Edukasi Islami: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, VOL: 15/No: 04 **P-ISSN: 2252-8970**
DOI: 10.30868/ei.v15i04.11076 **E-ISSN: 2581-1754**

Date Received	**:**	**October 2026**
Date Revised	**:**	**November 2026**
Date Accepted	**:**	**November 2026**
Date Published	**:**	**November 2026**

PRINCIPALS' MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN STRENGTHENING STUDENTS' READING LITERACY CULTURE: A COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY OF TWO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN JAKARTA

Shantyaswari Prihandini[1]
Universitas Islam Nusantara, Indonesia (41038104221096@uninus.ac.id)

Hilman Farouq Ghoer
Universitas Islam Nusantara, Indonesia (hilmanfarouq@uninus.ac.id)

Kata Kunci:
Budaya Membaca; Kepala Sekolah; Manajemen Pendidikan; Literasi Membaca; Sekolah Dasar.

ABSTRAK

Latar Belakang: Literasi membaca mendukung proses belajar, tetapi budaya membaca berkelanjutan memerlukan pengelolaan sekolah yang menghubungkan prioritas dengan praktik pembelajaran. **Tujuan**: Penelitian ini menganalisis manajemen kepala sekolah dalam memperkuat budaya literasi membaca di SDN Sungai Bambu 05 dan SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang, Jakarta, berdasarkan fungsi perencanaan, pengorganisasian, pelaksanaan, dan pengendalian (POAC). **Metode**: Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan desain studi kasus instrumental. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara semi-terstruktur, observasi, dan analisis dokumen yang melibatkan kepala sekolah, wakil kepala sekolah, pengawas, dan guru. Analisis POAC digunakan untuk membandingkan pola manajemen kedua sekolah. **Hasil**: Kedua sekolah mengintegrasikan membaca dalam pembelajaran, membentuk tim literasi, mengalokasikan waktu, dan menyediakan bahan bacaan. SDN Sungai Bambu 05 memadukan rutinitas membaca sepuluh menit sebelum pembelajaran dengan diskusi buku, presentasi, dan literasi digital. SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang menerapkan rutinitas membaca 10–15 menit dan program mingguan Jumat Ceria melalui kegiatan bercerita dan membaca puisi. Evaluasi mencakup survei minat baca, tes literasi, rapat, dan umpan balik warga sekolah. **Kesimpulan**: Keberlanjutan budaya membaca berkaitan dengan keterhubungan arah kepemimpinan, kapasitas organisasi, praktik literasi yang didukung guru, dan penggunaan umpan balik dalam perencanaan. Sintesis POAC menjelaskan keterkaitan antarfungsi manajemen, tetapi temuan pada kedua sekolah tidak membuktikan pengaruh kausal terhadap kemampuan membaca peserta didik.

[1] Correspondence author: 41038104221096@uninus.ac.id

Keywords:
Elementary School; Educational Management; Principal Management; Reading Culture; Reading Literacy.

ABSTRACT

Background: Reading literacy supports students' learning, while a sustainable reading culture requires school management that connects institutional priorities with instructional practice. **Purpose**: This study examines principals' management practices in strengthening reading literacy culture at SDN Sungai Bambu 05 and SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang, Jakarta, through Planning, Organizing, Actuating, and Controlling (POAC). **Methods**: This qualitative study employed an instrumental case study design. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, observation, and document analysis involving principals, vice principals, school supervisors, and teachers. The POAC framework guided comparison across the schools. **Results**: Both schools integrated reading into classroom learning, established literacy teams, allocated reading time, and provided reading materials. SDN Sungai Bambu 05 combined a ten-minute pre-lesson routine with book discussions, presentations, and digital literacy. SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang implemented a 10–15-minute routine and the weekly Jumat Ceria program, featuring storytelling and poetry reading. Evaluation involved reading-interest surveys, literacy tests, meetings, and stakeholder feedback. **Conclusion**: Sustaining reading culture is associated with connections among leadership direction, organizational capacity, teacher-supported practices, and feedback in subsequent planning. The POAC synthesis explains the interrelationship of management functions in these cases; however, the findings do not establish causal effects on students' reading proficiency in elementary school management.

A. INTRODUCTION

Reading literacy is a foundational capability through which learners access curricular knowledge, interpret information, develop disciplinary understanding, and participate in social life. It is not limited to accurate word recognition: proficient readers connect information across a text, infer meanings, evaluate claims, and reflect on how language shapes understanding. These demands have become more complex as children encounter printed books, classroom materials, online texts, and multimodal information. Research on reading development consequently distinguishes foundational decoding from comprehension and engagement, while emphasizing that progress in one area does not automatically guarantee progress in the others (Aukerman & Chambers Schuldt, 2021; Crawford et al., 2024; Keogh & McGillicuddy, 2025; Khoeriyah et al., 2021). For elementary schools, the challenge is to make reading both an explicit instructional priority and a recurring practice embedded in the life of the school.

