Coordination Skills, Digital Intelligence of Literacy Coordinators and Reading Program Performance of Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Santa Rosa City

Steven S Duclayan [1*], Remedios M Dela Rosa [2]
[1, 2] University of Perpetual Help System Laguna, Philippines

* Corresponding Author: **Steven S Duclayan**

Article Info
ISSN (online): 2582-7138
Volume: 06
Issue: 02
March-April 2025
Received: 21-02-2025
Accepted: 19-03-2025
Page No: 1368-1378

Abstract
This study investigated the relationship between coordination skills, digital intelligence, and the reading program performance of public elementary schools in the Division of Santa Rosa City. Literacy coordinators play a key role in implementing reading interventions, yet limited research has examined how their coordination skills and digital intelligence affect program outcomes. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study surveyed 61 literacy coordinators from 18 public elementary schools with validated instruments (Cronbach's alpha = 0.76). Descriptive statistics showed that literacy coordinators generally agreed on the importance of coordination skills (M = 3.45) and digital intelligence (M = 3.27). Pearson correlation analysis revealed low and negligible correlations between coordination skills and digital intelligence, coordination skills and reading program performance, and digital intelligence and reading program performance. However, regression analysis demonstrated that coordination skills and digital intelligence collectively accounted for 21.10% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.211$, $F = 15.763$, $p = 0.000$) in reading program performance, indicating that coordination skills significantly predict program performance. These findings highlight the need to enhance professional development programs focused on resource allocation, data collection and management, and digital literacy to strengthen coordinators' capacity to improve program outcomes. Future research should explore additional factors influencing reading performance, such as instructional practices, parental involvement, and community engagement strategies to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the determinants of reading success in public elementary schools.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2025.6.2.1368-1378

Keywords: Coordination skills, digital intelligence, literacy coordinators, reading program performance, public elementary schools, Santa Rosa City

1. Introduction

In an era marked by rapid technological advancement and an increasing emphasis on literacy, the role of literacy coordinators in public elementary schools had become more critical than ever. Literacy coordinators were tasked with overseeing reading programs, ensuring that learners developed essential literacy skills that would serve them throughout their educational journey and beyond. However, the effectiveness of these programs was not solely reliant on the curriculum or resources available; it was significantly influenced by the coordination skills and digital intelligence of the coordinators themselves.

Recent studies emphasized the critical role of leadership in educational outcomes, with Fullan (2020) highlighting the importance of strategic planning and coordination in driving student achievement. Additionally, the integration of digital technologies had been shown to enhance learning, with Vrasidas and Glass (2021) advocating for digital literacy among leaders to fully utilize these tools.

Literacy coordinators, especially in public elementary schools, also played a pivotal role in shaping effective reading programs. Their work was integral in fostering supportive environments for struggling readers, collaborating with teachers, parents, and administrators to ensure the success of literacy initiatives (Taganas *et al*., 2024) [133].

Moreover, studies had explored the development of competencies among reading coordinators, with Yaco-Noche (2019) [148] noting that while coordinators exhibited moderate management skills, challenges such as insufficient resources hindered program effectiveness. Ortiz (2024) found a significant relationship between reading coordinators' planning techniques and literacy development, highlighting the impact of teacher collaboration and individualized support. The integration of digital literacy programs, including digital fluency and safety, further supported the preparation of students for navigating digital environments (Buchan *et al*., 2024) [20]. Ridha *et al*. (2023) and Judijanto *et al*. (2024) [67] further discussed the strategic role of digital intelligence in school leadership, underscoring its potential to enhance communication, innovation, and student engagement. Thus, digital intelligence, coupled with leadership training, was essential for improving educational practices and student literacy outcomes.

However, while there was growing literature on the role of school leadership in general, limited research had focused specifically on how the coordination skills and digital intelligence of literacy coordinators impacted reading performance in the context of the Philippines, particularly in urban areas like Santa Rosa City. Moreover, the existing studies tended to focus on teachers' or students' use of technology rather than on the pivotal role that literacy coordinators played in leading and managing these efforts.

Moreover, despite a significant body of research on coordination skills, digital intelligence, and school reading program performance in educational settings, there was a notable research gap when it came to examining the intersection of these variables specifically among literacy coordinators.

These gaps in research were critical, given the increasing reliance on digital platforms in education, which forced schools to adapt to blended learning models. The ability of literacy coordinators to navigate both traditional and digital approaches to literacy instruction and program implementation might have had profound implications for improving reading program performance in public schools.

These data prompted the need to investigate the relationships between coordination skills, digital intelligence among literacy coordinators, and the level of school reading performance of the public elementary schools in the Division of Santa Rosa City. By exploring the interplay of these variables, the study aimed to determine if the coordination skills and digital intelligence of literacy coordinators had a predictive impact on school reading performance within this educational division.

Addressing the announced research gaps was crucial for gaining a deeper understanding of how coordination skills and digital intelligence jointly influenced school reading performance. By examining these variables within the specific context of literacy coordination, the study could provide valuable insights for educational institutions to enhance the school reading program performance. It also highlighted the need for empirical studies that investigated the complex relationship between school reading performance, their ability to coordinate, and their digital intelligence, while providing practical implications for professional development in the educational field.

2. Methods

This study utilized a descriptive-correlational research approach, which investigated the association between two or more variables without making any assumptions regarding causality. This methodology entails the gathering and examination of data on many factors to ascertain the presence of a correlation between them, without making any assumptions about causality (Yazon *et al*., 2021). The present study decided the interpretation of conditions that are related to literacy coordinators' coordination skills, digital intelligence and the reading program performance of the selected elementary school through questionnaires.

The study aimed at determining the level of coordination skills, digital intelligence of literacy coordinators and the reading program performance of the schools of the public elementary schools in the Division of Santa Rosa City, Laguna. The total population of the study consisted of 108 literacy coordinators. The sample size was 85 literacy coordinators using the Raosoft's Calculator with 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error.

The study involved 18 public elementary schools in the Division of Santa Rosa City including 6 literacy coordinators in Santa Rosa Elementary School Central I, 6 literacy coordinators in Santa Rosa Elementary School Central II, 6 literacy coordinators in Santa Rosa Elementary School Central III, 6 literacy coordinators in Aplaya Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Caingin Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Sinalhan Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Dila Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Dita Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Labas Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Santo Domingo Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Jose Zavalla Memorial Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Macabling Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Malitlit Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Southville IV Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Don Jose Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Tagapo Elementary School, 6 literacy coordinators in Pulong Santa Cruz Elementary School, and 6 literacy coordinators in Balibago Elementary School. Stratified random sampling technique was used in the study. The study was conducted during the school year 2024-2025.

