IJGGSD
International Journal of Global Goals and Sustainable Development
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INCLUSION | SUSTAINABLE FUTURES
ISSN: 3155-7716
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijggsd.V1.I1.42

The Development and Assessment of Instructional Leadership Towards the Fidelity of SOLO Taxonomy

Daren Gonzales-Melecio, PhD
Doctor of Education in Educational Management & Development, Cebu Technological University - Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

Email: darengonzales32@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study assessed instructional leadership practices, fidelity of Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) Taxonomy implementation, and implementation context among junior high school teachers in Trinidad Districts I and II, Bohol, to inform an instructional leadership framework. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design with comparative and predictive components involved 99 respondents (93 teachers, four school heads, and two public schools district supervisors) selected through complete enumeration. Data were obtained using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale and two validated researcher-developed questionnaires and analyzed through descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, regression, and Welch's ANOVA. Instructional leadership was rated high by teachers ($M = 4.19$), while SOLO implementation fidelity was very high ($M = 4.21$); the implementation context was moderately supportive ($M = 2.97$). Fidelity was positively associated with instructional leadership ($r = .305$, $p = .003$) and availability of instructional materials ($r = .558$, $p < .001$). Instructional materials independently predicted fidelity ($\beta = .472$, $p < .001$), and no significant stakeholder differences in leadership ratings emerged. Findings indicate that leadership and accessible instructional resources are associated with more consistent SOLO application, although the design does not establish causality. Schools should prioritize SOLO-aligned resources, instructional coaching, and stronger feedback and reflection practices. The four-school, questionnaire-based design limits generalizability and direct verification of instructional practices. The proposed leadership framework may guide evidence-informed school improvement and advance SDG 4 (Quality Education) through more sustainable instructional support.

Keywords: *Educational Leadership, Implementation Context, Implementation Fidelity, Instructional Leadership, Instructional Resources, Junior High School, SOLO Taxonomy*

1. INTRODUCTION

Instructional leadership is essential to the effective implementation of educational innovations because school leaders provide instructional direction, professional support, and organizational conditions that influence classroom practices. Recent research has established significant relationships between instructional leadership, teacher professional learning, and instructional improvement (He et al., 2024; Dorukbaşi & Cansoy, 2024). One instructional framework requiring sustained implementation support is the Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) Taxonomy, which facilitates the progressive development and assessment of learners' understanding. Studies have demonstrated its relevance to instructional planning, cognitive development, and assessment practices (Adeniji et al., 2022; Svensäter & Rohlin, 2023). However, instructional effectiveness depends not only on adopting educational frameworks but also on implementation fidelity and supportive organizational conditions (Lyon et al., 2022; Ulla & Poom-Valickis, 2023). Accordingly, this study examined instructional leadership practices, SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity, and implementation context among Junior High School teachers in Trinidad Districts I and II, Schools Division of Bohol, as the basis for developing an Instructional Leadership Framework.

Research Problem

The successful implementation of SOLO Taxonomy requires consistent alignment among learning objectives, instructional design, learning activities, assessment practices, and feedback. Recent Philippine studies have demonstrated its potential to improve learners' understanding and higher-order thinking skills (Sudaria & Sanchez, 2024; Clavacio & Legaspi-Estoque, 2025). Nevertheless, implementation challenges involving teacher competence, instructional alignment, assessment development, and professional support remain evident (Atrero & Ravana, 2026; DelaCerna, 2026). These concerns indicate that adopting an instructional framework does not necessarily ensure its consistent application. Instructional leadership may influence implementation by strengthening instructional supervision, teacher development, and organizational support. However, implementation fidelity also depends on contextual conditions, including instructional resources, administrative assistance, and implementation constraints (Lyon et al., 2022; Ulla & Poom-Valickis, 2023). Although existing studies have examined instructional leadership and SOLO Taxonomy independently, limited evidence establishes their relationship in Philippine public secondary schools. Specifically, empirical investigation is needed to determine how instructional leadership practices and implementation context relate to and predict SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity among Junior High School teachers in Trinidad Districts I and II, Schools Division of Bohol.

