LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AND ADVERSITY QUOTIENT®
OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

A Dissertation
Presented to the
Faculty of College of Teacher Education
Graduate School
BATANGAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Batangas City

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
Major in Educational Management

EMILIANA M. ROXAS
January 2021
APPROVAL SHEET

This dissertation entitled LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AND ADVERSITY QUOTIENT® OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS prepared and submitted by EMILIANA M. ROXAS in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, major in Educational Management, has been examined and is recommended for Oral Examination.

NERRIE E. MALALUAN, Ed.D.
Adviser

PANEL OF EXAMINERS

Approved by the Committee of Oral Examination with a grade of ________.

ROWENA R. ABREA, Ph.D.
Chairman

GLORIA G. MENDOZA, Ph. D.  FELIX M. PANIOPIO, Ph. D.
Member (External)  Member

ROMEO M. GUILLO, JR., Ed.D.  ROLDAN D. ATIENZA, Ph. D.
Member  Member

Accepted and approved in partial fulfilment for the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Education, major in Educational Management.

Comprehensive Examination: ______

__________________________  __________________________
Date  ROWENA R. ABREA, Ph. D.

Dean Graduate School
ABSTRACT

Title: LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AND ADVERSITY QUOTIENT® OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Researcher: Emiliana Madlangbayan Roxas

Degree: Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Management

Year: 2021

Adviser: Nerrie E. Malaluan, Ed. D.

Summary

The educational system needs a backbone of competent and calibrated school heads to back them up in times of great adversities hindering the delivery of quality and accessible education for all. Hence, it is imperative that the government, alongside the department, work hand in hand in facing the challenges in making sure quality is served for the students.

This present undertaking looked into the leadership behaviors manifested by school heads in executing their roles and responsibilities on various educative tasks to cater to the needs of stakeholders in the sector. As stipulated in the Republic Act No. 9155 or commonly known as
the “Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001”, all public elementary and secondary schools or a cluster thereof shall have a school head who shall be both an instructional leader and administrative manager who will be working with teaching and non-teaching staff to work on both academic and administrative tasks.

To realize this, the study assessed the leadership behavior and adversity quotient® of public elementary school administrators in the Division of Batangas. It aimed to describe the leadership behaviors of the respondents in terms of embracing aspects like personality, leadership style, learning environment, technology, and in the organizational composition and strength. The study likewise measured the respondents’ adversity quotient® along the components of control, ownership, reach and endurance. A null hypothesis for the significant relationship between leadership behavior and adversity quotient® was posted. The identification of the issues and challenges encountered by the school administrators in aspects of the organization of the school was also explored. A management plan was prepared and developed to enhance the leadership capabilities of public elementary school administrators based from the results of the study.
The descriptive method of research was utilized in the study along with a questionnaire as the main data gathering instrument. Also, interviews and focus group discussion (FGD) were also used to substantiate the data from the questionnaire. The study centered on surveying responses of 232 school administrator respondents in the Division of Batangas Province. The statistical tools used in the analysis of data were weighted mean and multiple regression analysis.

Based on the findings, school heads greatly manifested the leadership behavior of being appreciative in every accomplishment made by the members of the team and the ethical behavior in advocating transparency and accountability in the school management for both in their personality and the leadership style respectively. On the other hand, the respondents manifested to a great extent as well the following leadership behaviors, transparency in providing open communication platforms for parents, stockholders and the public and are greatly focused on achieving school goals for safe teaching-learning environment, open-mindedness in learning new skills utilizing technology and being honest and transparent in updating school’s transparency board to inform stakeholders on the MOOE disbursements, canteen reports, PTA financial reports. Meanwhile, it was revealed that the respondents’ adversity quotient in terms of control and
endurance dimensions are all below average while ownership and reach registered low level. In addition, there were significant differences in respondents’ leadership behavior in terms of personality and their adversity quotient in the dimension of endurance and in the dimension of control in terms of the learning environment. Meanwhile, the respondents’ leadership behavior in terms of learning environment, leadership style, technology and organizational composition and strength as regards their adversity quotient failed to reject the null hypothesis. The findings served as the bases in developing a management plan to enhance the leadership capabilities of the public elementary school administrators in Division of Batangas.

**Keywords:** Leadership Behavior, Adversity Quotient®, Management Plan, Governance, Basic Education Act
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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Quality education has been a perennial quest of school administrators in the basic education cycle as it will equip all learners of the capabilities required and expected of them to become economically productive. Indicative of this search is the ability of the school leaders to respond to varying trends and challenges in education backed up with their leadership readiness to become effective and efficient front runners of institutions, producing globally competitive individuals.

The implementation of Republic Act No. 9155 or commonly known as the “Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001” has specified the roles of school leaders in the pursuit of this endeavor. As stipulated, it has mandated all public elementary and secondary schools or a cluster to have a school head who shall take the role of an instructional leader and administrative manager working in synergy with teaching and non-teaching staff in academic and administrative tasks.

