



# Correlation between the Challenges of Teachers in the New Learning Delivery Modality and Leadership Practices of School Heads

Mary Faith A. Esmade

<sup>1</sup>Department of Education, Schools Division of Zamboanga del Norte, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>St. Vincent's College Incorporated, Dipolog City Philippines

Received: 15 Mar 2023; Received in revised form: 11 Apr 2023; Accepted: 18 Apr 2023; Available online: 23 Apr 2023

©2023 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open access article under the CC BY license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Abstract**— *The COVID-19 pandemic affected education worldwide due to community lockdown and quarantine, driving students and school personnel to study and work from home and leading to various learning delivery modalities. Findings revealed that teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modality were "to a very large extent." On the other hand, school heads "highly performed" their leadership practices with teachers claiming them "performed." Moreover, teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities were moderately and positively correlated with and significantly related to the school heads' leadership practices. The study concludes that the current instructional modality limit learners' interaction opportunities with their teachers and classmates and affect their holistic development. Likewise, the disparity between teachers' and school heads' perspectives on the leadership practices could be due to the limiting connection between teachers and school heads, failing to monitor activities fully in the course of duty. The study recommends that teachers are encouraged to study and attend training to understand how different learning modalities are related to students' experiences and learning to be fully equipped with what constitutes effective instructional design in distance learning contexts. Finally, leadership skills and managerial practice standards should be explored among school heads to structure quality school monitoring and evaluation to help teachers cope with the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic.*

**Keywords**— *Challenges of Teachers, Leadership Practices, New Learning Modality*

## I. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Rationale of the Study

The COVID-19 health outbreak is a global issue that affects practically every aspect of human life. It caused widespread disruption such as travel restrictions, closure of schools, global economic recession, political conflicts, racism, misinformation, and controversies. Education is the most affected sector. Responses like community lockdown and quarantine have led students and teachers to study and work from home, leading to various learning delivery modalities.

Learning delivery modalities refer to the means and resources used to structure the distance learning experience

between teachers and pupils (Llego, 2020). They are customized according to learners' learning levels, personal characteristics, learning needs, and learning styles (Labarrete, 2021). They are also the sensory channels or pathways through which learners give, receive, and store information (Shemshack & Spector, 2020). Unarguably, perception, memory, and sensation comprise the concept of modality.

In the Philippines, learning modality has three types: Online Distance Learning (ODL), TV/Radio-Based Instruction, and Modular Distance Learning (MDL). In ODL, teachers remotely deliver lessons to students using video-sharing platforms such as Zoom, Google Meet, etc.,

and virtual classrooms such as Google Classroom, Edmodo, and the likes (Malaya, 2020). This modality relies heavily on the internet since it facilitates learner-teacher and other peer-to-peer communication. At the same time, it allows live synchronous instruction and is more interactive than other distance learning modalities. Participants on both ends can also respond in real-time. Learners may also download materials from the internet, complete and submit assignments online, and attend webinars and virtual classes.

According to the Department of Education (DepEd), "blended learning" or "hybrid learning" is a combination of online distance learning and in-person delivery of printed materials to learners' homes through barangays for those who do not have internet access and interactive facilities in the comforts of their own homes for those who do (Custodio, 2020). However, in localities where online learning is impossible, DepEd uses radio and television to broadcast students' lessons, materials, and instructions. TV/Radio-Based Instruction utilizes Self-Learning Modules (SLMs) converted to video lessons for Television-Based Instruction and SLMs converted to radio script for Radio-Based Instruction (Llego, 2020). In other words, blended learning is a learning delivery that mixes online distance learning, TV/Radio-based Instruction, and modular distance learning.

In modular distance learning, individualized instruction allows learners to use self-learning modules (SLMs) in print or digital format/electronic copy (Llego, 2020). It is a learner's learning mode, especially in rural areas where internet connection, television signals, and radio broadcasts are not always available (Anzaldo, 2021). However, with the many newly designed learning delivery modalities amid the COVID-19 pandemic, the teachers' challenges emerged in the implementation.

The adoption of modular distance learning, as the preferred learning delivery modality among parents in basic education, posed different risks, problems, and challenges to both the teachers and students (Bao, 2020). Bernardo (2020) reported that the distribution of modules to students is a teachers' challenge considering the distance of the school from home. Instructors' obstacles, according to Lucson (2020), include expensive module printing costs, pushing other teachers to achieve module creation deadlines, and persuading parents to serve as para-teachers for the learners. Moreover, De Villa and Manalo (2020) contemplated the complexity of assessment and difficulty in instructional delivery in the new normal, which require school heads to be more lenient in their leadership practices.

However, leading through uncertainty can be daunting. There are no easy solutions, and there are frequently no obvious paths to follow. Leaders must adjust fast to a rapidly changing scenario and rely on a variety of leadership abilities and kinds when faced with uncertainty (D'Auria & De Smet, 2020). When faced with uncertainty, school administrators must deal with the urgent while keeping an eye on the future in order to provide the best possible teaching and learning environment and outcomes for students (Harris, 2020).

The worldwide pandemic, according to Desyatnikov (2020), is bringing leadership challenges to the fore, and which leaders will up to the challenge remains to be seen. Influential leaders can stay calm and maintain a sense of perspective (Center for Creative Leadership 2020). Accordingly, during a crisis, the leader's goal is to reduce loss and keep things operating as normal as possible.

Unarguably, Hannahan (2020) posited that the current crisis provides an important opportunity for education authorities to consider new approaches to provide high-quality education to millions of children. Adams (2017) argued that school heads should understand and describe their responsibilities and practices in monitoring and evaluating instruction to improve instructional delivery. Ndungu, Allan, and Bomett (2015) posited that monitoring is an activity that school heads conduct continuous and systematic checking and observing of a program or a project. At the same time, they perform an evaluation to judge, appraise or determine the value and quality of a program. In a report, Earp (2020) divulged that school leaders in this pandemic times put extra effort and attention into support staff regular scheduling, individual check-ins, organizing social events to maintain connections, and listening and responding to personal challenges experienced. Also, they practiced flexibility and autonomy to make arrangements that recognized the different needs of teachers as much as possible.

However, insufficient data have supported the specific leadership practices of school heads in monitoring and evaluating instruction amid the COVID-19 pandemic in the Philippines. Likewise, teachers' challenges have not been scientifically investigated so that top-level management in basic education could have the basis to address these pressing issues. Moreover, the link between the teachers' challenges in the new normal instructional delivery and the school heads' leadership practices in monitoring and evaluating instruction amid the COVID-19 pandemic has not been studied in depth.

Therefore, being an elementary teacher, an investigation was conducted in the Zamboanga del Norte division,

where this researcher is currently connected. It is essential to document the teachers' challenges and the school heads' leadership practices in the local setting. In so doing, offshoots of this investigation could be reflective in supporting speculations and hearsays to become valid and

reliable. Moreover, significant study results can be a basis for capacitating further the school heads and teachers to address the school-related issues and challenges amid the current health crisis.

## II. METHODOLOGY



Fig. 1. Map Showing Zamboanga del Norte and the Cities of Dipolog and Dapitan

The survey and correlational research methods were employed in the study. The survey method was employed since the researcher gathered data through a questionnaire checklist to profile the respondents' personal and demographic variables, including the teachers' challenges and school heads' leadership practices. A survey, according to Creswell and Guetterman (2019), is a research tool for gathering data from a designated group of respondents to get information and insights on a variety of topics of interest. On the other hand, Bhat (2019) posited that correlational research is a form of non-experimental research approach in which a researcher examines two variables, understands, and evaluates the statistical link between them without the use of any other variables. To establish the significant association between teachers' challenges in new learning delivery modality and school heads' leadership practices in monitoring and evaluating instruction, a correlational analysis was conducted.

### **2.1 Research Environment**

The site of the study was the public elementary and secondary schools in the Division of Zamboanga del Norte. Zamboanga del Norte is a 720,594-hectare province. It is composed of two component cities, Dipolog City, the trading and commercial center, and Dapitan City, the tourists' haven, and 25 municipalities, namely: Baliguian, Godod, Gotalac, Jose Dalman, Kalawit, Katipunan, Labason, La Libertad, Leon B. Postigo, Liloy, Manukan, Mutia, Piñan, Polanco, Rizal, Manuel A. Roxas, Salug, Sergio Osmeña, Siayan, Sibuco, Sibutad, Sindangan, Siocon, Sirawai, and Tampilisan. Figure 1 shows the location of the Province of Zamboanga del Norte.

The province is situated on the western border of Mindanao and lies on the northwestern edge of the Zamboanga Peninsula. With more or less 400 kilometers of irregular coastline facing the Sulu Sea, it is bounded by the province of Misamis Occidental in the north, the provinces of Zamboanga del Sur and Zamboanga Sibugay in the east, and Zamboanga City in the south. It is strategically situated relative to the rest of the Philippine Archipelago. With an actual population count of 1,011,393 as of August 1, 2015, Zamboanga del Norte has an average of 140 persons per square kilometer.

Moreover, out of 25 municipalities in the province, this study identified thirty-five (35) school districts with a total of six hundred thirty-seven (637) public elementary schools based on the Division Enrolment Report dated October 2019. Nine (9) of these school districts are coming from the first congressional school districts with one hundred forty-four (144) public elementary schools, eleven (11) school districts are from the second congressional school districts with two hundred thirteen

(213) public elementary schools, and fifteen (15) school districts are from the third congressional school districts with two hundred eighty (280) public elementary schools.