Assumptions of the Study

The study was guided by the assumption that instructional leadership practices and supportive implementation conditions are associated with teachers' consistent application of SOLO Taxonomy. School heads who provide instructional supervision, professional development, monitoring, and feedback may facilitate effective instructional implementation (He et al., 2024; Glover et al., 2023). Likewise, adequate instructional materials, administrative assistance, and organizational support may strengthen implementation fidelity, whereas insufficient resources and implementation constraints may limit consistency (Ulla & Poom-Valickis, 2023; van Dijk et al., 2023). These assumptions provided the basis for examining the relationships and predictive associations among instructional leadership, implementation context, and SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity without presuming causal relationships.

Objectives of the Study

The study aimed to assess instructional leadership practices, determine the fidelity of SOLO Taxonomy implementation, and examine the implementation context among Junior High School teachers in Trinidad Districts I and II, Schools Division of Bohol, during School Year 2026–2027. Specifically, it sought to describe respondents' demographic and professional profiles; assess instructional leadership practices as perceived by Public Schools District Supervisors, School Heads, and Junior High School teachers; determine teachers' SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity across instructional dimensions; and evaluate the availability of instructional materials, administrative and instructional support, and implementation constraints. Furthermore, it aimed to determine the significant relationships and predictive associations among instructional leadership, implementation context, and implementation fidelity; examine differences in stakeholder perceptions of instructional leadership; and develop an Instructional Leadership Framework for strengthening SOLO Taxonomy implementation based on the study findings.

Theoretical or Conceptual Basis

The study was anchored on Instructional Leadership Theory, the Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) Taxonomy, and Fidelity of Implementation Theory, which collectively explain the relationships among school leadership, instructional practices, and implementation conditions.Instructional Leadership Theory emphasizes the responsibility of school leaders to improve teaching and learning through instructional goal-setting, curriculum coordination, supervision, monitoring, and professional development. Recent empirical research demonstrates that instructional leadership contributes to teacher professional learning, instructional improvement, and positive teacher attitudes (Dorukbaşi & Cansoy, 2024; Hallinger et al., 2025). Within this study, instructional leadership represents the practices through which school heads guide and support teachers in implementing SOLO Taxonomy. The SOLO Taxonomy provides a framework for assessing the structural complexity of learners' understanding through five progressive levels: prestructural, unistructural, multistructural, relational, and extended abstract. Contemporary research supports its application in evaluating learning progression, developing assessment tasks, and aligning instructional activities with intended learning outcomes (Adeniji et al., 2022; Svensäter & Rohlin, 2023). Accordingly, SOLO Taxonomy serves as the instructional framework whose implementation fidelity is examined across learning objectives, instructional design, instructional delivery, learning activities, assessment practices, feedback and learning progression, and reflection and continuous improvement. Fidelity of Implementation Theory emphasizes the consistency, adherence, and quality with which instructional innovations are implemented according to their intended design. Recent studies highlight the importance of measuring implementation fidelity and considering contextual conditions that influence instructional delivery (Spacciapoli et al., 2022; van Dijk et al., 2023). Complementing this perspective, implementation leadership research identifies organizational support and leadership behaviors as relevant conditions for sustaining educational practices (Lyon et al., 2022). Thus, the study conceptualizes instructional leadership practices and implementation context as explanatory and predictive variables associated with SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity, providing the foundation for the proposed Instructional Leadership Framework.

The study primarily supports Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) by examining instructional leadership and implementation fidelity as mechanisms for improving teaching quality, assessment practices, and professional support. UNESCO and the International Task Force on Teachers for Education 2030 (2024) emphasized the importance of strengthening teacher capacity and institutional support to achieve equitable and quality education. Similarly, the Department of Education (2024) identified curriculum improvement, teacher development, and effective educational delivery as priorities under the MATATAG Agenda and Basic Education

Development Plan 2030. By developing an evidence-based Instructional Leadership Framework, the study may contribute to educational and institutional sustainability through continuous instructional improvement, strengthened teacher competencies, responsible resource utilization, and sustained implementation of SOLO Taxonomy in public secondary schools.

2. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design with comparative and predictive components. The descriptive component assessed instructional leadership practices, SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity, and implementation context. The correlational component examined relationships among these variables, while the comparative component determined differences in instructional leadership perceptions among respondent groups. Multiple regression and simple linear regression analyses identified significant predictors of implementation fidelity. The study examined naturally occurring conditions without manipulating variables, and the findings served as the basis for developing an Instructional Leadership Framework.

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted in Trinidad Districts I and II, Schools Division of Bohol, Philippines, during School Year 2026–2027. The participating public secondary schools were Tagum Sur National High School and Soom High School in Trinidad I District, and Hinlayagan National High School and Kinan-oan National High School in Trinidad II District. These schools represented varied rural educational environments in terms of institutional size, instructional resources, and organizational conditions. All operated under the Department of Education curriculum standards and implemented instructional initiatives promoting learner-centered education, higher-order thinking skills, and SOLO Taxonomy integration.

Participants or Data Sources

The study involved 99 respondents comprising two Public Schools District Supervisors, four School Heads, and 93 Junior High School teachers from the four participating schools. Complete enumeration was employed to include the entire identified population. The supervisors and school heads assessed instructional leadership practices, while teachers evaluated instructional leadership, their SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity, and implementation context. The two district supervisors provided school-level leadership assessments covering the four participating schools.

Research Instruments or Materials

Three questionnaires were utilized. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) by Hallinger (2015), administered with permission and without modification, assessed ten dimensions of instructional leadership. The researcher-developed Implementation Fidelity of SOLO Taxonomy Questionnaire (IFSTQ) contained 35 items across seven dimensions covering learning objectives, instructional design, delivery, learning activities, assessment, feedback, and continuous improvement. Its development was anchored on Biggs and Collis (1982), Biggs (1996; Biggs & Tang, 2011), and Carroll et al. (2007). The Implementation Context of SOLO Taxonomy Questionnaire (ICSTQ) comprised 15 items covering instructional materials, administrative and instructional support, and implementation constraints. Four experts validated the researcher-developed instruments, followed by revisions and pilot testing among respondents excluded from the actual study. The IFSTQ obtained an overall validation mean of 3.78 and Cronbach's alpha of 0.986, indicating excellent reliability, while the ICSTQ obtained an alpha of 0.823, indicating good reliability. Negatively worded constraint items were designated for reverse scoring. All three instruments employed five-point rating scales.

Data Gathering Procedure

Data collection began with securing authorization from the Schools Division Office and concerned district and school authorities. Following participant orientation and informed consent, the researcher finalized the instruments through expert validation, revisions, and pilot testing. The PIMRS was administered to supervisors, school heads, and teachers, while the IFSTQ and ICSTQ were administered to Junior High School teachers. Questionnaires were distributed within the approved schedule to minimize instructional disruption. Completed responses were retrieved, checked for completeness, coded, encoded, and verified before statistical analysis. Data collection was conducted in coordination with school authorities while maintaining confidentiality and voluntary participation.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency counts and percentages described respondents' age, sex, and length of service, while weighted means and standard deviations determined instructional leadership practices, SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity, and implementation context. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation examined relationships among the variables. Multiple regression identified implementation context dimensions predicting fidelity, while simple linear regression assessed instructional leadership as a predictor. Welch's Analysis of Variance determined differences in leadership perceptions among supervisors, school heads, and teachers. Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS, with Jamovi used for instrument reliability testing. Hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 significance level, and the findings informed the development of the Instructional Leadership Framework.