As the education sector is beset with challenges especially in these times of the pandemic, providing accessible and quality education has become the main thrust of school administrators and their subordinates.
Hindered by these challenges, institutions and students remain positive in their pursuit to give every learner the right to quality education.

School administrators, who are the frontline workers in the delivery of basic education services among the learners in school, are responsible and accountable for the effective management of the schools they serve. Skilled and well-supported school leaders foster efficient management of the school that encourages a sense of ownership and purpose in the way job performance is carried out. While the success and failure of schools rely on the professional experience, attributes, and performance of school administrators, it can also be said that learners are as good as the kind of school head and teachers they have.

Therefore, improving the school administrators’ leadership capacity and leadership behavior is truly vital and necessary to redound towards the realization of the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the Department of Education (DepEd). As a matter of principle, investments of a significant amount have been consistently and continuously put in place in terms of providing technical assistance for public elementary school administrators with the school-based management (SBM) at the frontline. This would strengthen management at the school level and motivate and improve instructional practices among teachers.
While difficulties are but a natural persistent story in the normal life of school leaders, specifically, nowadays, seems that difficulties and adversities are tests to the school leaders’ resiliency on emergent events where change is what keeps them stronger each day. School leaders’ awareness on their Adversity Quotient® (AQ®) helps determine how they can resolve challenges and strive to overcome them without affecting deeply that which should be accomplished. AQ® measures one’s resilience and ability to persevere in the face of constant change, stress, and difficulty, a tool to measure how one responds to adversity. Problems such as health pandemic due to COVID19, catastrophic natural disasters, international unrest and unsafe communities are re-directing the attention of school leaders to the necessity of remaining in a state of preparedness particularly in the governance of basic education. This preparedness defines the presence or absence of the right leadership behavior that school administrators have to display as traits and shield to combat the day-to-day challenges in their post as academic leaders.

Likewise, the desired change in schools is almost always dependent on the leadership of school administrators whose leadership styles and behaviors are important to the success of schools (Rhoden, 2012; Rapaido, 2011; Mendiola, 2012; Jamon, 2017; and Andal, 2020). There is
the gained understanding that leadership behaviour may create a better training process to prepare school administrators for a stressful job. Researches revealed leadership behaviors of school heads affect their performance along with their adversity quotient and resilience to face emergent changes that arise in schools (Aquino, 2013; Bakare, 2015; Baroa, 2015; and Bautista et al., 2016). However, the greatest challenges faced by the current generation of new leaders are different from those of before, one of these is that the increased accountability with reduced resources (Montecinosa et al., 2018; Alvarado et al., 2019; San Antonio, 2019; Rivera et al., 2020).

The challenges seen, experienced, and faced by school administrators as their worst constant companion daily are almost always coupled with heavy responsibilities and accountabilities underlying their position. Without an iota of doubt, any mismanagement and failure to handle every challenge may eventually and greatly affect performance of learners, trust of parents, and even the entire school community (Baroa, 2015). Considering the countless duties associated with as school heads, their job is fully covered with conflict, adversity, and crisis.

There is a great need to make them able and capable to guide the schools through constant and emergent change by equipping them well
with not only knowledge but with the right leadership behaviors towards the adversities they may experience. These adversities are indeed obstacles to the fulfillment of their dream of achieving quality education -- their goals and aspirations for the institution they dedicatedly and cordially serve. Adversities may be positively looked up to as opportunities as they strengthen the thoughts of school leaders and establish their achievements because surpassing any adverse event in life prepares and readies them to a better way of understanding problems.

Corollary, leadership issues continue to be on the forefront of realizing quality education; therefore, it is imperative that investigations be put in place focusing on the emotional intelligence, adversity quotient, and leadership behaviors of school administrators since these are highly related factors on how school administrators lead their schools. Examining this three-factor relationship might prove useful in the recruitment, identification, development, and retention of effective school leaders and administrators. Premised on this, the present study was conceptualized to examine the leadership behavior of public elementary school administrators and measure their adversary quotient in order to develop a management plan to enhance leadership capabilities.
Premised on the foregoing, this study was conducted with a hope-laden intent of helping public elementary school administrators become better capable of guiding their schools through constant and emergent change. The researcher finds this a very interesting area to study because of the nature of her job which requires her to work closely with public school administrators. Truly indeed, she smiles in their laughter, and feels their aches and pains as they face almost always courageously varied challenges and with all the challenges and adversities in leading their respective schools. The researcher herself is eyewitness to the myriad situations not only in her workplace, but also in the smallest corner of the educational arena where the resilience of school leaders is challenged or heavily provoked by adversities of all sorts, types, and degrees.

As a staunch advocate that quality education must not be compromised, the researcher believes that even if school administrators face a very different set up of schools under today’s so-called new normal, they are great thinkers, and through their creativity, they can fill in the needed resources on the goal for quality education among the learners and professional growth of teachers. They are good motivators to lead and encourage teachers to grow professionally with their craft as educators. They know how to listen to the voices of subordinates recognizing and
celebrating their accomplishments through the school administrators’ increased understanding of their commitments to the DepEd’s vision and mission. Therefore, they must be the leaders who look after the welfare of their people and subordinates because only then that they can eventually transform the culture of the organization towards realizing quality education.