This study used a researcher-made survey questionnaire and divided it into three parts. The first part covered the level of coordination skills of literacy coordinators in terms of communication, data, collection and management, teamwork, planning and resource allocation. The second part focused on the level of digital intelligence of literacy coordinators as to digital literacy, data-analysis, digital communication, and cybersecurity awareness. The final part of the questionnaire explored the school reading program performance level to reading intervention, recognition and awards, innovations, activities and parents' and other stakeholder' involvement.

The research instrument underwent a validation process by submitting it to a panel of specialists in research, language, and statistics, as it is a questionnaire created for research purposes. Their opinions and suggestions enhanced the validity of the study instrument. Once the necessary modifications were made, the researchers reviewed the

document for finalization. Upon finalization, the researcher requested authorization from Schools Division Superintendent of City Schools Division of Bińan City, to proceed with conducting a pilot test of the research instrument. Following the pilot testing, the researchers enlisted the assistance of a statistician to utilize Cronbach's alpha for the purpose of validating and assessing the consistency of the study instrument. The computed Cronbach's alpha yielded a value of 0.76, which indicated an acceptable level of internal consistency (George & Mallery, 2019). This suggests that the instrument demonstrated reliable and consistent responses, making it suitable for use in the actual data collection phase.

To assess the level of coordination skills and level of digital intelligence of literacy coordinators, and the school reading program performance level, the following measures were used:

Assigned Points	Numerical Ranges	Categorical Responses	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.50 – 4.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
3	2.50 – 3.49	Agree	High
2	1.50 – 2.49	Disagree	Low
1	1.00 – 1.49	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

The researcher sought authorization from the Schools Division Superintendent of Division of Santa Rosa City, to carry out the study. Upon receiving consent from the Schools Division Superintendent, the researchers sought authorization from the school heads of Division of Santa Rosa City to proceed with data collection. The collected data were handled with the highest level of caution, ensuring confidentiality and solely for research purposes. To guarantee the survey's effectiveness, the participants were allotted with enough amount of time to respond to the Google Forms, as it is an internet-based questionnaire that necessitates an internet connection. The researcher's personal contact numbers and email addresses were provided in the letter to the respondents, which will be connected to the Google Forms, to assist them in case they had any inquiries.

3. Results and Discussions

Table 1: Level of Coordination Skills of Literacy Coordinators in the Division of Santa Rosa City

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Communication	3.67	Very High	1
2. Data collection and management	3.31	High	4
3. Teamwork	3.66	Very High	2
4. Planning	3.43	High	3
5. Resource allocation	3.20	High	5
Overall Weighted Mean	3.45	High	

Table 1 showed that communication ranked highest among literacy coordinators in Santa Rosa City (3.67, "Very High"), highlighting its importance in managing literacy programs effectively. Teamwork (3.66, "Very High") and planning (3.43, "High") were also strong skills, with teamwork slightly prioritized over planning. Resource allocation ranked lowest (3.20, "High"), indicating a need for better training and support to enhance resource management and equitable distribution.

The weighted mean of 3.45 ("High") indicated that literacy coordinators in Santa Rosa City recognized the importance of coordination skills in their roles. Jones and Harris (2020) [66] emphasized that effective coordination helps sustain instructional quality, while Glover *et al*. (2021) [45] noted that it improves teaching alignment. Strengthening resource management could further enhance literacy program effectiveness.

Table 2: Level of Digital Intelligence of Literacy Coordinators in the Division of Santa Rosa City

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Digital literacy	3.19	High	3
2. Data analysis	3.14	High	4
3. Digital communication	3.40	High	1
4. Cybersecurity awareness	3.33	High	2
Overall Weighted Mean	3.27	High	

Table 2 showed that digital communication ranked highest among the digital intelligence skills of literacy coordinators in Santa Rosa City, with a weighted mean of 3.40 ("High"), reflecting their strong proficiency in using online platforms for communication and coordination. Cybersecurity awareness ranked second at 3.33 ("High"), indicating that coordinators were aware of cyber threats and protective measures. Data analysis ranked lowest at 3.14 ("High"), highlighting the need for further training to enhance coordinators' ability to analyze and interpret digital data effectively.

The overall weighted mean of 3.27 ("High") indicated that literacy coordinators in Santa Rosa City were highly confident in their digital skills. This aligned with previous studies emphasizing the importance of digital intelligence in education. Koçak *et al*. (2021) [73] defined digital intelligence as the essential skills educators need to navigate the digital landscape effectively. Similarly, Murdoch (2023) [95] highlighted that enhancing teachers' digital intelligence improves their ability to integrate technology into instruction, ultimately benefiting student learning. These findings underscored the need for continuous professional

development to further strengthen digital competencies among educators.

Table 3: Level of Reading Program Performance of Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Santa Rosa City

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Reading intervention	3.49	High	2
2. Recognition and awards	3.33	High	4
3. Innovations	3.16	High	5
4. Activities	3.57	Very High	1
5. Parents' and other stakeholders' involvement	3.47	High	3
Overall Weighted Mean	3.41	High	

Table 3 showed that "Activities" ranked highest (3.57), interpreted as "Very High," reflecting the success of schools in providing engaging reading events like book fairs and competitions. "Reading Intervention" (3.49) and "Involvement of Parents and Stakeholders" (3.47), both interpreted as "Very High," indicated effective support for struggling readers and strong collaboration with families. "Innovations" ranked lowest (3.16), interpreted as "High," highlighting the need for more advanced teaching methods and better use of technology. "Recognition and awards" (3.33), interpreted as "High," also required clearer communication and procedures.

On average, the reading program performance scored 3.41, interpreted as "High," indicating moderate effectiveness in Santa Rosa City public elementary schools' reading programs. Jamshidifarsani (2019) emphasized the impact of technology-based reading interventions, while Jones (2021) [65] highlighted the importance of strategic planning and professional development in improving literacy outcomes. The findings suggested that while schools performed well, improvements in innovation could further enhance reading performance.

