change. The Journal of Educational Change, 3(3-4), 225-245.
94. Simmons, A. O. D. (2019). The Impact of Instructional Leadership on Student Reading Success (Publication No. 13856497) [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Alabama]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
95. Soffar, H. (2020, March 18). The importance and uses of Tablets in education. Science Online. https://www.online-sciences.com/technology/the-importance-and-uses-of-tablets-in-education/
96. Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distributed leadership. Jossey-Bass.
97. Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36(1), 3-34.
98. Tablet vs book learning: Impact on memory, attention and learning skills. (2020, March 3). Research Square. Retrieved January 11, 2023, from https://assets.researchsquare.com/files/rs-15843/v1/bdff509f-de8d-418e-9044-0c109bb2b414.pdf?c=1631831556
99. Tablets Delivered, But Are They Used? (2022, June 27). Kenya Connect. Retrieved January 11, 2023, from https://www.kenyaconnect.org/2018/06/27/tablets-delivered-but-are-they-used/
100. Tablets vs. Textbooks - 15 Pros and Cons. (2022, November 28). Tablets Vs. Textbooks. https://tablets-textbooks.procon.org/

101. Team, T. i. (2022, May 18). The Digital Classroom: How Tablets In Schools Are Changing Education. iCleanse. https://icleanse.com/the-digital-classroom-how-tablets-in-schools-are-changing-education/
102. The Advantage of Tablets Over Textbooks | Higher Ground Gear. (n.d.). https://www.hggear.com/blog/the-advantage-of-tablets-over-textbooks
103. The Best Ways to Use Tablets in the Classroom with Students. (n.d.).
104. http://schools.magoosh.com/schools-blog/the-best-ways-to-use-tablets-in-the-classroom-with-students
105. Tkach, R., & Gallegher, T. L. (2020, December). Sparking Reading Engagement through Tablets: An Early Intervention Reading Program and Parent Workshop for Tablets at Home. Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts. Retrieved January 11, 2023, from https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3534&context=reading_horizons
106. Tremont, J. W., & Templeton, N. R. (2019). Principals as Instructional Leaders: An Embedded Descriptive Case Study of One Rural School's Effort to Improve Student Outcomes Through Reading Plus. School Leadership Review, 14(2), Article 3. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/slr/vol14/iss2/3
107. UNICEF's School-in-a-Bag brings hope to young learners in difficult areas. (n.d.). UNICEF Philippines. https://www.unicef.org/philippines/stories/unicefs-school-bag-brings-hope-young-learners-difficult-areas
108. WAMU 88.5. (2020, March 6). D.C. Is Spending Millions To Get Tablets In The Hands Of All Students. WAMU. https://wamu.org/story/20/03/06/d-c-is-spending-millions-to-get-laptops-in-the-hands-of-all-students/
109. Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement. McREL.
110. Winstead, S. (2022, February 23). Using Tablets in School: How to Implement 1:1 Technology in the Classroom. My eLearning World. https://myelearningworld.com/10-benefits-of-tablets-in-the-classroom/