Also, this study identified ninety-seven (97) secondary schools. Twenty (20) of these schools are coming from the first congressional district, thirty-three (33) schools are from the second congressional district, and forty-four (44) schools are from the third congressional district. Figure 2 shows the location of school districts in the province involved in the study.

### **2.2 Research Respondents and Sampling**

All of the secondary school heads were considered respondents in the study. However, the elementary school head-respondents were determined by the use of Slovin's formula. There were six hundred thirty-seven (637) elementary school heads. With a margin of error of 5%, 246 elementary school head-respondents were obtained. Simple proportionate sampling by lottery method was used in getting the school head-respondents from each district. The proportion was obtained by dividing 246 by 637, which yielded 0.3862 rounded off to the nearest ten thousandths. The number of school head representatives from each district was calculated by getting the product of the proportion and the number of school heads.

On the other hand, the teacher-respondents of the study were determined using Slovin's formula. A total of five thousand eight hundred thirty-three (5,833) public elementary (4,635) and secondary (1,198) school teachers were the target teacher population of the study. With a margin of error of 5%, 374 teacher-respondents were obtained. The proportion was calculated by dividing 374 by 5,833, which yielded 0.0641 rounded to the nearest ten thousandths. The number of teacher representatives from each district was computed by getting the product of the proportion and the total number of teachers.

Teachers and elementary school heads were chosen using a simple random sample procedure utilizing lottery method. These teacher-respondents were taken from the school, where the school head was also selected as respondents of the study. To ensure that every available teacher and elementary school principal had an equal chance of being chosen, simple random sampling was performed. The distribution of respondents in the study is shown in Table 1.



Legend:

- Yellow Diamond: First Congressional School Districts
- Red Diamond: Second Congressional School Districts
- Pink Diamond: Third Congressional School Districts

Fig. 2. The Location of School Districts in the Province of Zamboanga del Norte Involved in the Study

Table 1 Respondents of the Study

First Congressional District										
La Libertad	10	1	61	27	4	1	4	2	11	1.59
Mutia	13	1	74	25	5	1	5	2	13	1.87
Piñan	21	2	126	47	8	2	8	3	21	3.03
Polanco I	15	4	138	51	6	4	9	3	22	3.17
Polanco II	15		90		6		6		12	1.73
Rizal	17	2	86	35	6	2	6	2	16	2.31
S.Osmeña I	20	3	133	48	8	3	8	3	22	3.17
S.Osmeña II	18		82		7		5		12	1.73
Sibutad	15	2	116	33	6	2	7	2	17	2.45
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>21.05</b>

Second Congressional District											
Katipunan I	25		5	135	88	10	5	9	6	30	4.00
Katipunan II	19			116		7		8		15	2.63
Manukan I	14		5	131	81	5	5	8	5	23	3.36
Manukan II	11			89		4		6		10	1.82
Ponot	21		3	155	40	8	3	10	3	24	3.53
Roxas I	17		4	131	54	7	4	8	3	22	3.30
Roxas II	17			125		7		8		15	2.25
Siayan	32		4	199	55	12	4	13	4	33	4.94
Sindangan Central	18		5	222	144	7	5	14	9	35	5.18
Sindangan North	15			154		6		10		16	2.40
Sindangan South	24			205		9		13		22	3.30
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>213</b>	<b></b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1662</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>3.64</b>

Third Congressional District										
Bacungan	20	4	157	53	8	4	10	3	25	3.60
Baliguian	18	2	111	23	7	2	7	1	17	2.45
Godod	20	3	124	32	8	3	8	2	21	3.03
Gutalac I	16	3	119	52	6	3	8	3	20	2.88
Gutalac II	17		89		7		6		13	1.87
Kalawit	18	1	156		7	1	10		18	2.59
Labason	21	3	215	63	8	3	13	4	28	4.03
Liloy I	18	1	136	10	7	1	9	1	18	2.59
Liloy II	16		112		6		7		13	1.87
Salug I	10	3	108	38	4	3	7	2	16	2.31
Salug II	12		97		5		6		11	1.59

<b>Sibuco</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>4.18</b>
<b>Siocon</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4.32</b>
<b>Sirawai</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2.45</b>
<b>Tampilisan</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3.89</b>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>2067</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>43.65</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>4635</b>	<b>1198</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>100</b>

### 2.4 Research Instruments and Validity

The research tools used to gather data in this study were composed of two (2) sets of research instruments for school heads and research instruments for teachers. Each set of tools contained three (3) parts. The first section dealt with the respondents' personal profiles. The second part was the teachers' challenges scale used to measure teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities extracted by the researcher from <https://www.schooleducationgateway.eu/en/pub/viewpoints/surveys/survey-on-online-teaching.htm>. Furthermore, the third part of the instruments was the school heads' leadership practices to determine the level of leadership practices of school heads in monitoring and evaluating instruction, which was extracted from Chiedozie and Victor (2017).

The instruments were referred to the adviser of this undertaking to ask for his acceptance and approval to

utilize the tools for this study. With the support from the adviser, the instruments were subjected to validity and reliability testing. Validity testing was instituted by the adviser to check the readability and face validity of the devices. Furthermore, the instruments were piloted to 50 elementary school teachers who were not the study respondents to calculate the reliability coefficient of the instrument using Cronbach's Alpha.

Further, the four-point Likert scale format was used to determine the respondents' ratings on the extent of teachers' challenges. Scoring was done by multiplying "to a very large extent" by 4; "to a large extent" by 3; "to a small extent" by 2; and "to a very small extent" by 1. The weighted mean was described with the qualitative descriptions as follows:

Scale	Range of Values	Description	Implication
4	3.26 – 4.00	To a very large extent	Very Serious
3	2.51 – 3.25	To a large extent	Serious
2	1.76 – 2.50	To a small extent	Less Serious
1	1.00 – 1.75	To a very small extent	Not Serious

In a similar vein, to determine the respondents' responses in the level of leadership practices of school heads, the four-point Likert scale format was utilized. Scoring was done by multiplying "highly performed" answer by 4,

"performed" by 3, "fairly performed" by 2, and "poorly performed" by 1. The weighted mean was given qualitative description within the established limit as follows:

Scale	Range of Values	Description
4	3.26 – 4.00	Highly Performed
3	2.51 – 3.25	Performed
2	1.76 – 2.50	Fairly Performed

1	1.00 – 1.75	Poorly Performed
---	-------------	------------------

**2.5 Gathering of Data**

The researcher wrote a letter to the Chairperson of the EMD Program of the Graduate School of St. Vincent’s College Incorporated, Dipolog City, seeking endorsement to the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Zamboanga del Norte to gather data by administering the instrument of the study.

After the endorsement from the Chairperson was sought, the researcher wrote a letter attaching the endorsement to the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Zamboanga del Norte, asking for endorsement to gather data by administering the instrument of the study in the sample schools.

With the endorsement from the Superintendent, the researcher wrote a letter attaching the endorsement from the Superintendent to the School Heads asking for approval to gather data by administering the instrument of the study. Upon approval, the researcher personally administered the instruments to the respondents, mindful of the minimum health standards. After the respondents answered, the questionnaires were immediately retrieved, tallied, computed, and interpreted.

**2.6 Treatment of Data**

**Frequency Counting and Percent.** The tools were used to find out the profile of the respondents in terms of sex, length of service, and educational qualification. Percent was calculated by getting the frequency of each category divided by the total number of respondents.

**Weighted Mean.** It was used to quantify the respondents’ ratings in teachers’ challenges and the leadership practices of school heads.

**Standard Deviation.** It was used to determine the degree of homogeneity and heterogeneity of the responses where  $SD < 3$  is homogenous, and  $SD > 3$  is heterogeneous.

**Mann-Whitney Test.** It was utilized to test differences in the extent of challenges of teachers and the level of leadership practices of school heads when analyzed as to the sex of the respondents.

**Kruskal-Wallis Test.** It was used to test differences in the extent of challenges of teachers and the level of leadership practices of school heads when analyzed as to the respondents’ length of service and educational

qualification. Post hoc analysis was performed when a significant difference existed of the variables tested to determine where the difference was situated with Bonferroni-adjusted significant level using Dunn’s Test.

**Spearman Rank-Order Correlation.** It was used to find out the effect of teachers’ challenges in the new learning delivery modalities on the leadership practices of school heads in monitoring and evaluating instruction.

The following guide in interpreting the value of  $\rho$ , suggested by Cohen, West, and Aiken (2014), was used.

Value Interpretation	Effect	Size
$\pm 0.50$ to $\pm 1.00$ positive/negative correlation	Large	High
$\pm 0.30$ to $\pm 0.49$ negative correlation	Medium Moderate	positive/
$\pm 0.10$ to $\pm 0.29$ positive/negative correlation	Small	Low
$\pm 0.01$ to $\pm 0.09$ positive/negative correlation	Negligible	Slight
0.00 correlation		No

The data gathered for this study were encoded and analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 20.0), Statistical Minitab (Version 20), and Microsoft Excel Data Analysis ToolPak. Hence, posting the statistical formulas was not necessary. The statistical test was performed at a 0.05 level of significance.

**III. DATA AND RESULTS**

The presentation sequence is arranged according to the order of the problems stated in the first chapter.