Table 4: Relationship between the Level of Coordination Skills and the Level of Digital Intelligence of Literacy Coordinators

Coordination Skills	**Digital Intelligence of Literacy Coordinators**			
	Digital literacy	**Data analysis**	**Digital communication**	**Cybersecurity awareness**
Communication	r=0.177 Low correlation p=0.173	r=0.005 Negligible correlation p=0.969	r=-0.024 Negligible correlation p=0.854	r=0.244 Low correlation p=0.058
Data collection and management	r=-0.075 Negligible correlation p=0.566	r=0.228 Low correlation p=0.077	r=0.027 Negligible correlation p=0.839	r=-0.046 Negligible correlation p=0.723
Teamwork	r=-0.059 Negligible correlation p=0.652	r=-0.037 Negligible correlation p=0.775	r=-0.079 Negligible correlation p=0.546	r=0.084 Negligible correlation p=0.518
Planning	r=0.069 Negligible correlation p=0.599	r=0.005 Negligible correlation p=0.968	r=0.113 Low correlation p=0.387	r=0.114 Low correlation p=0.380
Resource allocation	r=0.213 Low correlation p=0.099	r=0.189 Low correlation p=0.144	r=0.037 Negligible correlation p=0.778	r=0.052 Negligible correlation p=0.693
Significance level @ 0.05				

Table 4 showed the highest correlation between cybersecurity awareness and communication coordination (r = 0.244), indicating a low positive relationship. Moderate correlations were noted between resource management and digital literacy (r = 0.213) and data collection and data analysis (r = 0.228), suggesting that stronger coordination might slightly enhance digital skills. The lowest correlations were negligible, especially between teamwork and digital intelligence, indicating that other factors may influence digital competency development.

Overall, the table revealed low to moderate positive correlations between coordination skills and digital intelligence, with weak overall connections. This suggested that improving coordination skills alone might not significantly enhance digital intelligence among literacy coordinators without targeted interventions. Research by Raju *et al*. (2022) [109] and Hobbs (2023) [58] emphasized the importance of tailored training programs that integrate both coordination and digital skills to foster a stronger digital environment in schools.

Table 5: Relationship between the Level of Coordination Skills and the Level of Reading Program Performance of the Schools

Coordination Skills	Reading Program Performance				
	Reading intervention	**Recognition and awards**	**Innovation**	**Activities**	**Parents' and other stakeholders' involvement**
Communication	r=0.177 Low correlation p=0.173	r=0.171 Low correlation p=0.187	r=0.072 Negligible correlation p=0.579	r=0.307* Low correlation p=0.016	r=0.294* Low correlation p=0.022
Data collection and management	r=0.085 Negligible correlation p=0.517	r=0.085 Negligible correlation p=0.515	r=0.295* Low correlation p=0.021	r=0.017 Negligible correlation p=0.897	r=0.131 Low correlation p=0.315
Teamwork	r=-0.024 Negligible correlation p=0.857	r=0.109 Low correlation p=0.402	r=0.160 Low correlation p=0.219	r=0.130 Low correlation p=0.317	r=0.088 Negligible correlation p=0.499
Planning	r=0.216 Low correlation p=0.095	r=0.255* Low correlation p=0.048	r=0.094 Negligible correlation p=0.473	r=0.120 Low correlation p=0.359	r=0.382** Low correlation p=0.002
Resource allocation	r=0.218 Low correlation p=0.091	r=0.294* Low correlation p=0.022	r=0.047 Negligible correlation p=0.720	r=0.183 Low correlation p=0.159	r=0.364** Low correlation p=0.004
**Significant @ 0.01, *Significant @ 0.05					

Table 5 revealed that planning skills had the strongest correlation with the "activities" aspect of the reading program performance (r = 0.382, p = 0.002), suggesting that effective planning was key to improving reading activities. Moderate correlations were seen between communication skills and stakeholder participation (r = 0.294, p = 0.022), as well as between resource allocation and awards (r = 0.294, p = 0.022), implying these skills had some influence but were less impactful than planning. The lowest correlations, such as teamwork with reading intervention (r = -0.024, p = 0.857) and communication with innovation (r = 0.072, p = 0.579), indicated minimal impact on reading program outcomes.

In general, the table showed that while some coordination skills, particularly planning, had a moderate association with improved reading program performance, most correlations were low to negligible. This suggests that other factors could also be contributing to the overall effectiveness of reading programs. Jamshidifarsani (2019) emphasized the importance of systematic, technology-driven interventions to boost literacy, while Jones (2021) [65] highlighted the role of quality planning and professional development in supporting reading interventions. These findings suggest the need for an integrated approach that combines enhanced coordination with targeted literacy interventions.

Table 6: Relationship between the Level of Digital Intelligence of Literary Coordinators and the Level of Reading Program Performance of Schools

Digital Intelligence	Reading Program Performance				
	Reading intervention	**Recognition and awards**	**Innovation**	**Activities**	**Parents' and other stakeholders' involvement**
Digital literacy	r=0.067 Negligible correlation p=0.606	r=-0.038 Negligible correlation p=0.771	r=0.101 Low correlation p=0.440	r=0.123 Low correlation p=0.347	r=0.092 Negligible correlation p=0.483
Data analysis	r=0.093 Negligible correlation p=0.477	r=0.005 Negligible correlation p=0.968	r=0.293* Low correlation p=0.022	r=-0.026 Negligible correlation p=0.844	r=0.188 Low correlation p=0.146
Digital communication	r=-0.033 Negligible correlation p=0.802	r=0.073 Negligible correlation p=0.578	r=0.071 Negligible correlation p=0.585	r=-0.003 Negligible correlation p=0.980	r=0.080 Negligible correlation p=0.542
Cybersecurity awareness	r=0.091 Negligible correlation p=0.487	r=0.161 Low correlation p=0.215	r=-0.024 Negligible correlation p=0.852	r=0.072 Negligible correlation p=0.583	r=0.225 Low correlation p=0.081
*Significant @ 0.05					

Table 6 revealed that the strongest correlation between digital intelligence and reading program performance was found between data analysis and innovation (r = 0.293, p = 0.022). This suggested that literary coordinators skilled in data analysis were more likely to implement innovative reading strategies effectively. However, most other digital intelligence factors, including digital literacy and communication, showed weak or negligible correlations with reading program components, indicating that while digital skills could assist in reading programs, they were not strong

predictors of overall performance. The lowest correlations, especially in digital literacy and cybersecurity awareness, had minimal or no impact on reading program outcomes, implying that these factors alone did not directly enhance program performance.

