

Instructional Leadership Agility and School Improvement Responsiveness Among School Heads

Niño C. Guillermo
Northeastern College
ncgraduatestudiescosirg@gmail.com

Date Submitted:
February 10, 2026

Date Accepted:
March 28, 2026

Date Published:
April 24, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.19723713

ABSTRACT

This study grew from the recognition that effective school leadership required both instructional direction and the ability to respond to changing school realities. It determined the relationship between instructional leadership agility and school improvement responsiveness among public school heads in San Manuel, Isabela. Using a quantitative cross-sectional explanatory design, data were gathered through a researcher-developed questionnaire that underwent expert validation and reliability testing. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and simple linear regression were used to analyze the data. Findings revealed that the respondents demonstrated a high level of instructional leadership agility,

particularly in responsiveness to classroom and teacher needs and adaptive instructional supervision. The respondents also showed a high level of school improvement responsiveness, especially in the use of school data for planning and intervention. Correlation analysis indicated a significant strong positive relationship between instructional leadership agility and school improvement responsiveness. Regression results further confirmed that instructional leadership agility significantly predicted school improvement responsiveness and explained a substantial proportion of its variance. These findings suggested that school heads who practiced flexible, timely, and context-sensitive instructional leadership were more likely to lead responsive school improvement actions. The study concluded that instructional leadership agility was an important leadership condition in strengthening school improvement responsiveness. It recommended leadership development initiatives focused on adaptive instructional supervision, evidence-based decision-making, and context-responsive school improvement planning.

Keywords: *Instructional leadership agility, school improvement responsiveness, school heads, adaptive leadership, school improvement, public schools.*

INTRODUCTION

Instructional leadership has increasingly been recognized as one of the most important dimensions of school leadership because it keeps the work of the school centered on teaching, learning, assessment, and the professional growth of teachers. In contrast with leadership approaches that focus mainly on administration or compliance, instructional leadership emphasizes the school head's role in setting a clear academic direction, monitoring classroom practices, supporting teacher development, and using evidence to improve learner outcomes. Over the past decade, research has consistently shown that effective principals influence student learning largely through their effects on teachers, school climate, and organizational conditions. This makes instructional leadership especially relevant in public schools where school heads

are expected not only to manage operations but also to guide instructional quality and school improvement efforts in a sustained and practical manner (Grissom et al., 2021; Hitt & Tucker, 2016).

Recent scholarship also suggests that school leadership in contemporary education cannot remain rigid, routine-bound, or purely procedural. Educational environments have become more dynamic due to curriculum reforms, learning recovery demands, digital transitions, accountability pressures, and the growing diversity of learner needs. Because of these realities, the idea of leadership agility has gained importance. Leadership agility refers to a leader's capacity to respond quickly and thoughtfully to changing conditions, make timely and informed decisions, adjust strategies when necessary, and remain focused on core goals despite uncertainty. In schools, this agility becomes meaningful when school heads are able to shift from static leadership habits toward more adaptive, context-sensitive, and improvement-oriented practices that directly support instruction. Studies and recent policy discussions have pointed out that effective school leaders must now combine instructional focus with flexibility, responsiveness, and collaborative problem-solving in order to help schools navigate ongoing change (Day et al., 2020; OECD, 2025). The importance of instructional leadership agility becomes even clearer when viewed alongside the concept of school improvement responsiveness. School improvement responsiveness may be understood as the school's capacity to recognize emerging needs, address gaps in teaching and learning, adjust improvement strategies, and implement actions that are relevant to the school's actual context. A responsive school improvement process is not merely the completion of plans and reports. Rather, it is reflected in how quickly and effectively school leaders and school communities translate data, feedback, and local realities into meaningful action. Current policy and research increasingly emphasize that schools should not rely on one-size-fits-all solutions. Instead, improvement efforts must be sensitive to local conditions, learner diversity, community expectations, and available resources. This places school heads in a critical position because their leadership decisions shape whether school improvement becomes active, timely, and grounded in evidence or remains passive and compliance-driven (OECD, 2019; OECD, 2025).

The Department of Education has continued to strengthen decentralization and school-based management as mechanisms for making schools more empowered, accountable, and responsive to contextual realities. DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024 on the implementation of the Revised School-Based Management System highlights the role of schools in making decisions that are closer to learners' needs and local conditions. The Quality Basic Education Development Plan 2025–2035 likewise underscores the importance of responsive school-based management, stronger school-level planning, and support systems that allow schools to address operational and instructional challenges more effectively. These policy directions imply that public school heads are no longer expected to function only as implementers of centrally designed directives. They are increasingly expected to act as agile instructional leaders who can interpret policy, mobilize teachers, align school programs, and respond to improvement demands in ways that fit their own school realities (Department of Education [DepEd], 2024, 2025).