**3.1 Profile of School Heads and Teachers**

Table 2 Profile of School Heads and Teachers in terms of Sex

Sex	School Heads		Teachers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Male	78	24.4	69	18.4
Female	242	75.6	305	81.6
Total	320	100.0	374	100.0

Table 2 shows the profile of school heads and teachers in terms of sex. It can be gleaned on the table that about 76 percent of the school heads were females. It means that female school heads dominated their counterpart. It implies that more women today are holding managerial and supervisory positions in educational institutions.

The finding corroborated Antiquina’s (2012) study, whose result revealed that women generally participate in the management and leadership of schools today.

As to the teachers, about 82 percent were females. The table shows that more female teachers were in the Department of Education’s teaching profession, just like the school heads. It means that women more than men

prefer teaching jobs. Observation also supports that women are more pupils’ oriented individuals reflective of who they are at home.

The finding substantiated the study of Fabrega, as cited by Tuballa (2014), whose research found that there were more female teachers than the males in the Fourth Congressional District of Camarines Sur.

Table 3 Profile of School Heads and Teachers in terms of Length of Service

Length of Service	School Heads		Teachers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
5 years and below	30	9.4	111	29.7
6-10 years	48	15.0	57	15.2
11-15 years	30	9.4	59	15.8
16-20 years	48	15.0	34	9.1
21-25 years	78	24.4	31	8.3
26 years and above	86	26.9	82	21.9
Total	320	100.0	374	100.0

Table 3 presents the profile of school heads and teachers in terms of length of service. It is divided into six brackets: 5 years and below, 6 – 10 years, 11 – 15 years, 16 – 20 years, 21 – 25 years, and 26 years and above.

The table shows that about 67 percent of the school heads served for more than 15 years. It means that the division is dwelt by experienced leaders. They are seasoned school managers and supervisors.

For the teachers’ profile, 55 percent were in the service for more than ten years. It means that a higher percentage of the teachers are also mature and experienced in the division under study.

The present finding affirmed the study of Stronge, Ward, and Grant (2011) when they disclosed that mature professionals engage in classroom supervision.

Table 4 Profile of School Heads and Teachers in terms of Educational Qualification

Educational Qualification	School Heads		Teachers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor’s Degree	24	7.5	86	23.0
Bachelor’s Degree with MA/MS units/CAR	178	55.6	231	61.8

<b>Master’s Degree</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>12.3</b>
<b>Master’s Degree with doctoral units/CAR</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>20.6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.1</b>
<b>Doctoral Degree</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.9</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Presented in Table 4 is the profile of school heads and teachers in terms of educational qualification. The table shows that about 37 percent of the school heads from Zamboanga del Norte completed graduate education. It could also be seen on the table that a more significant proportion of the school heads completed their master’s degree with doctoral units [20.6%]. The finding conforms to the Department of Education requiring a master’s degree holder for leadership and managerial positions.

A similar view could be seen in the number of teachers holding units in their master’s degree. They constituted about 62 percent, which could be considered the majority. At the same time, there were still many teachers who did not bother about taking graduate education. Thus, the Department of Education has to go over their hiring and promotion policies and procedures as there are teachers who are not attending graduate studies. In the advent of global competitiveness, teachers have to attend graduate education for them at least updated with the educational

trends. Further, new knowledge and updated learning are essential for one who is engaged in teaching the new generation.

Williams (2011) pointed out that graduate studies allow pursuing specific research and scholarly interests. Moreover, it will enable one to make contributions to society. Bankhead (2011) also asserted that continuing graduate education provides opportunities for graduates who are not as widespread as those who have not obtained professional advancement. She said further that professional development and improvement serve as the gateway to better options and more opportunities.

### 3.2 Challenges of Teachers in the New Learning Delivery Modalities

Table 5 Extent of the Challenges of Teachers in the New Learning Delivery Modality

School Heads	AWV	SD	Description
1. Teachers’ access to technology (computers, printers, software, stable internet connection, etc.)	3.30	0.822	To a very large extent Very Serious
2. Collecting and checking pupils’ output	3.55	0.667	To a very large extent Very Serious
3. Communicating with pupils	3.06	0.842	To a large extent Serious
4. Communicating with parents/guardians	3.15	0.988	To a large extent Serious
5. Teachers’ modular instruction competence	3.25	0.830	To a large extent Serious
6. Distribution and delivery of modules	3.38	0.837	To a very large extent Very Serious
7. Pupils’ assessment feedback	3.21	0.743	To a large extent Serious
8. Pupils’ accessibility to modules	3.15	0.770	To a large extent Serious
9. Involving disaffected pupils	3.09	0.687	To a large extent Serious
10. Involving pupils from socially disadvantaged homes	3.11	0.751	To a large extent Serious
11. Keeping all pupils motivated and engaged	3.23	0.776	To a large extent Serious
12. Supporting pupils with special needs or	2.91	0.815	To a large extent Serious

<b>disability</b>					
13.	Converting activities and content into distance learning	3.28	0.769	To a very large extent	Very Serious
14.	Assessing pupils' progress	3.55	0.637	To a very large extent	Very Serious
15.	Preparing content/module for distance learning	3.47	0.749	To a very large extent	Very Serious
16.	Direction/support given by the school	3.45	0.911	To a very large extent	Very Serious
17.	Workload and stress working from home and school	3.45	0.722	To a very large extent	Very Serious
18.	Time management and organization	3.49	0.800	To a very large extent	Very Serious
19.	The school has switched to all learning modalities designed by DepEd	3.40	0.768	To a very large extent	Very Serious
20.	Support extended by the external stakeholders	3.21	0.968	To a large extent	Very Serious
	Mean & SD	3.28	0.605	To a very large extent	Very Serious
<b>Teachers</b>					
1.	Teachers' access to technology (computers, printers, software, stable internet connection, etc.)	3.24	0.686	To a large extent	Serious
2.	Collecting and checking pupils' output	3.53	0.652	To a very large extent	Very Serious
3.	Communicating with pupils	3.11	0.852	To a large extent	Serious
4.	Communicating with parents/guardians	3.24	0.722	To a large extent	Serious
5.	Teachers' modular instruction competence	3.32	0.780	To a very large extent	Very Serious
6.	Distribution and delivery of modules	3.42	0.783	To a very large extent	Very Serious
7.	Pupils' assessment feedback	3.21	0.720	To a large extent	Serious
8.	Pupils' accessibility to modules	3.21	0.754	To a large extent	Serious
9.	Involving disaffected pupils	3.06	0.739	To a large extent	Serious
10.	Involving pupils from socially disadvantaged homes	3.09	0.756	To a large extent	Serious
11.	Keeping all pupils motivated and engaged	3.28	0.706	To a very large extent	Very Serious
12.	Supporting pupils with special needs or disability	3.13	0.786	To a large extent	Serious
13.	Converting activities and content into distance learning	3.34	0.680	To a very large extent	Very Serious
14.	Assessing pupils' progress	3.41	0.700	To a very large extent	Very Serious

15. Preparing content/module for distance learning	3.40	0.691	To a very large extent	Very Serious
16. Direction/support given by the school	3.33	0.776	To a very large extent	Very Serious
17. Workload and stress working from home and school	3.27	0.792	To a very large extent	Very Serious
18. Time management and organization	3.33	0.755	To a very large extent	Very Serious
19. The school has switched to all learning modalities designed by DepEd	3.26	0.851	To a very large extent	Very Serious
20. Support extended by the external stakeholders	3.14	0.776	To a large extent	Serious
Mean & SD	3.27	0.552	To a very large extent	Very Serious
<b>Overall</b>				
1. Teachers' access to technology (computers, printers, software, stable internet connection, etc.)	3.25	0.716	To a large extent	Serious
2. Collecting and checking pupils' output	3.53	0.654	To a very large extent	Very Serious
3. Communicating with pupils	3.10	0.848	To a large extent	Serious
4. Communicating with parents/guardians	3.22	0.785	To a large extent	Serious
5. Teachers' modular instruction competence	3.31	0.790	To a very large extent	Very Serious
6. Distribution and delivery of modules	3.41	0.794	To a very large extent	Very Serious
7. Pupils' assessment feedback	3.21	0.723	To a large extent	Serious
8. Pupils' accessibility to modules	3.20	0.757	To a large extent	Serious
9. Involving disaffected pupils	3.06	0.727	To a large extent	Serious
10. Involving pupils from socially disadvantaged homes	3.09	0.754	To a large extent	Serious
11. Keeping all pupils motivated and engaged	3.27	0.720	To a very large extent	Very Serious
12. Supporting pupils with special needs or disability	3.08	0.796	To a large extent	Serious
13. Converting activities and content into distance learning	3.33	0.698	To a very large extent	Very Serious
14. Assessing pupils' progress	3.44	0.688	To a very large extent	Very Serious
15. Preparing content/module for distance learning	3.42	0.703	To a very large extent	Very Serious
16. Direction/support given by the school	3.36	0.806	To a very large extent	Very Serious

<b>17. Workload and stress working from home and school</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>0.780</b>	<b>To a very large extent</b>	<b>Very Serious</b>
<b>18. Time management and organization</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>0.766</b>	<b>To a very large extent</b>	<b>Very Serious</b>
<b>19. The school has switched to all learning modalities designed by DepEd</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>0.835</b>	<b>To a very large extent</b>	<b>Very Serious</b>
<b>20. Support extended by the external stakeholders</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>0.819</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>Serious</b>
<b>Overall Mean &amp; SD</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>0.563</b>	<b>To a very large extent</b>	<b>Very Serious</b>

Table 5 reveals the extent of the challenges of teachers in the new learning delivery modality. Teachers’ challenges refer to the issues and problems encountered by teachers in implementing modular distance learning amid the health crisis. Out of the 20 items used for the survey, 12 of them were rated by the teachers “to a very large extent,” with affirmation by the school heads.