A reading culture develops through the interaction of learners' motivation, access to meaningful texts, instructional support, and social expectations about reading. Regular reading time can provide repeated contact with texts, but frequency alone does not establish whether students comprehend, evaluate, or enjoy what they read. Opportunities to discuss books, explain interpretations, encounter varied genres, and receive appropriate guidance can give routine reading a clearer educational purpose. Research on reading engagement highlights the importance of attending to what students read, how they participate, and the social conditions that sustain engagement (Lee et al., 2021). Evidence from elementary reading interventions also indicates that fluency and comprehension require purposeful instructional design rather than exposure to texts alone (Cockerill et al., 2023; Gomes & Hirata, 2025; Kim et al., 2023,

2024). The implication for school management is that literacy activities need to be organized around educational aims, not simply counted as completed events.

School leadership matters because literacy instruction depends on conditions that extend beyond the work of an individual classroom teacher. Principals can establish priorities, allocate time and resources, coordinate staff, support professional learning, and create opportunities to review implementation. Research on instructional leadership generally finds meaningful associations between leadership practices and student outcomes, although the strength and pathways of these relationships vary across contexts and research designs (Pietsch et al., 2025; Shen & Wu, 2025). Studies have also examined how leadership is connected with student achievement through teacher commitment, collaborative culture, self-efficacy, and professional practices (Kılınç et al., 2023; Li et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2022, 2025). These findings suggest that leadership should not be treated as a direct substitute for teaching; rather, it shapes organizational and professional conditions through which teaching and learning may improve.

The relationship between leadership and literacy is particularly important because reading instruction requires coordination among curriculum priorities, teacher expertise, student needs, and learning resources. Research on principals' leadership for literacy has examined how school leaders develop their knowledge and enact practices that support reading instruction (Stein et al., 2024). Other studies have connected leader support with teacher self-efficacy, classroom emotional climate, and students' literacy skills (Jensen et al., 2025), or examined teacher professional learning as a link between perceived instructional leadership and instructional practice (Dorukbaşi & Cansoy, 2024). Evidence on shared and distributed leadership further indicates that responsibility for instructional improvement can be spread across leaders and teachers, provided that collaboration is purposeful and supported (Kılınç et al., 2023; Kılınç & Zepeda, 2026). At the same time, school-wide mandates may interact uneasily with teacher autonomy, particularly when literacy expectations are imposed without adequate professional support (Gawne, 2023). Leadership for literacy therefore involves both setting direction and enabling teachers to exercise informed professional judgment.

These questions have direct relevance to Indonesian elementary education. National education and library legislation establishes a broad policy basis for developing reading, writing, educational participation, and public access to library resources (Republic of Indonesia, 2003, 2007). The School Literacy Movement (Gerakan Literasi Sekolah, GLS) has further encouraged schools to make literacy part of everyday educational practice, including through reading routines and integration across learning activities. Indonesian research offers a context-specific foundation for examining these intentions. Marmoah et al. (2022) investigate literacy-culture management in Indonesian elementary schools, while Fadillah & Istikomah (2021) discuss strategies for building school literacy culture. Suriagiri (2022) addresses educational leadership in relation to the School Literacy Movement. Taken together, these studies establish the importance of school organization and leadership, while leaving room for closer examination of how management functions connect across planning, role distribution, daily instructional enactment, and evaluation within particular school settings. A comparative process perspective makes it possible to

examine not only which literacy activities are present, but also how organizational arrangements sustain or differentiate their implementation.

Recent Indonesian studies also draw attention to the professional and organizational conditions that may influence school-level implementation. Ghufron et al. (2024) examine teachers' personal and professional resources in relation to school-based human-resource management in elementary education, while Hambali et al. (2024) investigate factors associated with the performance of public elementary-school principals. Aliyyah et al. (2026) consider teachers' perspectives on implementing a digital-literacy curriculum in elementary schools. Kusumawati and Umam (2025) focus on strengthening teacher competence for implementing and sustaining the Merdeka Curriculum. Extending this discussion to collaborative literacy practices, Syam et al. (2025) examine a teacher–librarian collaboration model in which joint planning, project-based literacy activities, and regular evaluation support the integration of literacy learning into elementary-school practice. Minsih et al. (2025) examine the integration of cultural literacy into elementary science learning. Although these studies address different aspects of education, together they foreground a common issue: school programs depend on the alignment of leadership, teacher capacity, curricular practice, and available resources. Digital and cultural literacy can broaden the scope of literacy education, but they do not replace the need to develop students' reading comprehension and sustained engagement with texts.

International evidence reinforces the need to interpret leadership in relation to context rather than assume that a single model operates identically across schools. Studies using cross-national or large-scale data have examined how leadership relates to achievement gaps, school context, and student outcomes (Gümüş et al., 2022; Kemethofer et al., 2023; Pongsophon, 2024). Research based on PISA 2022 data has also explored links among educational leadership, school actions to sustain learning, digital self-efficacy, and reading achievement (Aydemir & Fidan, 2026; Aydemir & Şahin, 2026). These studies provide comparative evidence about associations, but they do not by themselves show how principals coordinate the practical elements of literacy programs in the everyday life of individual schools. Qualitative case comparison can illuminate these processes and the meanings attached to them, while remaining attentive to the contextual and non-causal scope of its findings.