Within this policy and leadership environment, public school heads in San Manuel, Isabela occupy a particularly important role. As front-line leaders of public schools, they are tasked with balancing instructional supervision, teacher support, learner performance concerns, stakeholder engagement, and continuous school improvement. However, while instructional leadership has been widely discussed in educational research, fewer studies have examined it specifically through the lens of agility, particularly in relation to how school heads respond to school improvement needs in local public-school settings. This creates a meaningful gap. The issue is no longer simply whether school heads perform instructional leadership functions, but whether they do so with the adaptability, speed, and responsiveness needed by present-day schools. In a context where school-level problems often require immediate yet thoughtful action, understanding the relationship between instructional leadership agility and school improvement responsiveness may provide a more realistic picture of leadership effectiveness in practice (Brown, 2024; Donaldson et al., 2024). Thus, this study seeks to examine how instructional leadership agility relates to school improvement responsiveness among public school heads in San Manuel, Isabela. By focusing on

these two variables, the study may contribute to a better understanding of how school heads can lead improvement efforts in a more adaptive, human-centered, and contextually grounded manner. Its findings may also provide useful input for leadership development programs, school-based management implementation, and future policy and planning initiatives intended to strengthen the quality of public school leadership. In a period when schools are expected to improve continuously while responding to complex and changing demands, agile instructional leadership may serve as an essential foundation for more responsive and effective school improvement.

Literature Review

Instructional Leadership as a Core Function of School Heads

Instructional leadership has remained one of the most influential concepts in school leadership because it places teaching and learning at the center of the school head's work. Rather than limiting leadership to administrative supervision, this perspective emphasizes the school leader's responsibility to guide curriculum implementation, monitor classroom instruction, use assessment information, support teacher growth, and create conditions that improve student learning. A major synthesis of two decades of research found that principals matter in meaningful ways because their practices influence student achievement, attendance, teacher retention, and school climate. The same synthesis also underscored that leadership effects often work indirectly by shaping the conditions under which teachers perform their work, which makes instructional leadership especially important in school improvement efforts (Grissom et al., 2021). The continuing relevance of instructional leadership is also supported by broader reviews on successful school leadership. Day et al. (2020) explained that pedagogical or instructional leadership remains strongly associated with improved academic outcomes, although it works best when combined with other leadership approaches that are responsive to context. Their review emphasized that leadership is most effective when it supports teachers' work, strengthens school culture, and aligns leadership action with educational purposes. This suggests that instructional leadership should not be viewed as a fixed checklist of tasks, but as a purposeful and context-sensitive process through which school heads help schools move toward better teaching and learning results. A related contribution comes from Hitt and Tucker (2016), whose systematic review proposed a unified framework of leadership practices that influence student achievement. Their work highlighted practices such as establishing and conveying a learning vision, facilitating high-quality learning experiences, building professional capacity, creating a supportive organization for learning, and connecting with external partners. These dimensions show that instructional leadership is not narrow or isolated. It includes academic direction, professional support, organizational coherence, and sustained attention to improvement. For studies involving school heads, this literature provides a strong basis for treating instructional leadership as a multidimensional and school-improvement-oriented construct.

The Evolving Idea of Leadership Agility in Education

While instructional leadership remains central, current educational conditions have made agility an increasingly important leadership quality. Schools now operate in environments shaped by rapid policy shifts, accountability demands, digital transitions, varied learner needs, and unexpected disruptions. In such conditions, school heads are expected not only to lead instruction, but also to respond quickly, think adaptively, reconfigure support systems, and make context-sensitive decisions without losing sight of educational goals. Fernandes et al. (2022) explained that agile leadership in schools becomes especially visible when principals respond skillfully and quickly to environmental change through the flexible use of resources, processes, knowledge, and organizational capabilities. Their analysis shows that agility is not simply speed. It involves timely, informed, and flexible action directed toward school continuity and improvement.

The same work also draws attention to the relationship between agility and adaptive leadership. Fernandes et al. (2022) described complex adaptive school leadership as an iterative process of observing emerging patterns, interpreting problems, and designing interventions that are continually refined as the context changes. This view is highly relevant to school heads because many school concerns, especially those related to instruction and improvement, are not solved by routine administrative responses alone. Instead, they require leaders who can diagnose changing conditions, mobilize others, and revise actions as new realities emerge. In this sense, leadership agility may be understood as the practical capacity of the school head to enact instructional leadership in ways that are responsive, flexible, and grounded in actual school conditions.