Ethical Consideration

The study adhered to the ethical requirements of Cebu Technological University and the Department of Education. Necessary institutional approvals and informed consent were secured before data collection. Participation was voluntary, with respondents allowed to decline or withdraw without penalty. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained through participant coding, secure physical storage, password-protected electronic records, and aggregated reporting of findings. Individual responses were not disclosed to school authorities. Data were accessed only by the researcher and authorized technical personnel and used exclusively for academic research. Procedures were implemented to minimize potential harm, protect participant autonomy, and maintain research integrity.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Profile of the Respondents

3.1.1 Age, Sex, and Length of Service

The study involved 99 respondents comprising 93 Junior High School teachers, two Public Schools District Supervisors, and four School Heads. Most respondents were female (84.85%), and the largest age group was 30–39 years (39.39%), followed by 40–49 years (30.30%). Regarding professional experience, 30.30% had served for 6–10 years, while 22.22% had 11–15 years of service. Both district supervisors had more than 20 years of service, while the school heads had at least 11 years of professional experience. These characteristics indicate that respondents represented different career stages and professional responsibilities. Their varied experience provided perspectives on instructional leadership and classroom implementation within the participating schools. The importance of examining leadership within specific school contexts is consistent with Brooks and Brooks (2024), who emphasized that organizational conditions and local circumstances shape educational implementation.

3.2 Level of Instructional Leadership Practices

3.2.1 Overall Instructional Leadership Practices

Instructional leadership practices were rated high by teachers (M = 4.19, SD = 0.54) and school heads (M = 4.18, SD = 0.56), while district supervisors provided a very high rating (M = 4.49, SD = 0.27). Across the ten dimensions, promoting professional development and protecting instructional time consistently received favorable assessments. Maintaining high visibility obtained comparatively lower ratings, particularly among teachers (M = 3.64, SD = 0.91). These findings indicate that school heads generally demonstrate instructional leadership through goal-setting, curriculum coordination, instructional supervision, and teacher development. The results are consistent with Alanoglu (2022), who identified a positive relationship between instructional leadership and teacher self-efficacy. Similarly, Ninković and Knežević Florić (2024) emphasized the relevance of teacher professional learning, collaboration, and self-efficacy in connecting school leadership with instructional practices.

3.2.2 Strengths and Areas for Improvement in Instructional Leadership

Promoting professional development obtained very high ratings from teachers (M = 4.46), supervisors (M = 5.00), and school heads (M = 4.85). Protecting instructional time was likewise rated very high across all groups, with means ranging from 4.46 to 4.60. Teachers also rated framing school goals (M = 4.29), communicating school goals (M = 4.30), and providing incentives for learning (M = 4.23) as very high. In contrast, maintaining high visibility received the lowest teacher and supervisor ratings, while school heads rated monitoring student progress lowest (M = 3.85). The findings suggest that instructional leadership is particularly evident in professional development and the protection of teaching time, while classroom visibility and direct instructional engagement remain areas for improvement. He et al. (2024) established that instructional leadership contributes to teacher professional development, while Visscher et al. (2025) demonstrated the importance of appropriately designed professional learning in improving educational outcomes. Strengthening classroom monitoring and instructional feedback may therefore complement existing leadership practices.

3.3 Level of SOLO Taxonomy Implementation Fidelity

3.3.1 Fidelity in Instructional Planning and Classroom Implementation

Junior High School teachers demonstrated a very high overall level of SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity (M = 4.21, SD = 0.41). Learning objectives obtained the highest mean (M = 4.30, SD = 0.48), followed by instructional design (M = 4.28, SD = 0.48). Instructional delivery (M = 4.24), assessment practices (M = 4.24), and learning activities (M = 4.23) were likewise rated very high. These findings suggest that teachers consistently integrate SOLO Taxonomy principles into instructional preparation, classroom activities, and assessment. Svensäter and Rohlin (2023) demonstrated the application of SOLO Taxonomy in integrating formative and summative assessment, while Lucas et al. (2026) identified its relevance to cognitive progression and conceptual understanding in secondary science education. The results indicate that SOLO-based instructional planning and delivery are well established among the respondents.