Overall, the table showed that the relationship between schools' reading program performance and literary coordinators' digital intelligence was mostly weak, with the strongest link between data analysis and innovation. Jamshidifarsani (2019) highlighted that data-driven, technology-based interventions could improve literacy, while Jones (2021) [65] emphasized the importance of professional development and strategic planning in reading programs. These findings suggest that while digital skills are valuable, targeted efforts, particularly in data analysis, could be more effective in enhancing reading program performance.

Table 7: Regression Analysis of the Level of Coordination Skills and the Level of Digital Intelligence of Literacy Coordinators taken singly or in combination of the Level of Reading Program Performance of the Schools in Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Santa Rosa City

Predictor	Dependent Variable	R^2	F	p-value	β	t	p-value
Coordination skills (overall)	Reading program performance (overall)	0.211	15.763	0.000	0.395	3.970	0.000
*Significant @ 0.05							

Table 7 revealed that coordination skills strongly predicted reading program performance, explaining 21.10% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.211$). The statistical significance ($F = 15.763$, $p = 0.000$) confirmed that coordination skills were an important factor in improving reading programs. The beta coefficient ($\beta = 0.395$) suggested a moderate effect, indicating that while coordination skills contributed to performance, other factors likely accounted for the remaining 78.90% of the variance. This finding emphasized the need to explore additional predictors, such as digital intelligence and instructional methods, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of reading program performance.

Overall, the regression analysis showed that coordination skills were a significant and positive predictor of reading program performance ($\beta = 0.395$, $p < 0.001$), highlighting the importance of effective leadership and planning in education. Studies by Jamshidifarsani (2019) and Jones (2021) [65] emphasized the role of data-informed interventions and teacher coordination in improving reading outcomes. These findings suggest that enhancing coordination skills among literacy coordinators could lead to meaningful improvements in reading programs.

Action Plan

This action plan was developed to enhance the digital intelligence, coordination skills, and overall performance of the reading program in public elementary schools. Data analysis, resource allocation, and innovation were identified as the lowest indicators in the three variables, with ratings of 3.14, 3.20, and 3.16, respectively. Although these areas showed a high level of performance, they also indicated room for improvement. This plan aimed to address these gaps by strengthening these key components, thereby improving the overall effectiveness of the reading program.

Table 8: Proposed Action Plan

Activities	Objectives	Strategies	Persons Involved	Time Frame	Source of Fund	Success Indicator
Organization of seminar, workshop and training on resource allocation	To enhance the resource allocation skills of literacy coordinators	Conduct a seminar, workshop and training on resource allocation	School Head, Literacy Coordinators, Resource Speakers	1st Quarter	School MOOE, External Partners	98% of participants demonstrated improved knowledge in resource.
Creation of School Learning Action Cell	To provide hand-on activity on data analysis skills	Conduct a focal group discussion on data interpretation and analysis	School Head, Literacy Coordinators, Resource Speakers	2nd Quarter	School MOOE, External Partners	98% of participants demonstrated improved data analysis.
Development of Reading Intervention Program	To enhance the ability of literacy coordinators to introduce innovative practices in reading programs	Conduct a workshop on creative and technology-based reading strategies	School Head, Literacy Coordinators, Resource Speakers	3rd Quarter	School MOOE	98% of participants demonstrated improved understanding of innovative reading strategies based on post-test results

4. Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn based on the findings of the study:

- Literacy coordinators in the Santa Rosa City Division exhibit relatively high coordination skills overall, with communication being the most highly rated. Their teamwork capacity is high, which is important for effective management and cooperation.
- Literacy coordinators excel in digital communication but show a need for improvement in data analysis. With a digital intelligence weighted mean of 3.27, the results highlight strong digital knowledge overall yet emphasize the importance of enhancing data analysis skills to better leverage technology in reading programs.
- The performance of public elementary school reading programs is generally positive, with high engagement in reading activities and strong support from reading interventions and stakeholders. However, recognition, awards, and innovations are lower, indicating areas for improvement. With an overall weighted mean of 3.41, the findings suggest that while schools perform well, there is room to enhance innovation and recognition

strategies. The literacy coordinators' level of coordination skills, level of digital intelligence, and level of reading program performance are rated High. Most correlations are low or negligible, indicating that these variables do not strongly influence each other.

- As level of coordination skills and level of digital intelligence increase, the level of reading program performance improves.
- The level of coordination skills significantly predicts reading program performance, accounting for 21.10% of its variance ($R^2 = 0.211$, $p = 0.000$). A one-unit increase in coordination skills leads to a 0.395-unit improvement in reading program performance, highlighting the importance of enhancing coordination skills to drive better program outcomes.
- To enhance literacy coordinators' coordination skills, digital intelligence, and reading program performance, the developed action plan is to be implemented.

5. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made to enhance the level of coordination skills, digital intelligence and reading program performance:

- The Education Program Supervisor in charge of Literacy Development should strengthen coordination skills and digital intelligence by conducting seminars, workshops, training, and other professional development programs to increase capacity in resource management, decision-making, and innovative strategies.
- The principal should allocate a higher budget for the digitalization of governance systems, processes, and activities to enhance the effectiveness of coordination within the school's reading program. This can be achieved by providing modern digital tools, learning platforms, and data management systems that are accessible to all.
- The principal should sponsor, conduct, and require teachers to attend regular training on digital literacy, data analysis, and cybersecurity to maximize the use of technology in reading instruction, ensuring effective and engaging learning experiences for students.
- The principal should implement the proposed action plan to enhance coordination skills, digital intelligence, and reading program performance, supported by regular monitoring and evaluation.
- Future researchers are encouraged to identify other factors affecting reading program performance. Future studies may include variables such as teacher instructional practices, parent involvement strategies, and community support programs. The results of these studies could guide more sophisticated interventions that capture the complexity of reading program success.