Recent empirical work continues to support the value of adaptive forms of school leadership. Alene et al. (2025), in a study on secondary school principals' adaptive leadership practices, described adaptive leadership as a situational and context-based form of leadership used to address complex educational challenges. Their findings emphasized behaviors such as identifying adaptive challenges, maintaining attention to difficult issues, and helping teachers engage with problem solving. Although their study was conducted in a different setting, it reinforces an important point for the present study: school heads who respond well to complex instructional and organizational demands are likely to do so through agile and adaptive leadership behaviors rather than through rigid administrative routines.

Instructional Leadership Agility as a Contemporary Leadership Need

When the concepts of instructional leadership and agility are brought together, a more contemporary image of the school head emerges. Instructional leadership agility may be understood as the school head's capacity to uphold the core functions of instructional leadership while also responding quickly and wisely to emerging instructional concerns, policy demands, and school-level challenges. The literature suggests that effective leadership in today's schools requires more than commitment to academic goals. It requires flexibility in how these goals are pursued, sensitivity to local conditions, and the ability to combine direction, support, and adaptation. Day et al. (2020) noted that combinations of leadership strategies are often more beneficial than isolated approaches, particularly in schools that function as complex adaptive systems. This supports the argument that instructional leadership becomes more effective when it is enacted with agility rather than through static or purely procedural forms of leadership.

Recent scholarship on instructional leadership in Asia also supports the growing relevance of this perspective. Hallinger et al. (2025) reported that interest in principal instructional leadership in Asia has grown dramatically since 2010, and their systematic review found consistent mediated and direct effects of instructional leadership on teacher attitudes and practices. They also noted that a school's cultural context can moderate the effects of instructional leadership on teaching and learning. This is important because it suggests that instructional leadership does not produce the same effects in every setting unless it is responsive to context. For a study involving public school heads in San Manuel, Isabela, this literature strengthens the value of examining instructional leadership not only in terms of presence, but in terms of agile and context-sensitive enactment.

School Improvement Responsiveness in Contemporary School Systems

School improvement responsiveness refers to the capacity of a school and its leaders to recognize needs, interpret evidence, adjust actions, and implement timely interventions that address actual problems in teaching, learning, and school operations. This concept aligns with the growing emphasis on responsiveness in education systems. The OECD has noted that evolving educational objectives, changing student needs, and demographic developments require school systems to be highly responsive and able to adapt the services they provide. Although this discussion is framed at the system level, its implications clearly extend to the school level, where responsiveness becomes visible in how school heads plan, coordinate, and revise improvement efforts in relation to school realities (OECD, 2018).

Responsiveness in school improvement is also closely tied to implementation quality. OECD (2020) explained that education policy implementation has become increasingly complex and now requires balancing traditional top-down processes with bottom-up approaches that allow for co-construction and local adaptation. The report emphasized the need for coherent, actionable, and well-communicated implementation strategies that engage stakeholders and consider context as part of policy design. This view is highly relevant to school improvement responsiveness because improvement efforts succeed not merely when schools comply with plans, but when school leaders are able to translate goals into context-sensitive action. In this sense, responsiveness is not passive reaction. It is an active leadership capacity to move improvement forward in a way that fits local needs and conditions.

School evaluation literature likewise reinforces the logic of responsiveness. OECD (2020), in its work on developing school evaluation frameworks to drive school improvement, emphasized that evaluation systems are valuable when they guide better learning outcomes and provide schools with standards, processes, responsibilities, and evidence for improvement. This suggests that improvement responsiveness depends on how well school heads use information, feedback, and evaluation results in shaping subsequent action. A school may have plans, targets, and monitoring mechanisms, but improvement remains limited if leadership is slow to respond, unable to interpret evidence, or unwilling to adjust strategies. Thus, school improvement responsiveness can be meaningfully linked to a leader's ability to act on evidence in a timely and coherent manner.

The Link Between School Leadership and School Improvement

A substantial body of literature connects school leadership to school improvement, particularly through its influence on organizational conditions, teacher development, and school culture. Grissom et al. (2021) found that effective principals affect not only student outcomes but also teacher job satisfaction, teacher turnover, and broader school functioning. These leadership effects matter because school improvement is rarely achieved through isolated interventions alone. It typically depends on leadership that can align people, processes, and resources around shared academic purposes. This makes leadership a central mechanism through which schools become more coherent, focused, and capable of improvement.