3.3.2 Fidelity in Feedback, Learning Progression, and Continuous Improvement

Fidelity in feedback and learning progression obtained a high rating (M = 4.17, SD = 0.56), while reflection and continuous improvement received the lowest mean among the seven dimensions (M = 4.00, SD = 0.53). Although both remained within the high category, their ratings were lower than those for instructional planning, delivery, learning activities, and assessment. These findings indicate that feedback and reflective instructional practices require greater attention to strengthen implementation consistency. Lucas et al. (2026) emphasized the importance of using SOLO Taxonomy to examine progressive understanding and inform instructional decisions. Likewise, Lindvall et al. (2025) highlighted the association between professional development

and instructional improvement, supporting the relevance of sustained reflection and professional learning in strengthening classroom practices.

3.4 Implementation Context of SOLO Taxonomy

3.4.1 Availability of Instructional Materials and Administrative Support

The implementation context obtained an overall mean of 2.97 (SD = 0.36), interpreted in the original study as moderately supportive. Administrative and instructional support received the highest rating (M = 3.74, SD = 0.50), followed by availability of instructional materials (M = 3.57, SD = 0.59). Teachers particularly recognized the provision of constructive feedback (M = 3.83), administrative encouragement (M = 3.80), and collaborative opportunities (M = 3.78). Assessment resources and digital and printed learning materials were also perceived as available (M = 3.69 for both indicators). These results suggest that schools provide generally favorable organizational and instructional conditions for SOLO Taxonomy implementation. Lowell et al. (2024) demonstrated that instructional resources, leadership, and teacher collaboration influence curriculum implementation. Similarly, Lyon et al. (2022) emphasized the importance of implementation-focused leadership in supporting educational practices. These studies reinforce the relevance of instructional resources and organizational support in sustaining classroom implementation.

3.4.2 Support Needs and Implementation Constraints

Support needs and implementation constraints obtained a mean of 1.59 (SD = 0.55), interpreted as strongly disagree. Teachers generally did not identify additional planning time, instructional resources, workload reduction, administrative assistance, or professional development as major implementation constraints. The highest-rated concerns were additional instructional and administrative support (M = 1.67) and additional planning time (M = 1.61), although both remained within the strongly disagree category. The findings suggest that respondents generally perceived existing conditions as sufficient for implementing SOLO-based instruction. Nevertheless, low reported constraints do not eliminate the importance of continued professional and organizational support. Ulla and Poom-Valickis (2023) identified contextual support as an important consideration in educational program implementation, while Brooks and Brooks (2024) emphasized that implementation practices are influenced by school-level resources, leadership priorities, and organizational conditions.

3.5 Relationships Between Instructional Leadership, Implementation Context, and Fidelity

3.5.1 Relationship Between Instructional Leadership and SOLO Taxonomy Implementation Fidelity

Pearson correlation analysis revealed a statistically significant low positive relationship between instructional leadership practices and SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity ($r = 0.305$, $p = 0.003$). The result indicates that teachers reporting stronger instructional leadership practices also tended to report higher implementation fidelity. Consequently, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected. The finding supports the relevance of instructional leadership in sustaining instructional innovations. Ninković and Knežević Florić (2024) identified teacher collaboration and professional learning as mechanisms linking school leadership with instructional practices. Similarly, Lyon et al. (2022) emphasized leadership behaviors that support educational implementation. These findings suggest that instructional leadership may help establish conditions favorable to consistent SOLO Taxonomy application, although the observed relationship was relatively weak.

3.5.2 Relationship Between Implementation Context and SOLO Taxonomy Implementation Fidelity

Availability of instructional materials demonstrated a statistically significant moderate positive relationship with implementation fidelity ($r = 0.558$, $p < 0.001$). Administrative and instructional support also showed a significant low positive relationship ($r = 0.394$, $p < 0.001$). However, support needs and implementation constraints were not significantly related to implementation fidelity ($r = -0.081$, $p = 0.439$). The null hypotheses were rejected for instructional materials and administrative support but not for implementation constraints. These findings indicate that instructional resources and organizational support are positively associated with consistent SOLO Taxonomy implementation. Lowell et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of instructional materials and organizational collaboration in curriculum implementation, while Ulla and Poom-Valickis (2023) identified school-related support as an important implementation condition. The nonsignificant relationship involving implementation constraints suggests that perceived challenges did not meaningfully explain variations in fidelity within the participating schools.