6. References

1. Aka N. Response to the critiques of the Aka (2019) article, 'Reading performance of Japanese high school learners following a one-year extensive reading program.' Read Foreign Lang. 2019;31(2):296–301.
2. Al-Alawneh M, *et al*. Gender differences in teamwork skills among university students. [Journal name missing]. 2011.
3. Al-Rahmi WM, Alzahrani AI, Yahaya N, Alalwan N, Kamin YB. Digital communication: Information and communication technology (ICT) usage for education sustainability. Sustainability. 2020;12(12):5052. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12125052
4. Alghamdi AM. Academic leaders' attitudes toward artificial intelligence applications in leadership work in light of the diffusion of innovation theory: The impact of possession of digital literacy. J Educ Leadersh Policy Stud. 2024;8(Spring).
5. Algones BS. Enabling role of the stakeholders in the school-based management process. Countryside Dev Res J. 2019;7(1).
6. Alharbi T, Tassaddiq A. Assessment of cybersecurity awareness among students of Majmaah University. Big Data Cogn Comput. 2021;5(2):23. https://doi.org/10.3390/bdcc5020023
7. Alhusseini HA. The role of digital intelligence in promoting active learning. Educ Inf Technol. 2022;27(2):1435–50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10572-y
8. Almagro R, Flores LC, Amora MV, Bayuot M. Implementation practices of reading programs in elementary education in Davao De Oro: A multiple case study. Int J Res Innov Soc Sci. 2024;8(1):773–94. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.801059
9. Andal JD, Villenes RM. Home learning support and reading performance of the primary pupils in Alat-Alatin ES: Basis for reading intervention program in distance learning settings. Online Submiss. 2024;3(1):69–77.
10. Anjum S. Impact of internship programs on professional and personal development of business students: A case study from Pakistan. Future Bus J. 2020;6(2). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-019-0007-3
11. Aydin KO, Aydin AB. The impact of digital intelligence on student engagement and motivation. Int J Educ Technol High Educ. 2020;17(1):10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00192-5
12. Bagano R, De Guzman J. Strategic planning in educational leadership. MIJRD. 2024.
13. Baker RSJD. Educational data mining: A review of the state of the art. J Educ Data Min. 2020;12(2):1–19. https://doi.org
14. Baker SK, Kennedy PC, Richards D, Nelson NJ, Fien H, Doabler CT. Measuring instructional interactions during reading instruction for students receiving intervention in middle school. J Learn Disabil. 2024;57(5):303–16. https://doi.org/
15. Baker T, Smith L, Green J. The impact of digital recognition platforms on student engagement in literacy. J Educ Technol. 2023;15(2):45–60.
16. Bayram A. The viewpoints of educational managers on educational planning in Turkey. Eur J Educ Stud. 2019;6(7):452. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3528377
17. Bhandari P. Levels of measurement: Nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio. Scribbr. 2020. https://www.scribbr.com
18. Boughzala I. Digital intelligence: A key competence for the future of work. AACSB; 2019 Mar 4. https://www.aacsb.edu
19. Boulton H, McGarr O. Developing data literacy for teachers: A framework for professional development. Technol Pedag Educ. 2022;31(2):197–212. https://doi.org
20. Buchan MC, Bhawra J, Katapally TR. Navigating the digital world: Development of an evidence-based digital

literacy program and assessment tool for youth. Smart Learn Environ. 2024;11(7). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00246-3
21. Burdett J, Hastie M. The impact of academic experience on teamwork skills development. [Journal name missing]. 2009.
22. Burgess HJ, Matar H. Team-based learning in higher education: A systematic review of the literature. [Journal name missing]. 2020.
23. Burton J, *et al*. Emerging trends in teamwork research in education. [Journal name missing]. 2024.
24. Chen L, Chen P, Lin Z. Artificial intelligence in education: A review. IEEE Access. 2021;8:75264–78. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3069887
25. Chen L, Chen P, Lin Z. Artificial intelligence in education: A review. IEEE Access. [Year];[Volume(Issue)]:[Pages]. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9050875
26. Chen PFW, Chiu YH. Assessing digital intelligence competencies in education: Implications for personalized learning. J Educ Technol Syst. 2023;51(1):43–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395211001464
27. Coalition for Digital Intelligence. The DQ Global Standards Report 2019. 2019. https://www.coalitionfordigitalintelligence.org
28. Cohen SG, Bailey DE. What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. [Journal/book name missing]. 2021.
29. Cox DJ, Bobrowski PE. Enhancing teamwork in the classroom: The role of training. [Journal name missing]. 2004.
30. Crossan MM, Apaydin M. A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovation: A systematic review. J Manag Stud. 2019;56(2):113–39.
31. Dela Cruz R. An assessment of cybersecurity policies in Philippine educational institutions. Philipp J Educ Res. 2022;45(1):35–48.
32. Dharma Raja BW. Teachers' role in fostering reading skill: Effective and successful reading. i-manager's J Engl Lang Teach. 2021;11(4).
33. Drachsler H, Greller W. Privacy and ethics in learning analytics: A review of the current state. J Learn Anal. 2020;7(3):1–19. https://doi.org
34. D'Agostino TJ, Guzmán DB, Perrin P, Libertie-Osirus A, Schuenke-Lucien K. Explaining variation in treatment effects: An impact evaluation and mixed-methods study of variation in early grade reading program effects. Comp Educ Rev. 2024;68(1):125–41. https://doi.org/[insert DOI]
35. Egorov A, Platonova E. Strategic planning in higher education. SpringerLink. 2023.
36. Ehlert M, Hebbecker K, Sougley E. Implementing evidence-based practices in reading classrooms – Longitudinal interrelations between teaching-related attitudes, innovation-specific perceptions, and perceived implementation success. Stud Educ Eval. 2022;75:102103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2022.102103
37. Fantauzzi M, *et al*. Sustainability in higher education. SpringerLink. 2021.
38. Fisher D, Frey N, Hattie J. Family literacy and its impact on student motivation. J Educ Res. 2023;115(4):520–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2022.2147890
39. Fuchs LS, Vaughn S. Response to Intervention (RTI) and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) for reading in the primary grades. Int J Educ Psychol. 2020;9(1):27–50.
40. Galanes GJ, *et al*. Cultural influences on teamwork: Individualism versus collectivism. [Journal name missing]. 2004.
41. Gallarin ASI, Mascarenas RML, Dizon GO, Tamayo MY, Cruz JP. Teachers' role and level of awareness on safe internet use and its legal implications in the conduct of online classes during the pandemic. In: Proceedings of the 2022 13th Int Conf E-Educ, E-Bus, E-Manag, and E-Learn. 2022. p. 184–8. https://doi.org/10.1145/3514262.3514278
42. Garcia M, Fretwell K. The influence of teacher recognition on job satisfaction and professional development. Teach Teach Educ. 2022;37(3):123–35.
43. Gatcho ARG, Bautista JC. A literature review on remedial reading teachers: The gaps in the Philippine context. J Engl Teach. 2019;5(2):1063. https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v5i2.1063
44. Gersten R, Haymond K, Newman-Gonchar R, Dimino J, Jayanthi M. Meta-analysis of the impact of reading interventions for students in the primary grades. J Res Educ Eff. 2020;13(2):401–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2019.1689591
45. Glover D, Smith C, Williams M. Collaborative instructional practices: The role of coordination in schools. J Educ Res Pract. 2021.
46. Gorriz J, Simo P. Predictive analytics in education: A systematic review. Int J Educ Technol High Educ. 2021;18(1):1–24. https://doi.org
47. Grant AM, Gino F. The impact of recognition on motivation and performance. J Appl Psychol. 2019;104(1):45–60.
48. Grewal D, Herhausen D, Ludwig S, Villarroel Ordenes F. The future of digital communication research: Considering dynamics and multimodality. J Retail. 2021;98(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2021.01.007
49. Gubbels J, Swart NM, Groen MA. Everything in moderation: ICT and reading performance of Dutch 15-year-olds. Large-Scale Assess Educ. 2020;8(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-020-0079-0
50. Guthrie JT, Hoa LT, Hurst C. The relationship between reading motivation and reading comprehension: A longitudinal study. Read Res Q. 2019;54(3):243–63. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.247
51. Hackman JR, Wageman R. The role of leadership in team effectiveness. 2021.
52. Hall GI, Perker DC, Nelson PM, Putzev SN. Family involvement in elementary reading intervention: Compensatory relations to dosage and tutor-level heterogeneity. Remedial Spec Educ. 2024;45(5):279–91. Available from: https://sagepub.com
53. Harris A, Spillane J. Distributed leadership and the role of coordination in school improvement. Educ Adm Q. 2021.
54. Harris A, Jones M, Ismail N. Distributed leadership: Taking a retrospective and contemporary view of the evidence base. Sch Leadersh Manag. 2022;42(5):438–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2022.2072071
55. Harris SP, Davies RL, Christensen SS, Hanks J, Bowles B. Teacher attrition: Differences in stakeholder perceptions of teacher work conditions. Educ Sci.