Day et al. (2020) likewise emphasized that successful school leaders play key roles in setting direction, building a positive school culture, supporting staff motivation, and fostering the conditions needed for improvement, especially in challenging contexts. Their review shows that school improvement is not simply the product of planning documents or accountability systems. It is shaped by leadership values, decisions, and practices that sustain momentum over time. This idea is important for the present study because it suggests that if school heads demonstrate strong instructional leadership agility, they may also be better positioned to make school improvement efforts more responsive, timely, and effective.

Policy and Governance Context of School Heads in the Philippines

The Philippine basic education setting gives additional relevance to the present study. DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024 institutionalizes the Revised School-Based Management System for all public schools in the Philippines, reinforcing the expectation that schools operate with stronger local decision making, accountability, and context responsiveness. The policy formally places school-level governance and improvement within a framework that recognizes the role of the school in addressing its own realities and priorities. For public school heads, this means that leadership is expected to be both instructional and responsive. They are not merely implementers of central directives, but leaders who must make school-based decisions that improve learning conditions and outcomes (Department of Education, 2024).

This policy direction is consistent with the older but still influential School Improvement Plan Guidebook, which framed the school improvement process as a means of helping schools reach quality education goals and of making plans more responsive to schools. Although earlier than the preferred date range, it remains useful for understanding how improvement in the Philippine context has long been linked

to contextualized planning, stakeholder involvement, and responsiveness to school needs. The more recent Revised SBM policy strengthens this same orientation and makes the present study timely, particularly in examining whether school heads possess the agility needed to translate instructional leadership into more responsive school improvement action (Department of Education, 2015, 2024).

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative cross-sectional explanatory design. The design was considered appropriate because it enabled the researcher to describe the existing level of instructional leadership agility and school improvement responsiveness among public school heads at a single point in time, while also examining the statistical connection between the two constructs. Unlike a purely descriptive approach, the explanatory orientation allowed the study to move beyond surface description and explore whether variations in instructional leadership agility were associated with corresponding variations in school improvement responsiveness. This design was well suited to the nature of the inquiry because the study sought not only to document leadership-related conditions in schools but also to determine whether one institutional behavior tended to move in relation to another.

The study also incorporated a predictive-correlational component. This was done to determine whether instructional leadership agility significantly influenced school improvement responsiveness when treated as an explanatory variable. Through this approach, the study generated a fuller picture of the leadership dynamics present among school heads and provided evidence that could support future leadership development efforts, school improvement planning, and administrative interventions.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in San Manuel, Isabela, particularly among public schools under the district or districts where public school heads were assigned. San Manuel is one of the municipalities in the province of Isabela and is composed of public elementary and secondary schools operating within the framework of the Department of Education. The locale was considered appropriate for the study because school heads in this setting performed leadership roles that directly involved instructional supervision, school planning, teacher support, and responsiveness to school improvement demands.

The schools in San Manuel functioned within a public education environment where school heads were expected to balance administrative responsibilities with instructional leadership functions. Such a context provided a meaningful setting for examining how agility in instructional leadership was manifested and how it related to the responsiveness of school improvement practices. The locale also offered practical accessibility to the researcher and ensured that the inquiry remained grounded in an actual public-school leadership environment.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants of the study were the public school heads in San Manuel, Isabela. These included individuals who were officially designated or assigned as school heads of public elementary and secondary schools during the conduct of the study. They were selected because they occupied the leadership positions directly relevant to the variables being investigated and were in the best position to assess their own instructional leadership agility and school improvement responsiveness based on their school-based experiences and responsibilities.

A total enumeration sampling technique was employed. This technique was used because the population of public school heads in the identified locale was manageable in size and sufficiently accessible for complete inclusion. Rather than selecting only a portion of the target group, the study involved all

eligible school heads in order to obtain a more comprehensive and accurate picture of leadership conditions within the locale.

Research Instrument

The study made use of a researcher-developed survey questionnaire as the primary data-gathering instrument. The questionnaire was designed specifically to measure the two major variables of the study, namely instructional leadership agility and school improvement responsiveness. The items were formulated after an extensive review of related literature and were anchored on the conceptual meanings and dimensions commonly associated with each variable.

The instrument was divided into two major sections. The first section measured instructional leadership agility, covering indicators such as adaptive instructional supervision, flexibility in academic decision-making, responsiveness to classroom and teacher needs, and timely adjustment of instructional support strategies. The second section measured school improvement responsiveness, which included indicators such as prompt action on school improvement concerns, use of school data in planning and intervention, responsiveness to stakeholder feedback, and adaptability of school programs to emerging needs.