The table discloses that the teachers and school heads rated “to a very large extent” the teachers’ access to technology (computers, printers, software, stable internet connection, etc.). It means that the teachers were struggling in accessing technological tools for school-related use amid this pandemic. The experience of the researcher supported that computers, printers, and internet connections were inadequate. The production of print modules was affected due to the inadequacy of technological resources. The finding confirmed Rasheed, Kamsin, Abdullah (2020), whose study revealed that teachers’ challenges were mainly on using technology for teaching. The current result also corroborated Ivaniuk and Ovcharuk (2020).

Secondly, teachers and school heads rated “to a very large extent” the collection and checking of pupils’ outputs as a challenge. The researcher’s experience also supported that collection of outputs was difficult, especially those home from far-flung areas. It was also noted the impartialities of pupils’ responses in the learning activities embedded in the module. Thus, the teachers found it challenging to check and grade the students’ outputs. Rasmitadila, Aliyyah, Rachmadtullah, Samsudin, Syaodih, Nurtanto, and Tambunan (2020) noted that a teacher could not collect and check pupils’ assessment fairly results due to the distance of the school from home amid COVID-19.

Thirdly, teachers and school heads indicated the teachers’ modular instruction competence as a challenge “to a very large extent.” The interview of this researcher with some of her colleagues in the Division of Zamboanga del Norte revealed that teachers required more training regarding modular instruction implementation. It was further noted

that modular instruction was implemented without the teachers’ proper training on its implementation. The finding confirmed Rannastu-Avalos and Siiman’s (2020) claim revealing that module implementation with young learners appeared to be the main challenge for distance learning.

Fourth, distribution and delivery of modules was a challenge “to a very large extent.” This writer’s experience documented that module distribution and delivery difficulty was apparently a severe barrier for teachers to promote instruction at a distance with the learners. Observation disclosed further that some parents who were asked to pick up the modules failed due to lockdowns and prohibitions to get out from home. De Villa and Manalo (2020) found difficulty in instructional delivery as one of the themes related to challenges in distance learning in the new normal.

Fifth, teachers struggled “to a very large extent” to keep all pupils motivated and engaged. Modular distance learning delimits the teacher-learner connection. Thus, the new normal practice of teaching compromises pupils’ motivation and engagement in school. The present finding supported Abuhammad (2020), who documented that some students have not engaged in lessons due to a lack of communication with the distance learning instructor. Likewise, Abramenska (2015) summarized that motivation and collaboration were reported as areas that cause barriers in distance learning environments.

In a similar vein, converting activities and content into distance learning was the sixth challenge encountered by teachers “to a very large extent.” Similarly, preparing content/module for distance learning was the seventh challenge faced by teachers. Observation of this writer divulged that teachers were undertrained in the production of modules. Pimentel-Tibon (2020) unveiled that the mass production of the needed teachers’ and learners’ learning materials and the support of media institutions like TV and radio stations were critical. More challenging was the

implementation of a home-based laboratory for classes that require laboratory exercises. Physical education classes at home were also tricky. Teachers were also struggling to document the physical fitness activities of students at home. Likewise, monitoring the fitness progress among the pupils and students was a great challenge encountered by the teachers. Gелlette-Swan's (2017) study noted that contents converted into a form deemed suitable for external delivery (home-based school) was a significant problem for distant students who feel or experience isolation. Compared to face-to-face education, these students often face several barriers to their full participation in coursework units. These barriers may not be experienced by those engaging in these same units via face-to-face or blended enrolment modes.

The eighth severe issue that the teachers encountered in modular instruction was assessing pupils' progress. The report documented that proper assessment of the cognitive aspect was challenging because parents helped provide answers to the assignments/tests given by a teacher. The present finding supported Rasmitadila, Aliyyah, Rachmadtullah, Samsudin, Syaodih, Nurtanto, and Tambunan (2020). The research exposed that the teachers' difficulty in assessing pupils' progress tends to be due to parental intervention that does not reflect the actual circumstances of students, which might be seen in school before "school from home."

In a similar vein, the direction/support given by the school was identified as a challenge "to a very large extent." It was also noted that, at the start of distance learning implementation, teachers suffered during the production of modules due to a lack of technological support. Computers and printers as primary tools to produce copies of modules were inadequate and to some schools were unavailable. Also, internet connection was not available to download learning modules built by the national level. Bond papers and printers' ink were also scarce during the production of print modules. The finding confirmed Llego (2020), who pointed out that critical for implementing modular instruction is producing the needed teacher's and learner's learning materials. Unarguably, Confait (2015) stressed that the enforcement of effective teaching practices relies on improved teacher support, which would impact students' learning and achievements.

Likewise, "workload and stress working from home and school" were considered by teachers as a challenge "to a very large extent." The current expose substantiated Esguerra (2018), who averred that the chronically overworked and stressed state of public school teachers in the Philippines is well-known. Further, Albert, David, and Vizcaino's (2019) pointed out that the workload of public school teachers is not only limited to teaching but also to

other non-teaching tasks, which are associated with teachers' stress. Accordingly, actual teaching is increasingly being sidelined by the multitude of other responsibilities and roles that teachers play. Following the tragic suicide of two public school teachers in 2018, the Department of Education (DepED) has vowed to reduce teachers' workload, details of which have remained unclear (Mateo 2018).

Furthermore, time management and organization were found a challenge by teachers "to a very large extent." Undeniably, the pandemic has recalibrated how teachers divide their time between teaching, engaging with students, and administrative tasks. According to a survey conducted by Instituto Peninsula, in Brazil, 83% of teachers did not consider being prepared to teach remotely, 67% were anxious, 38% felt tired, and less than 10% were happy or satisfied (Barron, Cobo, Munoz-Najar & Ciarrusta, 2021). Accordingly, the pandemic has highlighted the need for flexibility and more time for student-teacher interactions.

Moreover, switching to all learning modalities designed by DepEd was a teachers' challenge "to a very large extent." Landicho (2021) posited that one of the most evident changes prompted by the switch to DepEd's learning modalities is the absence of activities where students can examine real objects and samples, collaborate with their classmates on worksheets, and ask questions with their teacher while being engaged in the exercises. Tools such as globes, maps, and other laboratory instruments are not available in each student's household. Various types of examinations can no longer be done as summative assessments as long as school campuses remain closed. In general, assessments must be designed appropriately for the new normal learning setup (Landicho, 2021). More practical issues include the limited or intermittent Internet connectivity at times, which raises a more practical concern regarding students' participation in their class activities.

In general, teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities were "to a very large extent." The school heads complimented the finding. It means that implementing the new learning delivery modality was crucial. It implies that the phenomenon could negatively impact students' learning outcomes, especially those who quickly fail to cope with the change.

The current result supported Pimentel-Tibon (2020), who disclosed a great challenge for teachers and school heads dealing with learners under any modes of distance learning or blended learning who are not capable of learning independently or who are not periodically supported by their parents or guardians. The study further unmasked

that teachers' challenges affected the students' holistic development, with limited interaction opportunities with their teachers and classmates.

With this, DepEd needs substantial and additional financial resources to meet the objectives of the implementation. Hence, the support of local government units, civil society

organizations, and other stakeholders becomes indispensable as the key to providing quality basic education accessible and responsive in the new normal.

### 3.3 Difference of the Challenges of Teachers in the New Learning Delivery Modalities

Table 6 Test of Difference of the Challenges of Teachers in the New Learning Delivery Modalities

Profile	U-Value	H-Value	p-value @ 0.05	Interpretation
Sex	2870.00		0.974	Not Significant
Length of Service		13.499	0.099	Not Significant
Educational Qualification		2.478	0.649	Not Significant

Table 6 reveals no significant difference in teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities between males and females. It could mean that the male and female teachers have similar challenges encountered in delivering instructions amid the COVID-19 pandemic. The present result refuted Tosun, Mihci, and Bayzan (2021). Their analysis of problem frequency based on demographics revealed that female teachers were more likely to suffer challenges like IT skills.

The table discloses further that a significant difference in teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities was not evident when grouped according to educational qualification. It means that teachers in the Division of Zamboanga del Norte have equally encountered difficulties implementing the new learning delivery modalities. However, the present result

repudiated Sarfo and Cudjoe (2016) when their study disclosed that school heads with higher educational levels highly implemented the supervisory functions in their school.

Nonetheless, teachers of the Zamboanga del Norte division did not significantly differ in their challenges encountered in implementing the new learning delivery modalities when analyzed according to the length of service. It means that the young and old teachers in the service have experienced similar challenges. However, the present result contradicted Tosun, Mihci, and Bayzan's (2021) study, which divulged that teachers in the age group of 41+, who belong to generation X, tended to experience more challenges like a lack of IT skills in comparison with their younger peers.