3.6 Predictive Influence of Implementation Context and Instructional Leadership

3.6.1 Implementation Context as a Predictor of SOLO Taxonomy Fidelity

Multiple regression analysis revealed that implementation context significantly predicted SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity, $F(3, 89) = 15.057$, $p < 0.001$. The model explained 33.7% of the variance in implementation fidelity ($R^2 = 0.337$). Availability of instructional materials was the only significant individual predictor ($B = 0.328$, $\beta = 0.472$, $p < 0.001$). Administrative and instructional support ($\beta = 0.175$, $p = 0.078$) and support needs and implementation constraints ($\beta = -0.058$, $p = 0.503$) were not significant independent predictors. The findings suggest that access to appropriate instructional resources is the strongest contextual factor associated with SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity in the fitted model. Lowell et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of instructional materials and organizational processes in supporting curriculum reforms, while Brooks and Brooks (2024) highlighted how resource availability and institutional conditions shape implementation. Thus, adequate teaching materials and assessment resources appear particularly relevant to sustaining SOLO-aligned classroom practices.

3.6.2 Instructional Leadership as a Predictor of SOLO Taxonomy Fidelity

Simple linear regression demonstrated that instructional leadership practices significantly predicted SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity ($B = 0.233$, $SE = 0.076$, $t = 3.052$, $p = 0.003$). The regression coefficient was positive, with a 95% confidence interval of 0.081 to 0.385. Instructional leadership explained approximately 9.3% of the variance in implementation fidelity, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. The finding indicates that stronger instructional leadership ratings were associated with higher implementation fidelity, although most of the variation remained unexplained by leadership alone. Alanoglu (2022) demonstrated a positive relationship between instructional leadership and teacher self-efficacy, while Ninković and Knežević Florić (2024) emphasized the indirect pathways connecting leadership with teaching practices. The findings support the relevance of instructional leadership while underscoring the need to consider additional contextual and teacher-related factors.

3.7 Differences in Stakeholder Perceptions of Instructional Leadership

3.7.1 Comparison of Teachers', Supervisors', and School Heads' Assessments

Welch's analysis of variance revealed no statistically significant difference among the perceptions of Junior High School teachers, Public Schools District Supervisors, and School Heads regarding instructional leadership practices, $F(2, 4.76) = 1.72$, $p = 0.274$. Supervisors provided the highest mean rating ($M = 4.49$), followed by teachers ($M = 4.19$) and school heads ($M = 4.18$). Because the difference was not statistically significant, the null hypothesis was not

rejected. These results suggest that the respondent groups generally reported comparable assessments of instructional leadership practices. Brooks and Brooks (2024) emphasized that school leadership operates within shared organizational and implementation conditions, while Ninković and Knežević Florić (2024) highlighted the importance of collaborative processes in instructional improvement. However, the nonsignificant difference should be interpreted cautiously because the supervisor and school-head groups were small, limiting the precision of between-group comparisons.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concludes that instructional leadership practices and implementation context are significantly associated with the fidelity of SOLO Taxonomy implementation among Junior High School teachers in Trinidad Districts I and II, Schools Division of Bohol. Instructional leadership practices were generally rated high, while teachers demonstrated very high implementation fidelity, particularly in instructional planning, delivery, and assessment. However, feedback, learning progression, and reflective improvement require further strengthening. The implementation context was moderately supportive, with instructional materials emerging as the strongest significant contextual predictor of fidelity. Administrative and instructional support showed a significant positive relationship with implementation fidelity, whereas perceived implementation constraints did not. Instructional leadership also demonstrated a significant positive predictive relationship with fidelity, although its explanatory contribution was relatively limited. Stakeholder perceptions of instructional leadership did not differ significantly. Collectively, these findings provide an empirical foundation for developing an Instructional Leadership Framework that integrates instructional supervision, professional support, resource provision, and continuous improvement.