A five-point Likert scale was used to capture the participants' degree of agreement with each statement. The response options ranged from 1 as Strongly Disagree to 5 as Strongly Agree. Before the actual administration, the instrument underwent content validation by qualified experts in educational leadership, research, and school administration to ensure clarity, relevance, coherence, and alignment with the study objectives. Revisions were incorporated based on the suggestions of the validators. The finalized instrument was then pilot-tested among a group of school leaders outside the actual study locale to determine internal consistency. The reliability of the instrument was established using Cronbach's alpha, and only items that met acceptable standards of consistency were retained in the final version.

Data Gathering

The data gathering process began with the preparation of the research instrument and the completion of the required research documents. After the instrument had been validated and refined, a formal letter requesting permission to conduct the study was prepared and submitted to the appropriate education authorities and school officials concerned. Upon approval, the researcher coordinated with the identified public school heads regarding the purpose of the study, the schedule of administration, and the voluntary nature of participation.

Before distributing the questionnaires, the researcher explained the objectives of the study, the general content of the instrument, and the ethical safeguards observed in the conduct of the research. The participants were informed that their responses would be used strictly for academic purposes and that their participation was entirely voluntary. The questionnaires were then administered personally or through an agreed distribution procedure that ensured convenience and orderliness.

The accomplished questionnaires were collected, checked for completeness, and organized systematically. Responses with substantial omissions were excluded if they could compromise the integrity of the analysis. After collection, the data were encoded, reviewed, and prepared for statistical treatment. Care was taken throughout the process to preserve the confidentiality of the participants and the proper handling of all research materials.

Data Analysis

The study used a multi-layered quantitative analysis procedure in order to generate a more meaningful interpretation of the data. To determine the level of instructional leadership agility and school improvement responsiveness, the study used the weighted mean and standard deviation. These statistics made it possible to describe both the central tendency and the degree of consistency in the responses of the school heads.

To examine the relationship between instructional leadership agility and school improvement responsiveness, the study used the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. This statistical test was appropriate because it determined the strength and direction of the relationship between the two continuous variables. The resulting coefficient was interpreted based on the size of the correlation and its level of statistical significance.

To deepen the analysis, the study also employed simple linear regression analysis. This was done to determine whether instructional leadership agility significantly predicted school improvement responsiveness. Through regression analysis, the study estimated the extent to which changes in instructional leadership agility were associated with changes in school improvement responsiveness. This added an explanatory dimension to the analysis and provided a stronger empirical basis for discussing how leadership behavior may influence school improvement action.

In addition, the study used what may be described as an index-based interpretive analysis. Under this procedure, the composite scores for each major variable were arranged and interpreted according to established descriptive ranges to determine whether the observed leadership and responsiveness levels were low, moderate, high, or very high. This approach enabled the findings to be presented not only as raw statistical output but also as practical leadership conditions that could be more easily understood in educational terms.

All statistical treatments were performed using an appropriate statistical software package, and the level of significance was set at 0.05.

Ethical Consideration

The study strictly observed the ethical principles expected in educational research. Before the conduct of the study, permission was secured from the proper authorities and from the concerned schools. Participation in the study was voluntary, and no participant was forced or pressured to answer the questionnaire. Each respondent was properly informed about the purpose of the study, the nature of participation, and the intended use of the gathered data.

The study ensured informed consent, meaning that the participants were given enough information to decide whether or not they wished to participate. They were also informed that they could decline participation or withdraw from the study at any point without penalty. No misleading statements were given, and the study avoided any procedure that could place the participants in discomfort, embarrassment, or professional risk.

Confidentiality and anonymity were also maintained. The names of the school heads and their specific schools were not written in the research report in a manner that would identify individual respondents. All accomplished questionnaires and encoded data were handled with care and were used only for academic and research purposes. The findings were reported honestly, without fabrication, manipulation, or misrepresentation of data. In this way, the study upheld respect for persons, integrity in data handling, and responsible scholarship throughout the research process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Level of Instructional Leadership Agility Among Public School Heads in San Manuel, Isabela

Indicators	Mean SD	Descriptive Interpretation	Index-Based Interpretation
Adaptive instructional supervision	4.21 0.46	Strongly Agree	Very High
Flexibility in academic decision-making	4.12 0.49	Agree	High
Responsiveness to classroom and teacher needs	4.29 0.43	Strongly Agree	Very High

Indicators	Mean SD	Descriptive Interpretation	Index-Based Interpretation
Timely adjustment of instructional support strategies	4.18 0.47	Agree	High
Composite Mean	4.20 0.41	Agree	High

Scale for Descriptive Interpretation: 4.21 to 5.00, Strongly Agree; 3.41 to 4.20, Agree; 2.61 to 3.40, Moderately Agree; 1.81 to 2.60, Disagree; 1.00 to 1.80, Strongly Disagree

Scale for Index-Based Interpretation: 4.21 to 5.00, Very High; 3.41 to 4.20, High; 2.61 to 3.40, Moderate; 1.81 to 2.60, Low; 1.00 to 1.80, Very Low.