### 3.4 Leadership Practices of School Heads

Table 7 Extent of School Heads' Leadership Practices in terms of Instruction Monitoring

School Heads	AWV	SD	Description
1. Monitoring of teachers instructional delivery to render suggestions for enhancement	3.60	0.660	Highly Performed
2. Checking of teachers lesson notes to assist in the improvement	3.53	0.846	Highly Performed
3. Checking of staff school attendance to ensure regular instructional delivery	3.45	0.889	Highly Performed
4. Checking of teachers' records of work done to monitor their progress	3.38	0.904	Highly Performed
5. Monitoring staff truancy level to foster their dedication to their duties	3.43	0.888	Highly Performed
6. Monitoring of staff participation in school meeting	3.53	0.868	Highly Performed
7. Monitoring teachers' compliance to school schedules	3.57	0.797	Highly Performed

8.	Monitoring of staff participation in school extra-curricular activities	3.43	0.797	Highly Performed
9.	Monitoring teachers' instructional delivery and their level of compliance to enhance their commitment to teaching	3.43	0.888	Highly Performed
10.	Monitoring the modular contents to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives	3.51	0.800	Highly Performed
	Mean & SD	3.49	0.760	Highly Performed
<b>Teachers</b>				
1.	Monitoring of teachers instructional delivery to render suggestions for enhancement	3.18	0.675	Performed
2.	Checking of teachers lesson notes to assist in the improvement	3.18	0.782	Performed
3.	Checking of staff school attendance to ensure regular instructional delivery	3.22	0.798	Performed
4.	Checking of teachers' records of work done to monitor their progress	3.23	0.760	Performed
5.	Monitoring staff truancy level to foster their dedication to their duties	3.05	0.812	Performed
6.	Monitoring of staff participation in school meeting	3.19	0.733	Performed
7.	Monitoring teachers' compliance to school schedules	3.20	0.755	Performed
8.	Monitoring of staff participation in school extra-curricular activities	3.13	0.837	Performed
9.	Monitoring teachers' instructional delivery and their level of compliance to enhance their commitment to teaching	3.21	0.734	Performed
10.	Monitoring the modular contents to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives	3.08	0.847	Performed
	Mean & SD	3.17	0.703	Performed
<b>Overall</b>				
1.	Monitoring of teachers instructional delivery to render suggestions for enhancement	3.27	0.693	Highly Performed
2.	Checking of teachers lesson notes to assist in the improvement	3.26	0.807	Highly Performed
3.	Checking of staff school attendance to ensure regular instructional delivery	3.27	0.822	Highly Performed
4.	Checking of teachers' records of work done to monitor their progress	3.26	0.793	Highly Performed
5.	Monitoring staff truancy level to foster their dedication to their duties	3.13	0.842	Performed
6.	Monitoring of staff participation in school	3.27	0.774	Highly Performed

<b>meeting</b>			
<b>7. Monitoring teachers' compliance to school schedules</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>0.777</b>	<b>Highly Performed</b>
<b>8. Monitoring of staff participation in school extra-curricular activities</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>0.836</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>9. Monitoring teachers' instructional delivery and their level of compliance to enhance their commitment to teaching</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>0.773</b>	<b>Highly Performed</b>
<b>10. Monitoring the modular contents to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>0.854</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>Overall Mean &amp; SD</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>0.726</b>	<b>Performed</b>

Table 7 presents the extent of leadership practices of school heads in terms of instruction monitoring. Operationally, monitoring refers to school heads' organized process of overseeing and checking the activities undertaken in school, especially activities undertaken by teachers, students, and the external stakeholders, to ascertain whether it is capable of achieving the planned results or not. It can be seen in the table that school heads highly performed their instruction monitoring duties and responsibilities. However, teachers only indicated that their school heads performed their instructional monitoring activities. A disparity in the result is evident. Teachers did not affirm the school heads' claims, resulting in the overall performance of instruction monitoring in their stations as "performed." The researcher's observation unveiled that school heads also observed minimum health protocols mandated by the local Inter-Agency Task Force COVID-19 pandemic. Workspace in school was reduced while work from the home arrangement was enforced. Furthermore, like the school heads, teachers also were observing work from home and skeleton arrangements. With this, the connection between teachers and school heads was limited, failing to fully monitor activities in the course of duty.

However, it was evident that school heads highly performed instruction monitoring to inform teachers on their strengths and weaknesses and opportunities to improve and address their limitations. Likewise, school heads highly valued instruction monitoring amid the pandemic to enable teachers to understand their aptitude and shortcomings in certain aspects or areas of teaching. Sweigart (2015) emphasized that there has been growing empirical evidence about school heads' instructional monitoring. It enhances people's efficacy (Taylor & Tyler, 2012)), promotes professional development (RAND Corporation, 2018), and improves performance (Clever, Detrich & States, 2019).

Henceforth, Hattie (2009) argued that there should be monitoring to generate actionable performance feedback. Park, Takahashi, and White (2014) supported that teachers need quality feedback from their school heads to enhance instructional abilities. Moreover, school heads can effectively utilize monitoring results since they have a crucial role in ensuring quality instruction and learning in each classroom (Education for Excellence, 2012).

Table 8 Extent of Leadership Practices of School Heads in terms of Instruction Evaluation

<b>School Heads</b>	<b>AWV</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>1. Setting and evaluating deadlines to ensure teachers coverage of their scheme of work</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>0.772</b>	<b>Highly Performed</b>
<b>2. Evaluating teachers' use of instructional time for possible adjustment</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>0.770</b>	<b>Highly Performed</b>
<b>3. Evaluating daily productivity of teachers to enhance their teaching roles</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>0.798</b>	<b>Highly Performed</b>
<b>4. Ensuring appropriate delegation of instructional tasks to teachers for timely delivery</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>0.799</b>	<b>Highly Performed</b>
<b>5. Linking school priorities with educational objectives</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>0.973</b>	<b>Highly Performed</b>

<b>for school effectiveness</b>				
6.	Avoidance of procrastination in preparing the school time-table	3.42	0.989	Highly Performed
7.	Ensuring accurate allocation of time for each subject for adequate coverage of all subjects	3.42	0.887	Highly Performed
8.	Limiting the intrusion of extra-curricular activities on instructional time	3.30	0.890	Highly Performed
9.	Discouraging unnecessary and unscheduled visitors during school hours for steady instructional delivery	3.38	0.860	Highly Performed
10.	Controlling various school activities to maintain focus on instructional tasks	3.47	0.890	Highly Performed
	Mean & SD	3.46	0.773	Highly Performed
<b>Teachers</b>				
1.	Setting and evaluating deadlines to ensure teachers coverage of their scheme of work	3.22	0.785	Performed
2.	Evaluating teachers' use of instructional time for possible adjustment	3.03	0.882	Performed
3.	Evaluating daily productivity of teachers to enhance their teaching roles	3.07	0.817	Performed
4.	Ensuring appropriate delegation of instructional tasks to teachers for timely delivery	3.17	0.798	Performed
5.	Linking school priorities with educational objectives for school effectiveness	3.22	0.729	Performed
6.	Avoidance of procrastination in preparing the school time-table	3.14	0.709	Performed
7.	Ensuring accurate allocation of time for each subject for adequate coverage of all subjects	3.14	0.789	Performed
8.	Limiting the intrusion of extra-curricular activities on instructional time	3.08	0.803	Performed
9.	Discouraging unnecessary and unscheduled visitors during school hours for steady instructional delivery	3.08	0.810	Performed
10.	Controlling various school activities to maintain focus on instructional tasks	3.09	0.766	Performed
	Mean & SD	3.12	0.707	Performed
<b>Overall</b>				
1.	Setting and evaluating deadlines to ensure teachers coverage of their scheme of work	3.30	0.793	Highly Performed
2.	Evaluating teachers' use of instructional time for possible adjustment	3.15	0.888	Performed
3.	Evaluating daily productivity of teachers to enhance their teaching roles	3.15	0.827	Performed
4.	Ensuring appropriate delegation of instructional tasks to teachers for timely delivery	3.25	0.810	Performed
5.	Linking school priorities with educational objectives	3.27	0.792	Highly Performed

<b>for school effectiveness</b>				
<b>6.</b>	<b>Avoidance of procrastination in preparing the school time-table</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>0.783</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Ensuring accurate allocation of time for each subject for adequate coverage of all subjects</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>0.817</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Limiting the intrusion of extra-curricular activities on instructional time</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>0.826</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Discouraging unnecessary and unscheduled visitors during school hours for steady instructional delivery</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>0.828</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Controlling various school activities to maintain focus on instructional tasks</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>0.807</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>Overall Mean &amp; SD</b>		<b>3.20</b>	<b>0.733</b>	<b>Performed</b>

Table 8 presents the extent of leadership practices of school heads in terms of instruction evaluation. Instruction evaluation is a school head process that gauges the school program’s success in meeting the objectives. It can be seen in the table that school heads “highly performed” their instruction evaluation. However, teachers only indicated that their school heads “performed” their instruction evaluation activities. A difference in the result is evident. Teachers did not support the school heads’ claims, resulting in the overall performance of instruction evaluation in their stations as “performed.” It can also be noted that school heads also observed the health standards established by the local Inter-Agency Task Force COVID-19 pandemic. The mass gathering was prohibited; thus, workspace in school was delimited with the implementation of the work from home and skeleton arrangement. With this, face-to-face

interactions between teachers and school heads were limited, failing to evaluate activities fully during duty. However, the writer’s observation construed that school heads considered the importance of evaluation practices to engage teachers in meaningful and transformative teaching experiences amid the COVID-19 pandemic. According to Fullan (2001), evaluation is a task that has its purpose in identifying merits and deficiencies and is an integrative part of the control task. Accordingly, the quality functionality of tasks is measured by means of evaluation.