School heads should sustain instructional supervision, professional development, and constructive feedback while strengthening classroom visibility and monitoring practices. Schools should prioritize developing, providing, and maintaining accessible SOLO-aligned instructional materials, assessment tools, and learning resources, considering their significant predictive association with implementation fidelity. Junior High School teachers should strengthen feedback strategies, learning progression monitoring, and reflective instructional practices through collaborative lesson planning, peer mentoring, and Learning Action Cell sessions. The Schools Division Office may institutionalize targeted capacity-building programs emphasizing practical SOLO Taxonomy application, instructional alignment, assessment development, and continuous improvement. School administrators should establish mechanisms for sharing instructional resources and monitoring implementation consistency. The proposed Instructional Leadership Framework may undergo pilot implementation and systematic evaluation to determine its usefulness in strengthening instructional practices. Future researchers may examine additional factors associated with implementation fidelity, including teacher competence, school culture, and learner outcomes, using broader samples and complementary research approaches.

The study was limited to 99 respondents from four public secondary schools in Trinidad Districts I and II, Schools Division of Bohol, during School Year 2026–2027, restricting the transferability of findings to other educational settings. Its quantitative descriptive-correlational design established statistical associations and predictive relationships but could not determine causality. The reliance on questionnaire-based assessments also limited direct verification of classroom implementation practices. Additionally, the small numbers of supervisors and school heads constrained stakeholder comparisons. Future studies may involve larger and more diverse samples, classroom observations, longitudinal investigations, and mixed-method approaches to provide a more comprehensive understanding of SOLO Taxonomy implementation fidelity.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Above all, I thank Almighty God for His guidance, wisdom, and strength throughout this doctoral journey.

I sincerely thank Cebu Technological University (CTU) for this opportunity and my adviser, DR. HELEN O. REVALDE, for her guidance. My heartfelt appreciation also goes to DR. ROBERTO L. SUSON, DR. NOLASCO K. MALABAGO, and the members of my dissertation committee, DR. REYLAN G. CAPUNO, DR. RAYMOND C. ESPINA, DR. MICHAEL R. CANGAYAO, and DR. IRENE O. MAMITES, for their valuable insights and support.

I am grateful to SDO Bohol for permitting me to conduct this study, and to the PSDSs of Trinidad Districts I and II, school heads, and teachers for their cooperation and participation. I also thank DR. PHILIP HALLINGER for allowing me to use the PIMRS.

To my family, Papa Rannie and Mama Delia; my siblings, Etie Raden, Sis Maria Adora, and Durian; my husband, Celfred; and my children, Ate Lady Psyche, Kuya Vee Jay, and the youngest John Deanne, thank you for your unconditional love, prayers, inspiration, and strength. You are my greatest motivation.

To everyone who became part of this journey, thank you. To God be the glory!

6. REFERENCES

Adeniji, S. M., Baker, P., & Schmude, M. (2022). Structure of the Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) model: A mixed-method systematic review of research in mathematics education. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 18*(6), Article em2119. https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/12087

Alanoglu, M. (2022). The role of instructional leadership in increasing teacher self-efficacy: A meta-analytic review. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 23*(2), 233–244. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-021-09726-5

Atrero, M. J. E., & Ravana, L. L. (2026). Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) taxonomy and learner achievement: Impact on educational performance. *The Advanced Social Science in Research Journal, 1*(2), 318–330. https://doi.org/10.11594/assrj.01.02.12

Brooks, J. S., & Brooks, M. C. (2024). Hot leadership, cool leadership: How education policies are implemented (and ignored) in schools. *Educational Policy, 38*(7), 1608–1637. https://doi.org/10.1177/08959048241268309

Clavacio, R.-A., & Legaspi-Estoque, M. (2025). Application of SOLO taxonomy in teaching English. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 43*(1), 22–34. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.430103