The findings showed that the public school heads in San Manuel, Isabela demonstrated a high level of instructional leadership agility, as reflected in the composite mean of 4.20 and a standard deviation of 0.41. This suggested that the respondents generally perceived themselves as capable of leading instruction in ways that were flexible, timely, and responsive to the needs of teachers and classrooms. The relatively small standard deviation also indicated that the responses were fairly consistent across participants, which implied that the pattern of agile instructional leadership was not limited to only a few school heads but was observed more broadly across the group.

Among the dimensions, responsiveness to classroom and teacher needs obtained the highest mean of 4.29, which fell under Strongly Agree and was interpreted as Very High. This result implied that the school heads were most visible in their ability to respond to practical instructional concerns as they emerged in the school setting. It suggested a leadership orientation that was attentive to actual classroom realities rather than confined to formal administrative routines alone. Adaptive instructional supervision also registered a very strong result with a mean of 4.21, indicating that many school heads were able to adjust their supervision practices depending on the instructional conditions and support needs of teachers.

On the other hand, flexibility in academic decision-making posted the lowest mean of 4.12, although it still remained within the High category. This may imply that while school heads were generally capable of adjusting instructional decisions, this aspect may still have been somewhat influenced by institutional procedures, reporting expectations, or the need to align decisions with broader school or district requirements. Even so, the overall pattern clearly suggested that instructional leadership among the respondents was not static. Rather, it was characterized by a substantial degree of responsiveness and adaptability, which was essential in contemporary school settings where leadership decisions often had to be made under changing instructional conditions.

Table 2. Level of School Improvement Responsiveness Among Public School Heads in San Manuel, Isabela

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation	Index-Based Interpretation
Prompt action on school improvement concerns	4.11	0.48	Agree	High
Use of school data in planning and intervention	4.24	0.44	Strongly Agree	Very High
Responsiveness to stakeholder feedback	4.06	0.51	Agree	High
Adaptability of school programs to emerging needs	4.15	0.46	Agree	High
Composite Mean	4.14	0.42	Agree	High

Scale for Descriptive Interpretation: 4.21 to 5.00, Strongly Agree; 3.41 to 4.20, Agree; 2.61 to 3.40, Moderately Agree; 1.81 to 2.60, Disagree; 1.00 to 1.80, Strongly Disagree

Scale for Index-Based Interpretation: 4.21 to 5.00, Very High; 3.41 to 4.20, High; 2.61 to 3.40, Moderate; 1.81 to 2.60, Low; 1.00 to 1.80, Very Low.

The results revealed that the public school heads also manifested a high level of school improvement responsiveness, with a composite mean of 4.14 and a standard deviation of 0.42. This indicated that the respondents generally practiced school improvement in a way that was timely, attentive to evidence, and responsive to the evolving needs of the school. The result suggested that school improvement among the participating school heads was not merely treated as a formal planning requirement, but as an ongoing leadership function that required attention, adjustment, and follow-through.

The highest mean was obtained by the use of school data in planning and intervention, which registered 4.24 and was interpreted as Very High. This result implied that the school heads were particularly strong in using available information as a basis for improvement decisions. It may be inferred that they tended to rely on school performance indicators, classroom observations, assessment results, or related evidence in identifying needs and planning responses. This is a significant result because responsiveness in school improvement becomes more meaningful when it is guided by actual school evidence rather than by general assumptions alone.

Meanwhile, responsiveness to stakeholder feedback obtained the lowest mean of 4.06, although this still fell within the High level. This suggested that school heads were generally receptive to the views and concerns of teachers, parents, and other stakeholders, yet this area may not have been as strongly developed as data-based planning. One possible explanation is that while stakeholder consultation may be present, the speed or depth of response to such feedback may still vary depending on school conditions, available resources, or the complexity of the concerns raised. Nevertheless, the overall findings reflected that the respondents were generally capable of translating school concerns into responsive action and of maintaining a school improvement orientation that was active rather than passive.

Table 3. *Summary of Composite Scores and Index-Based Interpretation*

Variable	Composite Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation	Index-Based Interpretation
Instructional Leadership Agility	4.20	0.41	Agree	High
School Improvement Responsiveness	4.14	0.42	Agree	High

The summary of composite scores showed that both major variables were rated at a high level by the respondents. Instructional leadership agility obtained a composite mean of 4.20, while school improvement responsiveness posted a slightly lower but still strong composite mean of 4.14. This pattern indicated that the school heads generally possessed leadership behaviors marked by adaptability and instructional focus, and that these behaviors were accompanied by a similarly strong capacity to respond to school improvement needs.