2019;9(4):300. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9040300
56. Hattie J, Timperley H. The power of feedback. Rev Educ Res. 2020;77(1):81–112. https://doi.org
57. Hedrick JK, Lemons CJ, Balasubramanian L, Dunaway L. Parent-implemented reading intervention for children with intellectual and developmental disability. Remedial Spec Educ. 2024;45(5):267–78. https://doi.org
58. Hobbs J. Cybersecurity awareness in higher education: A comparative analysis of faculty and staff. Issues Inf Syst. 2023;24(1):159–69. https://doi.org/10.48009/1_iis_2023_114
59. Hobbs J. Examining cybersecurity awareness in higher education: The case for personalized training programs. 2023.
60. Holmes W, Bialik M, Fadel C. Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Educ Technol Soc. 2021;24(1):43–58. https://doi.org
61. Härtel CEJ, *et al*. The role of teamwork in employee engagement and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. 2022.
62. Jehn KA, Mannix EA. The impact of conflict on team performance: A meta-analysis. 2020.
63. Johnson R, Lee S. Targeted awards for underrepresented student groups: Enhancing literacy engagement and performance. Lit Res Instr. 2024;63(1):10–25.
64. Johnson S, White K, Graham M. School-community partnerships: The importance of coordination for student success. Community Engag Educ Rev. 2022.
65. Jones G. An evaluation of one school's reading program to support struggling readers through the use of data [dissertation]. Chicago (IL): National Louis University; 2021. Digital Commons@NLU.
66. Jones L, Harris A. Crisis management in schools: The role of leadership and coordination. Educ Manag Leadersh J. 2020.
67. Judijanto L, Asy'ari F, Setiawan I, Al-Amin. Digital savvy: Building digital intelligence in 21st-century education. Tarbiyatul Ilmu J Kajian Pendidik. 2024;2(6):305–19.
68. Kahu ER, Nelson K. Student engagement in higher education: A systematic review of the literature. Stud High Educ. 2022;47(1):37–57. https://doi.org
69. Khumalo T. Parental involvement in education: The role of school management teams in supporting parents. S Afr J Educ. 2023;43(1):1–10. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v43n1a1933
70. Kim J, Hwang Y. The impact of peer-assisted reading strategies on fluency and comprehension. J Lit Res. 2020;52(1):20–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X19892237
71. Kim Y, Patel R. Inclusivity in recognition practices: A pathway to equitable education. Equity Educ J. 2023;5(1):88–102.
72. King EC. Integrating digital intelligence frameworks in national education standards. J Educ Policy. 2020;35(4):567–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2020.1805641
73. Koçak MMD, *et al*. Digital intelligence: Skills, dimensions, and education. Educ Inf Technol. 2021;26(2):1583–605. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10482-x
74. Krein U, Schiefner-Rohs M. Data in schools: (Changing) practices and blind spots at a glance. Front Educ. 2021;6. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.672666
75. Kucer SB, Silva M. Interactive read-alouds: Fostering engagement and comprehension in early literacy. Lit Teach Learn. 2019;23(2):45–60. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-019-09912
76. Ladson-Billings G. Culturally relevant pedagogy: Implications for reading instruction. J Educ Learn. 2019;8(3):1–12. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v8n3p1
77. Lee S, Lee J, Choi K. The effects of differentiated reading instruction on literacy outcomes: A meta-analysis. Rev Educ Res. 2021;91(2):203–34. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211005801
78. Li J, Zhang W. Coordinating inclusive education: Challenges and strategies for educators. Int J Incl Educ. 2022.
79. Liao H, Hao G, Yasmeen R, Shah WUH. Evaluation of educational resource utilization efficiency, regional technological heterogeneity, and total factor productivity change in 35 European countries. PLoS One. 2024;19(1):e0295979. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0295979
80. Liu SKM. Proactive approaches to digital intelligence in education. Comput Educ. 2021;165:104143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104143
81. Llarena ZG. Exploring the roles of school heads in the implementation of reading programs. EPRA Int J Multidiscip Res. 2023;9(4). https://doi.org/10.36713/epra12848
82. Lorenzana JA, Soriano CRR. Introduction: The dynamics of digital communication in the Philippines: Legacies and potentials. Media Int Aust. 2021;179(1):3–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X211010868
83. Lozano-Rodríguez T, *et al*. Teamwork skills and academic performance: A Mexican perspective. 2020.
84. Lucero NE. Managing the implementation and evaluation of the school reading program. Asian J Educ Soc Stud. 2019;5(4):1–10. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2019/v5i430151
85. Luik P, Lepp M. Local and external stakeholders affecting educational change during the coronavirus pandemic: A study of Facebook messages in Estonia. Educ Sci. 2021;11(3):113. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11030113
86. Malone TW. What is coordination theory? (SSM WP #2051-88). Cambridge (MA): Massachusetts Institute of Technology; 1988.
87. Marcos MJM. Intervention materials in reading in English for Grade 4 learners. Online Submiss. 2024;4(1):65–75. https://doi.org
88. Marmoah S, Gestiardi R, Sarwanto S, Chumdari C, Maryani I. A bibliometric analysis of collaboration skills in education (2019–2021). J Educ Learn (EduLearn). 2022;16(4):542–51. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v16i4.20337
89. Marnewick C, Marnewick A. Digital intelligence: A must-have for project managers. Proj Leadersh Soc. 2021;2:100026. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plas.2021.100026
90. Martinez A, Thompson H, Wilson J. Long-term effects of recognition on students' attitudes towards literacy. J Lit Res. 2021;53(4):456–72.
91. Marzouk A, Shabaan H. The effectiveness of learning management systems in enhancing data analysis for instructional design. Interact Learn Environ. 2023;31(3):548–63. https://doi.org