DelaCerna, K. (2026). Elementary teachers' readiness in implementing Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) taxonomy in the classroom: Action plan. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 53*(6), 664–680. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.530605

Department of Education. (2024, April 27). *DepEd's MATATAG Agenda, BEDP 2030 approved by NEDA Board as national policy and plan for basic education*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2024/04/27/depeds-matatag-agenda-bedp-2030-approved-by-neda-board-as-national-policy-and-plan-for-basic-education/

Dorukbaşi, E., & Cansoy, R. (2024). Examining the mediating role of teacher professional learning between perceived instructional leadership and teacher instructional practices. *European Journal of Education, 59*(3), Article e12672. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12672

Glover, T. A., Reddy, L. A., & Crouse, K. (2023). Instructional coaching actions that predict teacher classroom practices and student achievement. *Journal of School Psychology, 96*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2022.10.006

Hallinger, P., Liu, S., & Chen, L. (2025). Principal instructional leadership and teacher attitudes: A meta-analytic review, 1989–2024. *European Journal of Education, 60*(4), Article e70199. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70199

He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 9*, Article 63. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00290-0

Lindvall, J., Kirsten, N., Ryve, A., & Gustafsson, J.-E. (2025). A critical review and meta-analysis of studies investigating the effects of the professional development teachers typically receive. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 86*, Article 101482. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2025.101482

Lowell, B. R., Fogelman, S. E., & McNeill, K. L. (2024). Organizational sensemaking during curriculum implementation: The dilemma of agency, role of collaboration, and importance of discipline-specific leadership. *Science Education, 108*(5), 1448–1473. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21885

Lucas, N. B. I., Abrogena, L. G., & Panilo, J. G. (2026). The application of SOLO taxonomy in secondary science education: A scoping review. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation, 5*(5), 66–80. https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v5i5.8599

Lyon, A. R., Corbin, C. M., Brown, E. C., Ehrhart, M. G., Locke, J., Davis, C., Picozzi, E., Aarons, G. A., & Cook, C. R. (2022). Leading the charge in the education sector: Development and validation of the School Implementation Leadership Scale (SILS). *Implementation Science, 17*, Article 48. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-022-01222-7

Ninković, S., & Knežević Florić, O. (2024). School leadership and teaching practice: A systematic review of studies of the indirect effects. *Journal of Educational Administration, 62*(4), 357–372. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2023-0190

Spacciapoli, M., Viana, M., Saunders Wilder, O., Sullivan, J., McCallum, T., & Wilder-Smith, B. (2022). An equitable and scalable approach to track fidelity of implementation in partnership with teachers. *Frontiers in Education, 7*, Article 1020204. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1020204

Sudaria, C. M., & Sanchez, J. M. P. (2024). SOLO-based formative assessments in teaching and learning earthquakes. *Science Education International, 35*(4), 408–420. https://doi.org/10.33828/sei.v35.i4.11

Svensäter, G., & Rohlin, M. (2023). Assessment model blending formative and summative assessments using the SOLO taxonomy. *European Journal of Dental Education, 27*(1), 149–157. https://doi.org/10.1111/eje.12787

Ulla, T., & Poom-Valickis, K. (2023). Program support matters: A systematic review on teacher- and school-related contextual factors facilitating the implementation of social-emotional learning programs. *Frontiers in Education, 7*, Article 965538. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.965538

UNESCO & International Task Force on Teachers for Education 2030. (2024). *Global report on teachers: Addressing teacher shortages and transforming the profession*. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.18356/9789231006555

van Dijk, W., Lane, H. B., & Gage, N. A. (2023). How do intervention studies measure the relation between implementation fidelity and students' reading outcomes? A systematic review. *The Elementary School Journal, 124*(1), 56–84. https://doi.org/10.1086/725672

Visscher, A. J., Dmoshinskaia, N., Pellegrini, M., & Rey-Naizaque, A. (2025). (When) do teacher professional development interventions improve student achievement? A meta-analysis of 128 high-quality studies. *Educational Research Review, 49*, Article 100742. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2025.100742