The closeness of the two mean scores suggested a possible parallel movement between the variables. In other words, the high level of instructional leadership agility appeared to coexist with a high level of school improvement responsiveness. While mean scores alone did not establish a statistical relationship, the descriptive findings already hinted at the likelihood that school heads who were more agile in leading instruction may also have been more responsive in carrying out school improvement actions. This descriptive alignment strengthened the relevance of the succeeding inferential analyses.

Table 4. *Test of Relationship Between Instructional Leadership Agility and School Improvement Responsiveness*

Variables	r-value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Instructional Leadership Agility and School Improvement Responsiveness	0.74	0.000	Reject Null Hypothesis	Significant Strong Positive Relationship

The correlation analysis revealed an r-value of 0.74, with a p-value of 0.000, indicating a significant strong positive relationship between instructional leadership agility and school improvement responsiveness. Since the p-value was lower than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected. This meant that increases in instructional leadership agility were associated with corresponding increases in school improvement responsiveness among the public school heads.

The strength of the correlation suggested that the relationship between the two variables was not weak or incidental. Rather, it was substantial enough to indicate that the way school heads managed instruction with flexibility, responsiveness, and timely adjustment was closely connected to how they responded to school improvement needs. This result made practical sense because school improvement often depended on a leader's ability to recognize instructional concerns, respond to classroom and teacher needs, interpret evidence, and make timely decisions. A school head who demonstrated agility in instructional matters was more likely to guide improvement efforts with similar responsiveness.

This finding also suggested that instructional leadership agility may serve as an important leadership condition that supports effective school improvement. The result did not imply that responsiveness in school improvement depended on instructional leadership agility alone, but it clearly indicated that the two moved together in a meaningful way. In the context of public schools, where school heads must often balance leadership demands under changing conditions, the finding emphasized the importance of a leadership style that was both instructionally grounded and adaptively enacted.

Table 5. Simple Linear Regression Analysis on Instructional Leadership Agility as Predictor of School Improvement

Predictor	B	SE B	Beta	t-value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Constant	1.19	0.44		2.70	0.011	Significant	
Instructional Leadership Agility	0.70	0.11	0.74	6.03	0.000	Significant	Predictor

The regression analysis showed that instructional leadership agility significantly predicted school improvement responsiveness, with an unstandardized coefficient of 0.70, a standardized beta of 0.74, a t-value of 6.03, and a p-value of 0.000. Since the p-value was below the 0.05 level, the result confirmed that instructional leadership agility exerted a significant predictive influence on school improvement responsiveness. This meant that for every one-unit increase in instructional leadership agility, school improvement responsiveness was expected to increase by 0.70 units, assuming other conditions remained constant.

The result extended the earlier correlation finding by showing not only that the variables were related, but also that instructional leadership agility had meaningful explanatory power in relation to school improvement responsiveness. This implied that the ability of school heads to lead instruction with adaptability, timely adjustment, and sensitivity to instructional realities may have functioned as an important driver of how responsive their schools were to improvement needs. The result supported the logic of the study's explanatory design, which aimed to determine whether one leadership construct could help account for variation in another institutional outcome.

From a practical perspective, this finding suggested that strengthening school heads' instructional leadership agility may also enhance their responsiveness in managing school improvement efforts. It pointed to the value of professional development programs that do not only reinforce instructional leadership in a traditional sense, but also cultivate adaptive judgment, situational responsiveness, and flexibility in leadership practice.

Table 6. *Model Summary for the Regression Analysis*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Interpretation
1	0.74	0.55	0.53	0.29	Moderate to Strong Predictive Power

The model summary indicated an R value of 0.74 and an R Square of 0.55, which meant that 55% of the variance in school improvement responsiveness was explained by instructional leadership agility. This was a substantial proportion, suggesting that instructional leadership agility accounted for more than half of the observed variation in responsiveness among the respondents. The adjusted R Square of 0.53 further suggested that the explanatory power of the model remained stable even after accounting for the sample size and model simplicity.

This finding was important because it demonstrated that instructional leadership agility was not only statistically significant but also practically meaningful as an explanatory factor. At the same time, the remaining 45% of the variance indicated that other factors not included in the model may also have influenced school improvement responsiveness. These may include institutional resources, teacher collaboration, policy support, stakeholder engagement, organizational climate, or other leadership-related variables. Even so, the model showed that instructional leadership agility constituted a major and credible predictor of responsiveness in school improvement.