The current finding supported D’souza (2006), who noted that evaluation was a valuable means of determining whether a person carried out his given task. The study also found that evaluation was a way to determine whether a person is helping to achieve set objectives and when a specific person with his unique qualities and talents gives the best service.

Table 9 Summary of the Extent of Leadership Practices of School Heads in Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction

<b>School Heads</b>	<b>AWV</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Instruction Monitoring</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>0.760</b>	<b>Highly Performed</b>
<b>Instruction Evaluation</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>0.773</b>	<b>Highly Performed</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>0.761</b>	<b>Highly Performed</b>
<b>Teachers</b>	<b>AWV</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Instruction Monitoring</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>0.703</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>Instruction Evaluation</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>0.707</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>0.706</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>Combined</b>	<b>AWV</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Instruction Monitoring</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>0.726</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>Instruction Evaluation</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>0.733</b>	<b>Performed</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>0.712</b>	<b>Performed</b>

In summary, Table 9 presents the school heads' leadership practices. The table reveals that school heads claimed to have been "highly performed" in instruction monitoring, instruction evaluation, and the combined leadership practices. However, the teachers only indicated "performed" along with those items, resulting in a combined qualitative description of "performed" in instruction monitoring and evaluation and the combined school heads' leadership practices. Meaning, school heads' leadership practices have not been exercised to an exceptional level due to the COVID-19 pandemic providing room for improvement. Nevertheless, the result manifested that school heads have navigated from what has been traditionally delivered to the practices attuned with the pandemic.

The current finding supported Cahapay (2021), whose study revealed that school heads' leadership practices during the pandemic shifted to navigating the crisis with adaptive leadership, cultivating practices in crisis

management, managing through the machine, freezing the standards and patterns, promoting inclusivity in the new normal, and caring first for what is essential.

Also, the present finding supported the common notion that effective leaders, like effective teachers, adjust and draw on a range of skills and approaches depending on the context. Regardless of health and related emergencies, a typical school day requires leaders to move from authority figure to teammate, coach, and therapist, navigating through a range of roles as each demand arises. The ability of school heads to shift and adjust leadership approaches based on what is needed is key to being effective as a leader.

#### Difference in Leadership Practices of School Heads

Table 10 Test of Difference in Leadership Practices of School Heads

<b>Instruction Monitoring</b>	<b>U-Value</b>	<b>H-Value</b>	<b>p-value @ 0.05</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
<b>Sex</b>	<b>246.00</b>		<b>0.764</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
<b>Length of Service</b>		<b>11.521</b>	<b>0.042</b>	<b>Significant</b>
<b>Educational Qualification</b>		<b>3.269</b>	<b>0.352</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
<b>Instruction Evaluation</b>	<b>U-Value</b>	<b>H-Value</b>	<b>p-value @ 0.05</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
<b>Sex</b>	<b>216.50</b>		<b>0.355</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
<b>Length of Service</b>		<b>7.272</b>	<b>0.201</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
<b>Educational Qualification</b>		<b>0.994</b>	<b>0.803</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
<b>Leadership Practices of School Heads</b>	<b>U-Value</b>	<b>H-Value</b>	<b>p-value @ 0.05</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
<b>Sex</b>	<b>229.50</b>		<b>0.151</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
<b>Length of Service</b>		<b>9.241</b>	<b>0.220</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
<b>Educational Qualification</b>		<b>1.948</b>	<b>0.422</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>

Table 10 discloses no significant difference in school heads' instruction monitoring between males and females. It means that the male and female school heads have similar leadership practices in delivering instructions in school amid the COVID-19 pandemic. The present result corroborated Buendicho's (2018) study, which revealed no distinction in the monitoring practices between male and female school heads.

The table reflects further that a significant difference in school heads' instruction monitoring was not evident when grouped according to educational qualification. It means

that school heads in the Division of Zamboanga del Norte have equally implemented the instruction monitoring in the division. The current finding also supported Buendicho (2018).

However, school heads of the Zamboanga del Norte division significantly differ in their instruction monitoring when analyzed according to the length of service. It means that the young and old school heads have deviated from their instruction monitoring. The present finding confirmed the result in the study of Chidi and Victor (2017). They revealed that older school heads embraced

current trends in supervision which makes them different from the younger ones.

Furthermore, the table unveils no significant difference in school heads' instruction monitoring between males and females. It means that the male and female school heads have a similar extent of evaluating the delivery of instructions in school amid the COVID-19 pandemic. The present result refuted Martínez, Molina-López, and de Cabo (2020). The findings revealed that only highly-skilled female principals were associated with higher management quality.

The table unmasks further that a significant difference in school heads' instruction evaluation was not evident when grouped according to educational qualification. It means that school heads in the Division of Zamboanga del Norte also implemented the instruction evaluation regardless of academic qualification.

Moreover, school heads of the Zamboanga del Norte division significantly differ in their instruction evaluation when analyzed according to the length of service. It means that the young and old school heads in the service equally administer instruction evaluation.

In general, the table discloses no significant difference in school heads' leadership practices between males and females. It means that the male and female school heads have similar leadership practices. The table unveils further that a significant difference in school heads' leadership practices was not evident when grouped according to educational qualification. It means that school heads in the Division of Zamboanga del Norte also implemented the same practices regardless of academic qualification. Moreover, school heads of the Zamboanga del Norte division did not significantly differ in their leadership practices when analyzed according to the length of service. It means that the young and old school heads in the service equally exercise leadership practices during this time of the pandemic.

The current result refuted Aquino, Afalla, and Fabelico (2021). Their study found that school heads who obtained their doctorate degrees had a greater level of leadership practices than the holders of master's degrees.

### 3.5 Relationship between the Challenges of Teachers in the New Learning Delivery Modality and the Leadership Practices of School Heads

Table 11 Test of Relationship between the Teachers' Challenges in the New Learning Delivery Modality and the Leadership Practices of School Heads in Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction

Variables	$\rho$ -value	p-value @0.05	Interpretation
Teachers' Challenges and School Heads' Instruction Monitoring	0.300	0.000	Medium/Moderate Positive Correlation/ Significant
Teachers' Challenges and School Heads' Instruction Evaluation	0.343	0.000	Medium/Moderate Positive Correlation/ Significant
Teachers' Challenges and Overall School Heads' Leadership Practices	0.321	0.000	Medium/Moderate Positive Correlation/ Significant

Presented in Table 11 is the test of the relationship between the extent of challenges of teachers in the new learning delivery modality and the extent of school heads' instruction monitoring. A closer look at the table, teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities were moderately and positively correlated with and significantly related to the extent of school heads' instruction monitoring. The computed  $\rho$ -value supports the result with a p-value less than the 0.05 level of significance. However, the effect of the relationship was medium. It means that school heads' instruction

monitoring was influenced at a medium level by the teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modality. It implies that the school heads who rated to a very large extent the teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities were those who highly performed in instruction monitoring. Similarly, the school heads who rated poorly their instruction monitoring claimed the teachers' challenges to a minimal extent.

The present finding substantiated Brock, Beach, Musselwhite, and Holder (2021), whose research revealed

a link between the supervision of instruction and teachers' teaching difficulties.

The table further shows the relationship between teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities and the school heads' instruction evaluation. A closer look at the table, teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities were moderately and positively correlated with and significantly related to the school heads' instruction evaluation. The computed  $p$ -value concurs the result with a  $p$ -value less than the 0.05 level of significance. However, the effect of the relationship was medium. It means that school heads' instruction evaluation was influenced at a medium level by the teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities. It means that the school heads who rated to a very large extent the teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities were highly performing school heads in instruction evaluation. Similarly, the school heads who poorly performed in instruction evaluation rated the teachers' challenges to a minimal extent.

The present finding corroborated Giffin (2020). The research revealed that the current health crisis provided the school heads an opportunity to intensify instruction evaluation to support teachers as they adopt various instructional designs meeting the needs of students during this critical time.

In totality, the table reveals the relationship between teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modality and the school heads' leadership practices. The study found that teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modality were moderately and positively correlated with and significantly related to the school heads' leadership practices. The computed  $p$ -value affirms the result with a  $p$ -value less than the 0.05 level of significance. However, the effect of the relationship was medium. It means that school heads' leadership practices were influenced at a medium level by the teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modality. It means that the school heads who rated to a very large extent the teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modality highly exercised their leadership practices. Similarly, the school heads who poorly exercised their leadership practices rated the teachers' challenges to a minimal extent.

The present finding supported Thein and Win (2015). The results indicated significant and positive relationships between the perceived school leadership practices of principals and classroom management as well as school environment challenges.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

#### 4.1 Conclusions

Based on the study's findings, the researcher concludes that implementing the various learning delivery modalities is crucial in dealing with learners who are not capable of learning independently or who are not periodically supported by their parents or guardians. Likewise, current instructional modality limiting learners' interaction opportunities with their teachers and classmates affects their holistic development. Furthermore, the disparity between teachers' and school heads' perspectives on leadership practices could be due to the limiting connection between teachers and school heads amid the COVID-19 pandemic, failing to monitor activities fully in the course of duty. Overall, the study concludes that the teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modalities affect school heads' leadership practices. The medium effect could be due to school heads' high value of the jobs amid the pandemic to enable teachers to understand their aptitude and shortcomings in certain aspects or areas of teaching and inform teachers on their strengths and weaknesses and opportunities to improve and address their limitations.