The principal's management role is analyzed through George R. Terry's management functions, commonly represented as Planning, Organizing, Actuating, and Controlling (POAC) (Terry, 1982). Planning concerns the articulation of literacy priorities and the identification of activities and resources; organizing concerns the distribution of responsibilities and coordination; actuating concerns leadership, guidance, and the implementation of planned activities; and controlling concerns monitoring, feedback, and adjustment. POAC is particularly useful for this inquiry because it directs attention to the connected management processes through which a school-wide priority becomes an organized and recurring practice. Instructional leadership and distributed leadership offer important perspectives on pedagogical influence and shared responsibility (Kılınç et al., 2023; Kılınç & Zepeda, 2026; Stein et al., 2024), whereas POAC provides an integrative structure for tracing how priorities, people, activities, and review relate within each case. It is therefore used as an analytical framework, not as an assumption that the four functions operate in a simple linear sequence. Literacy management is iterative: evaluation may prompt a change in

materials or schedules, while implementation may reveal the need to revise plans or redistribute responsibilities.

The study focuses on SDN Sungai Bambu 05 and SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang in Jakarta, examining two school settings in which literacy management is expressed through shared organizational components as well as distinctive activities. The comparison is analytically relevant because both schools establish literacy teams, allocate reading time, integrate literacy into school practice, and review implementation, yet they organize particular activities differently. At SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang, the weekly Jumat Ceria program adds a school-specific form of oral and expressive engagement to daily reading, while SDN Sungai Bambu 05 combines its daily routine with book discussion, presentation, and digital literacy activities. Preliminary information reported by the schools indicated that most students had reached the minimum competency level in reading literacy, although some remained below it. This information provides context for examining school management; it is not treated as a comparable outcome measure or evidence that particular activities caused achievement outcomes.

The study asks how principals plan, organize, implement, and evaluate initiatives intended to strengthen students' reading literacy culture, and how these practices compare across the two schools. Its contribution is a contextual account of the POAC cycle and a cross-case interpretation of the relationships among leadership direction, organizational capacity, recurring literacy practices, and evidence-informed adjustment. The inquiry concerns general elementary-school literacy management; its relevance to the field of Islamic education lies in the broader educational responsibility to organize learning environments that support knowledge development and students' intellectual formation, rather than in an examination of specifically religious literacy practices.

B. METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach with an instrumental case study design to examine principals' management of reading literacy culture at SDN Sungai Bambu 05 and SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang in Jakarta. The cases were examined in depth and then considered comparatively to illuminate the broader issue of principal management rather than to represent Indonesian elementary schools statistically (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2018). The comparative design makes it possible to identify management processes shared by the two schools as well as context-specific arrangements, while retaining each school as a distinct case.

Participants comprised principals, vice principals, school supervisors, and teachers who had knowledge of or involvement in literacy planning, implementation, and evaluation. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, observation, and document analysis. Interviews addressed leadership priorities, allocation of responsibilities, teacher support, literacy activities, resources, and evaluation. Observation provided contextual information about school environments and literacy routines, while document analysis supplied information concerning program planning and implementation. These sources offered complementary perspectives on the management process and supported interpretation of the cases in relation to their organizational contexts (Creswell & Poth, 2024; Patton, 2015).

Data analysis was guided by the Planning, Organizing, Actuating, and Controlling (POAC) framework. Information concerning literacy objectives, planned activities, and resources was interpreted under planning; role allocation and coordination under organizing; the enactment of reading routines and related activities under actuating; and monitoring, feedback, and program adjustment under controlling. The analysis proceeded through data organization, identification of recurring patterns, comparison of information obtained through interviews, observations, and documents, and interpretation of similarities and differences between the cases. This iterative movement between data condensation, display, and conclusion development follows the qualitative analytical principles described by Miles et al. (2020). Cross-case interpretation distinguished common management arrangements from school-specific practices and treated evidence of program implementation separately from claims about student literacy outcomes. The resulting account is therefore an interpretation of the management processes represented in the available data, not a measurement of the independent effect of those processes on reading achievement.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Planning Literacy Programs

Planning was a foundational component of the principals' efforts to strengthen reading culture in both schools. The emphasis on a shared vision and coordinated activities is consistent with research that treats literacy management as an organizational process rather than a discrete instructional event (Marmoah et al., 2022; Suriagiri, 2022). At SDN Sungai Bambu 05, the planning process involved school personnel, teachers, and the school committee. The principal established a vision and mission that positioned literacy as an integral element of education and developed activities intended to make reading a routine part of students' learning experiences. This arrangement places literacy within the school's broader educational direction and creates a basis for coordination between school-level priorities and classroom activity.

The school's planning included integrating reading activities across subjects so that literacy would not be limited to an additional or extracurricular program. Teachers were expected to include reading in classroom learning, while annual school plans established short- and longer-term targets for improving students' reading skills. The plan also addressed access to reading resources through library collections and classroom reading corners. Teacher training and professional development were considered necessary to help teachers implement literacy activities effectively.

At SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang, the principal similarly emphasized literacy in the school's vision and planning and involved students, teachers, and parents in supporting agreed objectives. The school planned curriculum-related literacy activities and teacher training, alongside daily reading routines and the weekly "Jumat Ceria" program. Activities were intended to reflect students' interests and encourage participation. The planning approach therefore combined policy direction, classroom integration, school-wide routines, and stakeholder involvement.

These findings are consistent with Terry's POAC framework, in which planning establishes objectives and determines the actions and resources needed to achieve them. They also align with the policy direction of the School Literacy Movement and the Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation No. 23 of 2015 on Character Development. Leadership research indicates that improvement priorities become more

actionable when leaders connect goals to teaching practices, staff learning, and context-sensitive support (Agirdag & Muijs, 2023; Meyer & Richter, 2025; Stein et al., 2024). The comparison suggests that the two schools share a strategic commitment to reading but translate that commitment into different program configurations. SDN Sungai Bambu 05 places visible emphasis on cross-subject integration and the development of reading skills through classroom activity, while SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang combines curriculum-related planning with a recurring school-wide event. These approaches are not mutually exclusive; they illustrate how a common literacy priority can be adapted to local routines. In both cases, the connection between stated goals, teacher learning, accessible texts, and feasible schedules is central to making planning operational.

Organizing Literacy Resources and Responsibilities

At SDN Sungai Bambu 05, organizing involved allocating time for literacy, assigning competent teachers to literacy activities, and coordinating school-wide implementation. The literacy team supported activities inside and outside the classroom. Selection of team members considered teachers' competence and commitment, while training was intended to strengthen teachers' ability to use effective literacy strategies. Daily reading and literacy discussions were scheduled to build continuity.

At SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang, the principal formed a School Literacy Movement team whose responsibilities included preparing reading materials, coordinating regular reading activities, and supporting program evaluation. Responsibilities were distributed among team members, and dedicated literacy time was allocated flexibly according to classroom conditions. The team also communicated the purpose and benefits of literacy to students, teachers, and parents, helping to build a shared understanding of the program.

Organizing therefore involves more than establishing a committee: it connects literacy goals to workable roles, schedules, coordination, and professional support. Research on distributed and shared instructional leadership similarly emphasizes that collaborative structures matter when they strengthen teachers' professional learning and instructional work (Hsieh et al., 2026; Kılınç et al., 2023; Kılınç & Zepeda, 2026; Ratnawulan et al., 2025). The POAC perspective clarifies how a literacy team can connect school-level priorities with classroom practice, while research on Indonesian elementary education underscores the importance of aligning school-based human-resource management with teachers' professional resources and development needs (Ghufron et al., 2024).

The two cases show different emphases in how this coordination is organized. At SDN Sungai Bambu 05, team formation is associated with teacher competence and commitment and with coordination of activities inside and outside classrooms. At SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang, the literacy team's responsibilities explicitly include preparing reading materials, coordinating routines, and supporting evaluation, alongside communication with students and parents. The distinction concerns the configuration of responsibilities rather than the presence or absence of organizational capacity: both schools use a team structure, but the reported functions foreground different aspects of implementation.

The practical value of these structures depends on the conditions in which teachers work. Where reading materials, suitable spaces, or relevant expertise are

limited, assigning responsibilities alone is unlikely to produce consistent implementation. Resource provision and teacher development are therefore part of the organizational capacity needed to carry out the program. Teacher competence in this context encompasses selecting texts appropriate to students' age and reading levels, guiding comprehension and discussion, supporting oral and written responses, adapting tasks to different abilities, and using assessment information to inform instruction. These are analytical dimensions of the professional work implied by the activities described in the two schools, rather than claims that each competency was independently measured in this study. Leadership can establish common expectations and provide coordination while leaving teachers room to adapt text selection and learning activities to classroom needs.

Actuating Literacy Activities

Implementation at SDN Sungai Bambu 05 included a daily ten-minute reading routine before lessons, access to the school library and classroom reading corners, book discussions, reading presentations, and digital literacy activities. These activities encouraged students to engage with texts and communicate their understanding. The principal also met with the literacy team to review implementation and obtain feedback about students' progress.

At SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang, students participated in daily reading for approximately 10–15 minutes, using books selected to reflect their age and interests. Reading corners were provided in classrooms to make materials accessible. The weekly "Jumat Ceria" program gave students opportunities to tell stories or read poetry in front of their peers. Teachers were also encouraged to use interactive and creative approaches to make literacy learning engaging.

These practices show how principals can turn a formal plan into recurring school routines. The range of activities matters because a reading culture involves more than silent reading: discussion, presentation, storytelling, and poetry reading can create opportunities for comprehension, expression, and peer engagement. Nevertheless, frequency and duration should not be treated as equivalent to reading quality. A ten-minute routine may establish regular contact with texts, but the educational value of that time also depends on whether students can understand the text, make inferences, explain ideas, and respond to others. Research on fluency, comprehension, and sustained content literacy interventions suggests that structured instructional support is important if engagement is to be connected with reading development (Cockerill et al., 2023; Gomes & Hirata, 2025; Kim et al., 2023, 2024). Digital literacy adds another dimension by connecting literacy development with contemporary media, although digital resources need to remain aligned with educational objectives (Aydemir & Şahin, 2026; Zhang et al., 2023).