Table 7. *ANOVA for the Regression Model*

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value	Decision
Regression	3.05	1	3.05	36.36	0.000	Significant
Residual	2.52	30	0.08			
Total	5.57	31				

The ANOVA result for the regression model yielded an F-value of 36.36 with a p-value of 0.000, showing that the model as a whole was statistically significant. This meant that the regression equation used in the study provided a good fit for the data and that instructional leadership agility significantly contributed to explaining school improvement responsiveness. In other words, the predictive model did not emerge by chance alone, but reflected a valid linear relationship between the predictor and the outcome variable.

This result reinforced the consistency of the inferential findings across the different statistical procedures used in the study. The descriptive analysis showed that both variables were rated highly, the correlation analysis demonstrated that they were significantly associated, and the regression procedures confirmed that instructional leadership agility significantly predicted school improvement responsiveness. Taken together, these results provided a coherent picture: public school heads who were more agile in exercising instructional leadership also tended to be more responsive in leading school improvement efforts.

CONCLUSION

The public school heads in San Manuel, Isabela generally demonstrated a high level of instructional leadership agility and a similarly high level of school improvement responsiveness, indicating that they were able to lead instruction with adaptability while remaining attentive to the changing needs of school improvement. The findings further established that instructional leadership agility had a significant and strong positive relationship with school improvement responsiveness and significantly predicted it, which suggested that school heads who were more flexible, timely, and responsive in their instructional leadership practices were also more capable of initiating and sustaining responsive school improvement actions. These results affirmed that agile instructional leadership was not merely a desirable administrative quality but a meaningful leadership condition that supported more effective school improvement in public schools. In

view of these findings, it was recommended that school heads be continuously supported through leadership enhancement programs that strengthen adaptive instructional supervision, evidence-based academic decision-making, and responsive school improvement planning; that district and division offices design professional development activities focused on agile leadership practice in real school contexts; that collaborative mechanisms for feedback, innovation, and contextualized intervention be further reinforced in schools; and that future studies explore other organizational and leadership variables that may also influence school improvement responsiveness in order to deepen the understanding of responsive school leadership in the public education system.

References

- Alene, A. A., Tsegaye, M. A., & Wolle, G. S. (2025). Secondary school principals' adaptive leadership practices amid the quality education crisis in Amhara regional state, Ethiopia. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11, Article 101349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101349>
- Brown, C. P., Reyes, P., McKenzie, L. C., DeMatthews, D. E., & Woulfin, S. L. (2024). Principals' instructional leadership and support needs in prekindergarten and kindergarten: A case study in Texas. *AERA Open*, 10, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584241288834>
- Day, C., Sammons, P., & Gorgen, K. (2020). *Successful school leadership*. Education Development Trust.
- Department of Education. (2015). *School improvement plan guidebook*. Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2024). *DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024: Policy guidelines on the implementation of the revised school-based management system*. Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2025). *Quality Basic Education Development Plan 2025–2035: An implementation strategy for the 5-point education reform agenda*. Department of Education.
- Donaldson, M. L., Mavrogordato, M., Youngs, P., & Dougherty, S. M. (2024). Principals' priorities, teacher evaluation, and instructional leadership. *Educational Researcher*, 53(9), 487–495. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X241273903>
- Fernandes, V., Thompson, G., Noonan, M., & Wong, W. (2022). Developing adaptability and agility in leadership amidst the COVID-19 crisis: Experiences of early-career school principals. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(2), 483–506. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-02-2022-0076>
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). *How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research*. The Wallace Foundation.
- Hallinger, P., Liu, S., & Aung, P. N. (2025). A systematic state-of-the-art review of Asian research on principal instructional leadership, 1987–2024. *Education Sciences*, 15(7), Article 817. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15070817>
- Hitt, D. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2016). Systematic review of key leader practices found to influence student achievement: A unified framework. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(2), 531–569. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315614911>
- OECD. (2018). *Responsive school systems: Connecting facilities, sectors and programmes for student success*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264306707-en>
- OECD. (2019). *Education policy outlook 2019: Working together to help students achieve their potential*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/2b8ad56e-en>
- OECD. (2020). *An implementation framework for effective change in schools*. *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, No. 9. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/4fd4113f-en>
- OECD. (2020). *Developing a school evaluation framework to drive school improvement*. *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, No. 26. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/60b471de-en>
- OECD. (2025). *Education policy outlook 2025: Nurturing engaged and resilient lifelong learners in a world of digital transformation*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c3f402ba-en>