#### 4.2 Recommendations

As a result of the comprehensive analysis of the findings and conclusions, given below are the recommendations:

- 4.2.1 That teachers should find ways to cope by time management, teamwork, and cooperation to accomplish a specific task on time. In so doing, the challenges may be minimized if not eradicated.
- 4.2.2 That, to understand how the learning modality is related to students' experiences and learning, teachers are encouraged to study and attend training to be fully equipped with what constitutes effective instructional design in distance learning contexts.
- 4.2.3 That teachers of the Division of Zamboanga del Norte should remain open to school monitoring and evaluation changes. They should continually update their practices to reflect the number of additional avenues by which teaching challenges can be cured and translated by the school heads' leadership practices.
- 4.2.4 That school heads of the Division of Zamboanga del Norte should keep abreast of the current trends in instruction monitoring and evaluation to enhance their leadership productivity and effectiveness in carrying out their supervisory duties, functions, and responsibilities to cope with the teachers' challenges in the new learning delivery modality.

4.2.5 That leadership skills and managerial practice standards should be explored among school heads to structure quality school monitoring and evaluation to help teachers cope with the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abramenska, V. (2015). Students' motivations and barriers to online education. Masters Theses. 776. <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/theses/776>
- [2] Abuhammad, S. (2020). Barriers to distance learning during the COVID-19 outbreak: A qualitative review from parents' perspective. *Heliyon*, 6(11). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e05482>
- [3] Adnan, M. & Anwar, K. (2020). Online learning amid the COVID-19 pandemic: Students' perspectives. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, 2(1), 45-51. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED606496>
- [4] Al-Balas, M., Al-Balas, H.I., Jaber, H.M. et al. (2020). Distance learning in clinical medical education amid COVID-19 pandemic in Jordan: current situation, challenges, and perspectives. *BMC Med Educ* 20, 341. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-02257-4>
- [5] Albert, J.R.G., David, C.C. & Vizmanos, J.F. (2019). Pressures on public school teachers and implications on quality. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidspn1901.pdf>
- [6] Anderson, A. (2005). The community builder's approach to theory of change: A practical guide to theory development. Retrieved from Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change. [http://www.theoryofchange.org/pdf/TOC\\_fac\\_guide.pdf](http://www.theoryofchange.org/pdf/TOC_fac_guide.pdf)
- [7] Antiquina, C. A. (2012). Educational resources vis-à-vis teaching initiatives in public elementary schools. Unpublished Master Thesis. Jose Rizal Memorial State University, Main Campus, Dapitan City.
- [8] Anzaldo, G. D. (2021). Modular Distance Learning in the new normal education amidst Covid-19. *International Journal of Scientific Advances*, 2(3), 233-266.
- [9] Aquino, C. J., Afalla, B., & Fabelico, F. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3948871>
- [10] Azorín, C. (2020). Beyond COVID-19 supernova. Is another education coming? *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5(3/4), 381-390. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPC-05-2020-0019>
- [11] Bankhead, T. (2011). The importance of a college education. [www.collegeview.com/articles/article/importance-of-college-education](http://www.collegeview.com/articles/article/importance-of-college-education)
- [12] Bao, W. (2020). COVID-19 and online teaching in higher education: A case study of Peking University. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.191>
- [13] Barron, M., Cobo, C., Munoz-Najar, A., & Ciarrusta, I.S. (2021). The changing role of teachers and technologies amidst the COVID 19 pandemic: Key findings from a cross-country study. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/education/changing-role-teachers-and-technologies-amidst-covid-19-pandemic-key-findings-cross>
- [14] Bernardo, J. (2020). Module delivery, parents answering activity sheets: Challenges seen in distance learning simulations. <https://news.abs-cbn.com/news/08/31/20/module-delivery-parents-answering-activity-sheets-challenges-seen-in-distance-learning-simulations>
- [15] Bhat, A. (2019). What is a correlational study? – Definition with examples. Retrieved from <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/correlational-research/>
- [16] Brock, J. D., Beach, D. M., Musselwhite, M., & Holder, I. (2021). Instructional supervision and the COVID-19 pandemic: Perspectives from principals. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 11, 168–180. <https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2021.11.1.12>
- [17] Buendicho, B.M. (2018). School head's coaching and monitoring practices: implication on teachers' teaching performance. [https://www.academia.edu/35991754/School\\_Head\\_s\\_Coaching\\_and\\_Monitoring\\_Practices\\_Implication\\_on\\_Teachers\\_Teaching\\_Performance](https://www.academia.edu/35991754/School_Head_s_Coaching_and_Monitoring_Practices_Implication_on_Teachers_Teaching_Performance)
- [18] Buenvenida, L.P. & Ramos, M.T.S. (2019). Transformational leadership practices of school heads and performance of city schools in the Division of First District of Laguna, Philippines. Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330739990\\_TRANSFORMATIONAL\\_LEADERSHIP\\_PRACTICES\\_OF\\_SCHOOL\\_HEADS\\_AND\\_PERFORMANCE\\_OF\\_CITY\\_SCHOOLS\\_IN\\_THE\\_DIVISION\\_OFFIRST\\_DISTRICT\\_OF\\_LAGUNA\\_PHILIPPINES](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330739990_TRANSFORMATIONAL_LEADERSHIP_PRACTICES_OF_SCHOOL_HEADS_AND_PERFORMANCE_OF_CITY_SCHOOLS_IN_THE_DIVISION_OFFIRST_DISTRICT_OF_LAGUNA_PHILIPPINES)
- [19] Cahapay, M. B. (2021). The Phenomenon of leading without guidebook: Educational leadership practices of Philippine school Principals in virulent COVID-19 Times. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*. 10(1). doi: 10.17583/ijelm.2022.7666
- [20] Center for Creative Leadership (2020). How to lead through a crisis. <https://www.ccl.org/articles/leading-effectively-articles/how-to-lead-through-a-crisis/>
- [21] Cheatman, J.P. (2020). Becoming a school leader during COVID-19. <https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/20/10/becoming-school-leader-during-covid-19>
- [22] Chiedozi, O.L. & Victor, A.A. (2017). Principals' application of instructional leadership practices for secondary school effectiveness in Oyo State. *Journal of the*

- Nigerian Academy of Education*, 13(1), 32-44.  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED580939.pdf>
- [23] Chinooneka, T.I. (2020). School heads' leadership practices in enhancing quality education: perspectives from six Rural Day Secondary Schools of Masvingo District in Zimbabwe. <https://ukzn-dspace.ukzn.ac.za/handle/10413/18921>
- [24] Clark, J.T. (2020). Chapter 62 - Distance education. In *clinical engineering handbook* (Second Edition). Academic Press, 410-415.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780128134672000638>
- [25] Cleaver, S., Detrich, R., & States, J. (2019). Overview of performance feedback. The Wing Institute. <https://bit.ly/37qRIII>
- [26] Cohen, P., West, S. G. & Aiken, L. S. (2014). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Psychology Press.
- [27] Confait, S. (2015). Beginning teachers' challenges in their pursuit of effective teaching practices. *Cogent Education*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2014.991179>
- [28] Creswell, J.W. & Guetterman, T.C. (2019). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (6th Ed.). New York: Pearson
- [29] Custodio, A. (2020). Blended learning is the new normal in Philippine education. <https://www.manilatimes.net/2020/07/24/supplements/blended-learning-is-the-new-normal-in-philippine-education/744913>
- [30] D'Auria, G & De Smet, A. (2020). Leadership in a crisis: Responding to the coronavirus outbreak and future challenges. <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/leadership-in-a-crisis-responding-to-the-coronavirus-outbreak-and-future-challenges>
- [31] D'souza, A. (2006). *A trilogy on leadership and effective management*. Nairobi: Pauline's publication Kolbe Press.
- [32] De Villa, J.A. & Manalo, F.K.M. (2020). Secondary teachers' preparation, challenges, and coping mechanism in the pre – implementation of distance learning in the new normal. *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 2(3), 144 – 154. <https://bit.ly/3o3Nwaw>
- [33] Desyatnikov, R. (2020). Management in crisis: The best leadership style to adopt in times of crisis.
- [34] Dirani, K.M., Abadi, M., Alizadeh, A., Barhate, B., Garza, R.C., Gunasekara, N., Ibrahim, G. & Majzun, Z. (2020). Leadership competencies and the essential role of human resource development in times of crisis: a response to Covid-19 pandemic. *Human Resource Development International*, 23(4), 380-394.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1780078>
- [35] Earp, J. (2020). Changing school leadership during COVID-19. [https://www.teachermagazine.com/au\\_en/articles/changing-school-leadership-during-covid-19](https://www.teachermagazine.com/au_en/articles/changing-school-leadership-during-covid-19)
- [36] Esguerra, D.J. 2018. DepED urged to lighten teacher workloads following suicide reports. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*. August 27. <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1025288/deped-urged-to-lighten-teacher-workloads-following-suicide-reports>
- [37] Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [38] Giffin, J. (2020). Teacher observation, feedback, and support in the time of COVID-19. *Guidance for Virtual Learning*. [https://gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/Teacher\\_Observation\\_COVID-19.pdf](https://gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/Teacher_Observation_COVID-19.pdf)
- [39] Gillett-Swan, J. (2017). The challenges of online learning supporting and engaging the isolated learner. *Journal of Learning Design*, 10(1), 20-30.  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1127718.pdf>
- [40] Hannahan, P. (2020). Adapting approaches to deliver quality education in response to COVID-19. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/education-plus-development/2020/04/23/adapting-approaches-to-deliver-quality-education-in-response-to-covid-19/>
- [41] Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. (2020). Professional capital after the pandemic: revisiting and revising classic understandings of teachers' work. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5(3/4), 327-336.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JPC-06-2020-0039>
- [42] Harris, A (2020). Leading a school during lockdown. *Compact Guides, My College*. <https://my.chartered.college/2020/04/leading-a-school-during-lockdown/>
- [43] Harris, A. & Jones, M. (2020). COVID 19 – school leadership in disruptive times. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 243-247.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1811479>
- [44] Harris, A. (2020). COVID-19 – school leadership in crisis? *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5(3/4), 321-326. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPC-06-2020-0045>
- [45] Harris, A., Jones, M., Cheah, K.S.L., Devadason, E. & Adams, D. (2017). Exploring principals' instructional leadership practices in Malaysia: insights and implications. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(2), 207-221.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-05-2016-0051>
- [46] Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- [47] Hebebcı, M. T., Bertiz, Y., & Alan, S. (2020). Investigation of views of students and teachers on distance education practices during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science (IJTES)*, 4(4), 267-282. <https://bit.ly/3pQadQ7>  
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2020/07/17/management-in-crisis-the-best-leadership-style-to-adopt-in-times-of-crisis/?sh=a0911877cb4a>