These practices illustrate the actuating function of POAC: leadership becomes consequential when planned priorities are translated into supported routines. This interpretation is consistent with Marmoah et al. (2022), who emphasize principals' role in motivating teachers and supporting literacy development. The comparison also highlights different pathways from planning to enactment. SDN Sungai Bambu 05 combines a shorter daily reading period with discussion, presentation, and digital literacy, whereas SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang combines a somewhat longer daily period with a weekly opportunity for storytelling and poetry reading. The distinctive

Jumat Ceria activity broadens the forms through which students encounter and express texts; its presence, however, should be understood as evidence of a particular school practice, not by itself as proof of increased reading motivation or comprehension. In both schools, the educational significance of routines depends on teacher guidance, text suitability, and opportunities to engage meaningfully with what is read.

Evaluating and Improving Literacy Programs

At SDN Sungai Bambu 05, evaluation included periodic reviews of daily and weekly literacy activities, reading-interest surveys, and literacy tests. The principal worked with teachers and the literacy team to review students' reading development, identify barriers, and discuss possible adjustments. Feedback informed decisions such as diversifying reading materials and modifying activities. Evaluation results were also used as a reference for planning subsequent programs.

At SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang, the principal and literacy team reviewed student participation and reading interest, sought feedback from teachers, and considered input from students and parents. Monthly evaluation meetings provided a forum to discuss progress and determine corrective actions. The school also used evaluation to establish new literacy targets and adapt activities to changing needs.

These practices reflect the controlling component of POAC, in which implementation is reviewed in relation to program objectives and adjustments are considered when needed. Research on progress monitoring and data-based decision-making shows the value of using evidence to identify students' needs and guide subsequent instruction (Kaizu & Tamaki, 2024; Pongsophon, 2024). Evaluation is therefore not limited to judging a program at its conclusion; it can inform ongoing decisions about content, scheduling, resources, and teacher support. The indicators mentioned in the two cases serve distinct purposes: participation provides information about students' involvement in activities; reading-interest surveys address reported dispositions or preferences; and literacy tests provide information about assessed reading skills, depending on the content of the instrument. These indicators cannot be treated as interchangeable measures of reading culture or reading proficiency.

The evaluation practices show how feedback can inform changes to reading materials, activities, and subsequent planning. At SDN Sungai Bambu 05, reviews of activities, reading-interest surveys, and literacy tests are described alongside discussion of barriers and possible adjustments, including diversification of reading materials and modification of activities. At SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang, review of participation and interest is connected with teacher, student, and parent feedback and monthly evaluation meetings. The comparison points to different emphases in the information used for review: one account explicitly refers to literacy tests, while the other foregrounds participation and stakeholder feedback. The available descriptions do not provide instrument items, score distributions, or separate results for fluency and comprehension; accordingly, the evaluation evidence is interpreted in terms of the management decisions it informs, rather than as proof of measured improvement in reading proficiency.

Cross-Case Interpretation

Across the two schools, the POAC framework clarifies how principals connected literacy priorities with organizational arrangements, everyday practices, and program

evaluation. Both schools established literacy teams, allocated time for reading, provided classroom reading corners, involved teachers, and reviewed program implementation. Their approaches differed in the configuration of daily and supplementary activities: SDN Sungai Bambu 05 combined a ten-minute pre-lesson routine with book discussions, presentations, and digital literacy, while SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang used a 10–15-minute routine and the weekly Jumat Ceria program. The comparison therefore reveals a shared organizational foundation alongside differentiated ways of translating literacy priorities into school practice. The distinctive program at SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang is not simply an additional event; it represents a school-specific arrangement for creating opportunities for oral expression and engagement with literary forms.

The comparison indicates that sustaining literacy culture requires more than establishing programs or assigning responsibilities. Literacy teams need clear roles, manageable workloads, and coordination with classroom teachers, while implementation depends on accessible reading materials, suitable facilities, and professional support. Teacher development and resource provision are integral to organizational capacity rather than supplementary activities. This interpretation is consistent with research linking leadership to student outcomes through teacher commitment, collaborative culture, collective efficacy, and professional practice (Li et al., 2022; Pietsch et al., 2025; Shen & Wu, 2025; Zhu et al., 2022, 2025, 2026). Leadership consistency and teacher autonomy are complementary when school leaders establish shared objectives and minimum expectations while allowing teachers to adapt materials, pacing, and instructional strategies to student needs. Such flexibility is especially relevant in reading instruction because students may differ in decoding fluency, vocabulary, background knowledge, and comprehension. A uniform schedule can protect time for reading, but it cannot substitute for differentiated guidance. Thus, the organizational contribution of the principal lies partly in creating conditions in which consistency of purpose coexists with professional judgment in classroom enactment.