92. McGuier EA, Kolko DJ, Aarons GA, Schachter A, Klem ML, Diabes MA, *et al*. Teamwork and implementation of innovations in healthcare and human service settings: A systematic review. Implement Sci. 2024;19:49. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-024-01344-w
93. Mejia JR. Early language reading interventions and reading skills of elementary grade one pupils in Zambales, Philippines. Int J Multidiscip Appl Bus Educ Res. 2024;5(3):829–37.
94. Muhaimin A. Reading, mind mapping, and sharing (RMS): Innovation of new learning model on science lecture to improve understanding concepts. Year. 2019;7(2):333–40. https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.570501
95. Murdoch JT. The significance of digital intelligence in teacher training programs. J Digit Learn Teach Educ. 2023;39(2):123–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2023.2182005
96. Northouse PG. Leadership: Theory and Practice. 9th ed. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications; 2021.
97. Opoku M, Afful-Broni A, Donkor F. External stakeholders' support for inclusive education: Insights from primary schools in Ghana. J Incl Educ. 2023;27(1):15–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2023.2023161
98. Orivida AM, Nabos JQ. Teachers' digital literacy and pedagogical integration of information and communication technology in teaching: Basis for a training program. Ignatian Int J Multidiscip Res. 2024;2(6). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11503539
99. Otani K. Parental involvement and academic achievement: A focus on school level, gender, and subject. Int J Educ Res. 2019;96:103–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.05.006
100. Paraiso JP. Stakeholders' involvement in school-based programs of Gosoon Elementary School, Carmen, Agusan Del Norte. Int J Novel Res Educ Learn. 2022;3(3):187–212.
101. Park S, *et al*. The impact of teamwork learning on academic performance. [Journal name]. 2015.
102. Pathways to College Network. Using data to improve educational outcomes [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2025 Apr 15]. Available from: https://www.pathwaystocollege.net
103. Perdue MV, Mahaffy K, Vlachvevic K, Wolfman E, Erbeli F, Richlan F, *et al*. Reading intervention and neuroplasticity: A systematic review and meta-analysis of brain changes associated with reading intervention. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2022;132:465–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.11.011
104. Perez MLT, Rodriguez RJT. Development of PISA-like reading comprehension test. Int J Knowl Manag Pract. 2023;2(1):14–28.
105. Perez M, Thomas L. Digital tools for school coordination: Enhancing collaboration in remote learning environments. Technol Educ Q. 2021.
106. Perkins R, Dizon J. Formative assessment in reading instruction: A practical approach. Read Improv. 2022;59(1):45–52. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327930pje1101_5
107. Pruett J, *et al*. The impact of digital collaboration tools on team dynamics. [Journal name]. 2023.
108. Puniatmaja GA, Parwati NN, Tegeh IM, Sudatha IGW. The effect of e-learning and students' digital literacy towards their learning outcomes. Pegem J Educ Instr. 2024;14(1):348–56. https://www.pegegog.net
109. Raju A, *et al*. Cybersecurity awareness among students in higher education institutions: A study on UiTM Terengganu. [Journal name]. 2022.
110. Ramos S, Velez P. The digital transformation of school coordination: Lessons from the pandemic. J Educ Technol. 2020.
111. Rasinski TV, Young C. Reading fluency: Understanding and teaching this complex skill. In: Morawski E, editor. Perspectives on Reading. [Place unknown]: [Publisher unknown]; 2020. p. 144–59.
112. Renaissance Learning. What is digital literacy and why does it matter? [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2025 Apr 15]. Available from: https://www.renaissance.com
113. Ridho MR, Lesmana I, Safitri HDA, Meirani RK, Prestiadi D. Digital leadership in the scope of education. In: Wiyono BB, *et al*., editors. ICEMT 2022, ASSEHR. 2023;727:52–61. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-95-4_7
114. Robinson CD, Gallus J, Lee MG, Rogers T. The demotivating effect (and unintended message) of awards. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process. 2021;163:51–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.03.006
115. Robinson C, Peters E, Scott L. Engaging parents through recognition: The impact of awards on family involvement in literacy. Int J Educ Manag. 2024;38(2):200–15.
116. Robles MM. "Ups and downs" and "ins and outs" of organizational communication. Bus Commun Res Pract. 2020;3(1):1–3. https://doi.org/10.22682/bcrp.2020.3.1.1
117. Rodríguez-Gómez G, *et al*. Teamwork skills in higher education: Is university training contributing to their mastery? [Journal name]. 2018.
118. Rojas A, Cárdenas R. Digital storytelling as a tool for enhancing reading comprehension in middle school students. Comput Educ. 2021;174:104176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104176
119. Sagiroglu S, Sinanc D. Big Data: A review. J Inf Sci Eng. 2020;36(1):1–48.
120. Salas E, *et al*. The science of teamwork: A historical perspective. [Journal name]. 2020.
121. Salva RVR. Human relations and instructional leadership behavior of the subject area coordinators of the high school department in a private sectarian university. Int J Integr Educ. 2021;4(5). https://doi.org/10.31149/ijie.v4i5.1772
122. Samosa RC, Decopano MDG, Gregorio KJB, Managawa MMC, Omlang MG. Cartoon cum strategic intervention material to improve learners' making meaning of a text. Online Submiss. 2021;5(12):121–5.
123. Singer PW, Friedman A. Cybersecurity and Cyberwar: What Everyone Needs to Know. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2019.
124. Sisk VF. Developing collaborative skills through team-based learning. [Journal name]. 2011.
125. Slade S, Prinsloo P. Learning analytics: The ethics of data use in education. Comput Human Behav. 2021;113:106484. https://doi.org
126. Smith EE, Storrs H. Digital literacies, social media, and undergraduate learning: What do students think they need to know? Int J Educ Technol High Educ. 2023;20(29). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00394-7
127. Smith J, Garcia T, Chan K. School-wide literacy awards:

Impact on student performance and community engagement. Educ Res Q. 2023;45(2):35–50.
128. Smith J, Johnson L, Thompson M. Teacher professional development in reading instruction: Impacts on student outcomes. Prof Dev Educ. 2020;46(4):569–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2020.1723921
129. Smith K, Young VM. A new narrative: How unlocking the power of R&D through inclusive innovation can transform education. Digital Promise; 2024. https://digitalpromise.org
130. Solovieva OV, Palieva NA, Borozinets NM, Kozlovskaya GY, Prilepko JV. Development of digital intelligence among participants of inclusive educational process. Propósitos Represent. 2020;8(SPE2):e675. https://doi.org/10.20511/pyr2020.v8nSPE2.675
131. Soomro KA, Kale U, Curtis R, Akcaoglu M, Bernstein M. Digital divide among higher education faculty. Int J Educ Technol High Educ. 2020;17(21). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00191-5
132. Southeastern Oklahoma State University. How principals can use data to inform school improvement. Southeastern Oklahoma State University; 2021 Aug 4. https://www.se.edu
133. Taganas RI, Jancinal RA. Lived experiences of reading coordinators in handling grade 7 struggling readers: A phenomenological inquiry. Cogniz J Multidiscip Stud. 2024;4(3):81–9. https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2024.v04i03.008
134. Taylor M, Larson P. Multidisciplinary teams in inclusive education: Coordinating efforts for student success. J Spec Educ Leadersh. 2019.
135. Thompson G, Adams R. The role of intrinsic motivation in literacy engagement: Effects of recognition. Educ Psychol Rev. 2022;34(2):345–60.
136. Ton LKDT, Thao HHM. Teaching digital ethics: A necessity for digital intelligence. Comput Educ. 2019;128:224–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.09.012
137. Van der Vegt GS, Bunderson JS. Learning and performance in teams: The role of cultural diversity. 2022.
138. Verso F. 5 reasons why coordination in education is crucial for student success. 2023 Aug 12. https://querianson.com
139. Verčič D, Špoljarić A. Digital communication and corporate social responsibility: New challenges in communication management. Public Relat Rev. 2020;46(2):209–17.
140. Wages AS. A case of arts coordination in a rural school district: A distributed perspective [dissertation]. Clemson University; 2019. https://open.clemson.edu/all_dissertations/2512
141. Walter Y. Embracing the future of artificial intelligence in the classroom: The relevance of AI literacy, prompt engineering, and critical thinking in modern education. Int J Educ Technol High Educ. 2024;21(15). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00404-w
142. Wang L, Wu Q. The impact of data visualization on students' engagement in learning. Interact Learn Environ. 2020;28(5):635–48.
143. Wang THZ, *et al*. Parental involvement and its impact on children's digital intelligence development. Fam Relat. 2022;71(1):152–67. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12662
144. Wang X, Li Y, Zhang J. Awards and motivation in literacy: Effects on student engagement and self-esteem. J Educ Psychol. 2021;113(3):480–92.
145. Wariyo LG. Building college readiness: Theories and practices. Open Educ. 2021;25(3):62–71. https://doi.org/10.21686/1818-4243-2021-3-62-71
146. Wilder S. Effects of parental involvement on academic achievement: A meta-synthesis. In: Mapping the Field. 1st ed. Routledge; 2023. p. 21.
147. Willis J, Krausen K, Caparas R, Taylor T. Resource allocation strategies to support the four domains for rapid school improvement. The Center on School Turnaround at WestEd. n.d. https://www.wested.org
148. Yaco-Noche A. Reading management program for junior high school English coordinators in Batangas Province. Int J Adv Res Publ. 2019;3(5):110. https://www.ijarp.org
149. Yeke S. Digital intelligence as a partner of emotional intelligence in business administration. Asia Pac Manag Rev. 2023;28(4):390–400. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2023.01.001
150. You T. The influence of educational big data visualization on students' learning initiative. J Educ Technol Dev Exch. 2024;17(2):118–33. https://doi.org/10.18785/jetde.1702.02
151. Zagerman J. The role of the project manager: Communication is key. Harrisburg University; 2020 May 21. https://www.harrisburgu.edu
152. Zainuddin NSB, *et al*. The correlation between digital intelligence and academic performance. J Educ Psychol. 2023;115(3):509–23. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000633
153. Zhang L, Wong Y. Coordinating external partnerships in schools: Impact on school climate and student outcomes. Int J Educ Dev. 2023.
154. Zhang QYZ, *et al*. Integrating artificial intelligence and virtual reality in education: Implications for digital intelligence. Educ Technol Res Dev. 2023;71(2):217–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10245-3