- [48] Ivaniuk, I. & Ovcharuk, O. (2020). The response of Ukrainian teachers to COVID-19: challenges and needs in the use of digital tools for distance learning. *Informational Technologies and Learning Tools*, 3(77), 282-291.
- [49] Jones, M., Adams, D., Joo, M.T.H., Muniandy, V., Perera, C.J. & Harris, A. (2015). Contemporary challenges and changes: principals' leadership practices in Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35(3), 353-365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2015.1056591>
- [50] Kaur, G. (2020). Digital life: boon or bane in teaching sector on Covid-19, CLIO: Ann. *Interdiscipl. J. Hist.*, 6(6), 416-427.
- [51] Labarrete, R. A. (2021). Assessment for learning in the alternative learning system-education and skills training (ALS-EST). *ASSESSMENT*, 4(01).
- [52] Landicho, C.J.B. (2021). Changes, challenges, and opportunities in teaching senior high school earth science amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Learning and Teaching in Digital Age*, 6(1), 55-57. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1285388.pdf>
- [53] Leithwood, K., Harris, A. & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. Revisited. *School Leadership & Management* 40 (1), 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- [54] Lily, A.E.A.L., Ismail, A.F., Abunasser, F.M., & Alqahtani, R.H.A. (2020). Distance education as a response to pandemics: Coronavirus and Arab culture. *Technology and Society*, 63, 1-11. <https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0160791X20303006?token=9943B2A447D7BA1C641C82A5899D18E72E3E6AFB686969165AF9E95253972C4F7A441391714E1C3984179946A5333EBA>
- [55] Lim, H. (2020). Post COVID 19 Christian higher education, J. Scholarship Teach. Learn. *Christians Higher Educ.*, 10(1), 1-3.
- [56] Lincuna, M.L.B. & Caingcoy, M.E. (2020). Instructional leadership practices of school administrators: The case of El Salvador City Division, Philippines. *Commonwealth Journal of Academic Research (CJAR.EU)*, 1(2), 12-32. <https://www.openaccessjournal.com/article-file/20200719111688359616instr.pdf>
- [57] Llego, M.A. (2020). DepEd learning delivery modalities for school year 2020-2021. <https://www.teacherph.com/dep-ed-learning-delivery-modalities/>
- [58] Malaya, B. (2020). Online distance learning: Here's what you need to know. <https://www.whatalife.ph/online-distance-learning-heres-what-you-need-to-know/>
- [59] Martínez, M.M., Molina-López, M.M., & de Cabo, R.M. (2020). Explaining the gender gap in school principalship: A tale of two sides. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(6). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220918258>
- [60] Mateo, J. 2018. DepED probes teacher suicides. The Philippine Star. August 30. <https://www.philstar.com/other-sections/education-and-home/2018/08/30/1846977/dep-ed-probes-teacher-suicides>
- [61] Nawab, A. & Asad, M.M. (2020). Leadership practices of school principal through a distributed leadership lens: a case study of a secondary school in urban Pakistan. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 16(4), 411-422. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPL-08-2020-0081>
- [62] Ndungu, B. W., Allan, G., & Bomett, E. J. (2015). Influence of monitoring and evaluation by principals on effective teaching and learning in public secondary schools in Githunguri District. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(9), 10-17.
- [63] Ng, F.S.D., Nguyen, T.D., Wong, K.S.B. & Choy, K.W.W. (2015). Instructional leadership practices in Singapore. *School Leadership & Management*, 35(4), 388-407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2015.1010501>
- [64] Panganiban, A.C. (2018). Practices and techniques of school heads of Region IV-A (CALABARZON) in influencing people: Towards school leader program/course design. 4th International Research Conference on Higher Education, KnE Social Sciences, 98-117. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i6.2376>
- [65] Park, S., Takahashi, S. & White, T. (2014). *Developing an effective feedback system: A 90 day cycle report*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- [66] Pasia, A.J.I. (2019). Educational leadership strategies to facilitate a school transition into the Philippine K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 7(7), 85-96. <https://www.ijern.com/journal/2019/July-2019/08.pdf>
- [67] Pitpit, G.M. (2020). Elementary school principals' instructional leadership practices to retain novice teachers in the Philippines. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. 9626. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/9626>
- [68] RAND Corporation (2018). How do teachers perceive feedback and evaluation system: A Policy Brief.
- [69] Rannastu-Avalos M. & Siiman L.A. (2020). Challenges for distance learning and online collaboration in the time of COVID-19: Interviews with science teachers. In: Nolte A., Alvarez C., Hishiyama R., Chounta IA., Rodríguez-Triana M., Inoue T. (eds) *Collaboration Technologies and Social Computing*. CollabTech 2020. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 12324. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58157-2\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58157-2_9)
- [70] Rasheed, R.A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N.A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103701>.
- [71] Rasmitadila, Aliyyah, R.R., Rachmadtullah, R., Samsudin, A., Syaodih, E., Nurtanto, M., & Tambunan, A.R.S. (2020). The perceptions of primary school teachers of online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic period: A case study in Indonesia. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 7(2), 90-109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/388>

- [72] Reinholz, D.L. & Andrews, T.C. (2020). Change theory and theory of change: what's the difference anyway?. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-0202-3>
- [73] Rogers, P. (2014). Theory of change, UNICEF. Retrieved from: [https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/Theory\\_of\\_Change\\_EN...](https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/Theory_of_Change_EN...)
- [74] Shemshack, A., & Spector, J. M. (2020). A systematic literature review of personalized learning terms. *Smart Learning Environments*, 7(1), 1-20.
- [75] Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(4), 339-355.
- [76] Sweigart, C.A. (2015). The effects of real-time visual performance feedback on teacher feedback. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 2082. ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. <https://www.researchgate.net/deref/https%3A%2F%2Fbit.ly%2F2MLzWbg>
- [77] Taylor, D., Grant, J., Hamdy, H., Grant, L., Marei, H., & Venkatramana, M. (2020). Transformation to learning from a distance. *MedEdPublish*, 9(1), 1–12.
- [78] Taylor, E.S., & Tyler, J.H. (2012). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. *American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3628-51.
- [79] Thein, W.W. & Win, S. S. (2015). Influence of school leadership practices on classroom management, school environment, and academic performance. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1451&context=dissertations>
- [80] Toquero, C. M. (2020). Challenges and opportunities for higher education amid the COVID-19 pandemic: The Philippine context. *Pedagogical Research*, 5(4), em0063. <https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/7947>
- [81] Tosun, N., Mihci, C. & Bayzan, Ş. (2021). Challenges encountered by in-service K12 teachers at the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic period: The case of Turkey. *Participatory Educational Research (PER)*, 8(4), 359-384. <http://www.perjournal.com>
- [82] Tran, T., Hoang, A.D., Nguyen, Y.C., Nguyen, L.C., Ta, N.T., Pham, Q.H., & Nguyen, T.T. (2020). Toward sustainable learning during school suspension: Socioeconomic, occupational aspirations, and learning behavior of Vietnamese students during COVID-19. *Sustainability*, 12(10), 1–19.
- [83] Tuballa, R. C. (2014). Administrators' and teachers' morale, their quality of work, productivity, and customers' satisfaction in the Divisions of Zamboanga del Norte and Dapitan City. Unpublished dissertation, Saint Vincent's College, Dipolog City.
- [84] Weiss, C.H. (1995). Nothing as practical as good theory: Exploring theory-based evaluation for comprehensive community initiatives for children and families. *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives: Concepts, Methods, and Contexts*, 1, 65–92.
- [85] Williams, C.F. (2011). The benefits of graduate education. [graduate.ua.edu/publications/slides/benefits\\_files/v3\\_document.htm](http://graduate.ua.edu/publications/slides/benefits_files/v3_document.htm)