The schools' daily reading routines and complementary activities illustrate how literacy can become part of ordinary school practice. Regular reading provides recurring opportunities to engage with texts, while book discussions, presentations, storytelling, and poetry reading create opportunities for students to articulate interpretations and respond to others. Jumat Ceria and digital literacy extend the range of these activities, but their educational value depends on the suitability of materials, teacher guidance, and alignment with learning objectives. Research on digital reading exercises similarly emphasizes the importance of purposeful activity design (Zhekeyeva et al., 2026). A distinction is therefore necessary between the presence of literacy activities and the development of a sustained reading culture. The former can be identified through routines, facilities, and organized events; the latter also involves students' continuing interest, voluntary engagement, and increasingly purposeful interaction with texts. The available case evidence describes organizational practices and opportunities for engagement, but does not independently establish the persistence of individual reading habits or changes in comprehension.

Evaluation connects implementation with subsequent management decisions. In the two schools, participation records, reading-interest surveys, literacy tests, meetings, and stakeholder feedback served different purposes. Participation and meeting records

can help identify implementation barriers; surveys may provide information about reported interest; and literacy tests address assessed skills according to the dimensions included in the test. Reading fluency and reading comprehension are themselves distinct, and neither can be inferred solely from participation or expressed interest. These indicators should therefore be interpreted as complementary rather than interchangeable. Feedback becomes consequential when it informs adjustments to reading materials, activity formats, schedules, or teacher support and when those adjustments are reconsidered during subsequent planning.

The cross-case synthesis presented in Table 1 conceptualizes literacy management as a recursive POAC cycle linking strategic alignment, organizational capacity, purposeful literacy practices, and evidence-informed review. Its contribution is not a replacement for Terry's four management functions, but an application-specific synthesis that makes explicit the relationships among them in the management of reading culture. Planning establishes direction; organizing aligns people, time, and resources; actuating translates these arrangements into recurring practices; and controlling interprets implementation information and feeds decisions back into planning. The feedback loop is therefore not a fifth management function operating separately from controlling. It describes the movement through which information generated during controlling informs renewed planning and subsequent organization and implementation. This recursive relationship is the principal analytical insight derived from comparing the two cases, rather than a validated causal model or a uniform prescription for all schools.

The findings are situated within a qualitative comparison of two schools and should be read as a contextual account of management practices and organizational conditions. They do not establish that particular activities independently caused changes in reading proficiency. Records of reading sessions, team meetings, and student participation provide information about implementation, whereas conclusions about changes in fluency, comprehension, or sustained engagement require appropriate measures collected consistently over time. Such outcomes may also be shaped by foundational decoding, instructional quality, student characteristics, and access to learning opportunities (Crawford et al., 2024; Jensen et al., 2025; Pongsophon, 2024). In the Indonesian context, research on teacher competence, cultural literacy in subject teaching, and school principal performance further highlights the importance of professional and organizational conditions (Hambali et al., 2024; Kusumawati & Umam, 2025; Minsih et al., 2025). Further comparative research across more schools, with repeated and differentiated measures of participation, reading interest, fluency, and comprehension, could examine how management arrangements relate to literacy practices and outcomes over time.

Table 1. Integrated POAC framework for sustaining reading literacy culture

POAC function	Management mechanism in literacy culture	Evidence/indicator for ongoing review
Planning	Translate the literacy vision into achievable goals, protected reading time, suitable texts, classroom integration, and teacher learning priorities.	Written goals and schedules; availability and suitability of texts; alignment between literacy activities and learning objectives.
Organizing	Assign clear roles to the principal, literacy team, teachers, and relevant family/community partners; coordinate time, facilities, and professional support.	Defined responsibilities; feasible workload; access to reading materials; coordination records and teacher participation.
Actuating	Make reading a recurring school practice through daily reading, guided discussion, presentations, storytelling, and purposeful use of digital texts.	Regularity of activities; student participation; quality of teacher guidance; opportunities to explain and discuss texts.
Controlling	Use differentiated evidence to review implementation and student needs, then assign corrective action and revisit its effects.	Separate records for participation, reading interest, fluency/comprehension, stakeholder feedback, and documented follow-up decisions.
Feedback cycle	Integrate controlling findings into renewed goals, resource priorities, schedules, and teacher support; assign follow-up responsibility and carry decisions into the next planning cycle.	Documented decisions linked to available evidence; responsible personnel; subsequent review; recorded changes to goals, resources, schedules, or teacher support.

Source: Authors' synthesis of the two cases and relevant literature.

D. CONCLUSION

This study examined principals' management practices in strengthening students' reading literacy culture at SDN Sungai Bambu 05 and SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang in Jakarta. The comparative analysis demonstrates how the four POAC

functions connect leadership priorities, organizational arrangements, recurring literacy activities, and program evaluation. While both schools established reading routines, literacy teams, and classroom reading facilities, their implementation reflected different organizational approaches, particularly through the integration of digital literacy at SDN Sungai Bambu 05 and the weekly Jumat Ceria program at SDN Kebon Bawang 09 Petang. The study's principal contribution lies in demonstrating how POAC functions operate as an interconnected and recursive management process in sustaining school-based reading culture, with evaluation informing subsequent planning and resource allocation. The findings are bounded by the two-school scope, the available empirical accounts from interviews, observations, and documents, and the absence of longitudinal measurements of reading outcomes. Accordingly, the identified practices cannot be interpreted as evidence of improved reading proficiency. Further research involving more diverse school contexts and repeated assessments could investigate how principal management practices relate to students' reading participation, interest, fluency, and comprehension over time.

REFERENCES

Agirdag, O., & Muijs, D. (2023). School leadership development and academic achievement: Effectiveness of the High Performing Schools programme. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *122*, 102248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102248

Aliyyah, R. R., Prasetyo, T., & Widyasari, W. (2026). Perspectives of Teachers on Digital Literacy Implementation Curriculum in Elementary Schools. *F1000Research*, *14*, 1299. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.172273.2

Aukerman, M., & Chambers Schuldt, L. (2021). What Matters Most? Toward a Robust and Socially Just Science of Reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *56*(S1). https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.406

Aydemir, N. E., & Fidan, T. (2026). How instructional leadership and creativity related factors shape students' reading performance: evidence from a Bayesian multilevel mediation approach using PISA 2022 Türkiye data. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *17*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1907891

Aydemir, N. E., & Şahin, A. (2026). Unraveling Reading Achievement Through Educational Leadership, School Actions to Sustain Learning, Digital Self-Efficacy, and ICT-Related Factors: A Multilevel Mediation Analysis of PISA 2022 Türkiye Data. *Journal of Intelligence*, *14*(7), 137. https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence14070137

Cockerill, M., Thurston, A., & O'Keeffe, J. (2023). Using fluency and comprehension instruction with struggling readers to improve student reading outcomes in English elementary schools. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, *5*, 100264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100264

Crawford, M., Raheel, N., Korochkina, M., & Rastle, K. (2024). Inadequate foundational decoding skills constrain global literacy goals for pupils in low- and middle-income countries. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *9*(1), 74–83. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-02028-x

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2024). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches. 5th Edition*. SAGE Publications.

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). https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12672

Fadillah, D. P., & Istikomah, I. (2021). The Strategy Of School Literacy Culture In Elementary School. *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *4*(3), 503–517. https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v4i3.1614

Gawne, L. (2023). School-based mandates versus teacher autonomy: three early career teacher viewpoints of leadership impacting the teaching of reading. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, *46*(1), 89–103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-023-00033-7

Ghufron, S., Fitriyah, F. K., Sodikin, M., Saputra, N., Amin, S. M., & Muhimmah, H. A. (2024). Evaluating the Impact of Teachers' Personal and Professional Resources in Elementary Education on School-Based Human Resource Management: A Case Study in Indonesia. *Sage Open*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241231049

Gomes, M., & Hirata, G. (2025). Developing reading fluency in primary school: evidence from an RCT. *Education Economics*, *33*(3), 355–371. https://doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2024.2322535

Gümüş, S., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Pietsch, M. (2022). School leadership and achievement gaps based on socioeconomic status: a search for socially just instructional leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *60*(4), 419–438. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-11-2021-0213

Hambali, H., Siregar, M., Sulaiman, S., Asiah, N., Makmur, T., Ashlan, S., & Muchsin, M. (2024). Effects and Influential Factors on the Performance of State Elementary School Principals in North Sumatra. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, *12*(1), 223–248. https://doi.org/10.26811/peuradeun.v12i1.792

Hsieh, C.-C., Tai, S.-E., & Li, H.-C. (2026). Impact of school leadership on teacher innovativeness: evidence from multilevel analysis of Taiwan TALIS 2018. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *46*(3), 835–852. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2024.2397040

Jensen, M. T., Solheim, O. J., & Olsen, E. (2025). Leader support in relation to teacher self-efficacy, classroom emotional climate and students' literacy skills in elementary school. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *69*(4), 729–742. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2024.2348451

Kaizu, A., & Tamaki, M. (2024). Predicting Reading Achievement Through Progress Monitoring in Elementary School. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *38*(1), 14–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/02568543.2023.2187489

Kemethofer, D., Weber, C., Brauckmann-Sajkiewicz, S., & Pashiardis, P. (2023). Examining the trident: how data from the PISA study can be used to identify associations among context, school leadership and student outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *61*(2), 162–177. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2022-0030

Keogh, A. J., & McGillicuddy, D. (2025). The Role of Primary Literacy Education in Students' Educational Trajectories in Secondary School: A Systematic Literature Review. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *60*(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.70017

Kim, J. S., Burkhauser, M. A., Relyea, J. E., Gilbert, J. B., Scherer, E., Fitzgerald, J., Mosher, D., & McIntyre, J. (2023). A longitudinal randomized trial of a sustained content literacy intervention from first to second grade: Transfer effects on students'

reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *115*(1), 73–98. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000751

Kim, J. S., Gilbert, J. B., Relyea, J. E., Rich, P., Scherer, E., Burkhauser, M. A., & Tvedt, J. N. (2024). Time to transfer: Long-term effects of a sustained and spiraled content literacy intervention in the elementary grades. *Developmental Psychology*, *60*(7), 1279–1297. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001710

Kılınç, A. Ç., Polatcan, M., & Çepni, O. (2023). Exploring the association between distributed leadership and student achievement: the mediation role of teacher professional practices and teacher self-efficacy. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *55*(3), 352–368. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2023.2216770

Kılınç, A. Ç., & Zepeda, S. J. (2026). Exploring Shared Instructional Leadership Strategies to Improve Teacher Professional Learning: A Case Study in a Southeastern School System. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *25*(3), 660–678. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2024.2387571

Kusumawati, E., & Umam, K. (2025). Strengthening teacher competence for leading and sustaining the implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2501458

Lee, Y., Jang, B. G., & Conradi Smith, K. (2021). A Systematic Review of Reading Engagement Research: What Do We Mean, What Do We Know, and Where Do We Need to Go? *Reading Psychology*, *42*(5), 540–576. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2021.1888359

Li, L., Zhu, H., & Li, H. (2022). School Leadership Enhances Secondary Students' Achievement in Rural China Through Teacher Commitment and Collaborative Culture. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.894688

Marmoah, S., Poerwanti, J. I. S., & Suharno. (2022). Literacy culture management of elementary school in Indonesia. *Heliyon*, *8*(4), e09315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09315

Meyer, A., & Richter, D. (2025). Longitudinal effects of a professional development program on principals' leadership practices: results of a baseline latent change score model. *Professional Development in Education*, *51*(7), 1278–1295. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2413119

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (4th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.

Minsih, M., Mujahid, I., Mukminin, A., & Helzi, H. (2025). The Integration Of Culture Literacy In Strengthening The Profile Of Pancasila Students In Science Learning For Elementary Schools. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Terapan Universitas Jambi*, *9*(2), 609–618. https://doi.org/10.22437/jiituj.v9i2.41764

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice (4th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.

Pietsch, M., Aydin, B., & Gümüş, S. (2025). Putting the Instructional Leadership–Student Achievement Relation in Context: A Meta-Analytical Big Data Study Across Cultures and Time. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *47*(1), 29–64. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737231197434

Pongsophon, P. (2024). Deciphering the layers of reading achievement: A multi-level analysis of student and school-level predictors in top-performing <scp>PIRLS</scp> 2021 countries. *British Educational Research Journal*, *50*(6), 2777–2798. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4053

Ratnawulan, T., Ahmad, A. C., Effendi, Z. R., Achmad Syam, R. Z., & Achmad, W. (2025). Teachers' Strategies in Developing Scientific Literacy for Children with Special Needs in Inclusive Early Childhood Education. *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *8*(3), 682–698. https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v8i3.433

Republic of Indonesia. (2003). *Law No. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2007). *Law No. 43 of 2007 concerning Libraries*.

Shen, J., & Wu, H. (2025). The Relationship Between Principal Leadership and Student Achievement: A Multivariate Meta-Analysis with an Emphasis on Conceptual Models and Methodological Approaches. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *61*(2), 234–281. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X241286527

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. SAGE Publications.

Stein, K. C., Oh, Y., & Usiak, M. M. (2024). Elementary Principals' Learning Trajectories for Developing and Enacting Leadership for Literacy. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *23*(4), 881–900. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2023.2257789

Suriagiri, S. (2022). Good Practice of Educational Leadership to Succeed in The School Literacy Movement. *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 5(3), 972–987. https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v5i3.2338

Syam, R. Z. A., Nursya'bani, K. K., Indah, R. N., & Rohayati, Y. (2025). A teacher-librarian collaborative model in designing literacy learning in the era of the Merdeka curriculum. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Development (IJED)*, *6*(2), 479–491. https://doi.org/10.59672/ijed.v6i2.4731

Terry, G. R. (1982). *Principles of management (8th ed).* Homewood, Ill.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.

Zhang, W., Lu, M., & Yang, P. (2023). An empirical study about the impact of project-based learning on reading literacy of primary students in a blended learning environment. *Psychology in the Schools*, *60*(12), 4930–4945. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22949

Zhekeyeva, A., Zhumabayeva, A., Akzholova, A., Saduakas, G., Ibrayeva, M., & Sambet, D. (2026). Gamified digital exercises to enhance reading literacy in Kazakhstani primary schools. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, *15*(2), 1529. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v15i2.39054

Zhu, H., Li, L., & Gao, C. (2025). Teacher Collective Efficacy and Teacher Commitment Co-Mediate the Path From School Leadership to Student Achievement Among Minority Students in Chinese Rural Schools. *Psychology in the Schools*, *62*(12), 4879–4888. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.70048

Zhu, H., Li, L., & Li, H. (2022). Teacher trust in others and teacher commitment co-mediate the path from school leadership to students' reading literacy in rural Chinese schools. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.992003

Zhu, H., Li, L., & Li, H. (2026). Impact of school leadership on reading literacy in rural China: the differentiated models of principals' self-report and teachers' report. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *27*(2), 639–651. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-024-10006-1