With the desire to make education transformative, school heads should be able to learn and adapt to ways their leadership more effectively. This is only possible through subjecting oneself in the process of learning and relearning the different approaches and strategies to run an institution.

After all, great leaders are always made and not born

Objectives

This study aimed to describe the leadership behavior of public elementary school administrators and measure their adversity quotient® in order to develop a management plan to improve the way they lead and respond to challenges.

Specifically, this study sought to fulfill the following objectives:

1. Describe the leadership behavior of public elementary school administrators in terms of:
   
   1.1 personality
1.2 leadership style
1.3 learning environment
1.4 knowledge on technology
1.5 organizational composition and strength

2. Measure the respondents’ adversity quotient® along the following components:
   2.1 control
   2.2 ownership
   2.3 reach
   2.4 endurance

3. Find out the effects of the respondents’ adversity quotient on their leadership behavior

4. Identify the issues and challenges encountered by the school administrators

5. Develop a management plan to enhance leadership capabilities

**Hypothesis**

Ho: The respondents’ adversity quotient has no significant effect on the leadership behavior of administrators.
Scope, Delimitation, and Limitation of the Study

This study focused on describing the leadership behavior of public elementary school administrators covering aspects of personality, leadership style, learning environment, technology and organizational composition and strength. It was also directed to measure their adversity quotient® along the components of control, ownership, reach and endurance.

To further analyze the data, the present undertaking went into a hypothetical testing to determine the relationship between the leadership behavior of the respondents and their adversity quotient®. Moreover, it also dealt upon identifying the issues and challenges faced by school administrators in their respective schools. With the aim to enhance the school heads’ leadership capabilities, the study proposed a management plan/model that might address their need to face the challenges of the 21st century education.

Employing the descriptive method of research to quantify the needed data in order to come up with the study’s desired results, the researcher assigned the 232 public elementary school administrators from one Schools Division in Batangas Province under the Department of Education (DepEd) during the school-year 2020-2021 to serve as
respondents. The Raosoft formula, a sampling procedure, was used to obtain the desired and manageable number of respondents. Moreover, this research utilized a four-part researcher-made survey questionnaire on leadership behavior inclusive of a standardized online assessment on Adversity Quotient® with the permission of Dr. Paul Stoltz in cooperation with the Peak Learning, Inc.

The analysis of the results was basically based on the responses of the respondents to the particular items stipulated in both the online and researcher-made questionnaires. The AQ®P version 9.1 instrument provided by Dr. Paul G. Stoltz of Peak Learning, Inc. measured the Adversity Quotient® of public elementary school administrators through answering online using the URL provided by Peak Learning, Inc. to the researcher.

Further, this inquiry was focused and limited to the public elementary school heads who were also under the jurisdiction of Schools Division Office (SDO) Batangas Province. This research was delimited to non-academic personnel handling management positions in the research locale per se or outside the aforesaid places since this population universe would not fit the criteria by which samples were obtained. Finally, the members of the population who did not possess the traits sought for by this inquiry
within the samples obtained were eventually delimited from becoming participants of the study.

Premised on the aforesaid, one of the limitations of the study was the lack of internet access or connectivity issues experienced by most public elementary school administrators. Such problems on technical aid caused the researcher to take another round of administration through the links sent by Peak Learning and the self-made questionnaire. Also, the researcher monitored the respondents via Google Meet to track their progress in answering. With the fear of losing the connection and not being able to submit it on time since it was under time constraint, the responses of the participants might not be as well-thought and objective since respondents had it fastly done in the best of their abilities.

By the same token, the dearth of reference materials was another limitation by which the researcher had experienced, and such might have had direct or indirect effects on the results of the inquiry. Moreover, other limitations could be the results obtained by this study could not be taken as a generalization of all public elementary school administrators with similar conditions or in identical situations. Lastly, the time constraint faced by the researcher whose function as a public school district supervisor was almost always extremely hectic along with the current health pandemic,
created huge restrictions in various actions which could have been done under a normal condition were major limitations.

**Pedagogical Implications**

This part showcases the pedagogical implications of the research as the reflection done by the researcher with reference to the purposes of the conduct of this research.

The findings of the study can influence intergroup dynamics as a practical implication of the present study. From an educational perspective, understanding the leadership behavior of public elementary school administrators and measuring their adversity quotient® will eventually redound towards enhanced leadership capabilities. This would provide them clear insights in determining their capacity to stay strong and be focused in difficulties, challenging tasks, constant and emergent changes and responsibilities of being school leaders. Further, this is an avenue to improve job performance and attain physical and mental well-being that could lead to the overall quality of school leadership.

Next, implications can touchdown the teaching and learning aspect whereby the findings of the study are indeed relevant for teachers. The awareness of teachers as regard the various leadership behaviors possessed by their school administrators can help them determine their
roles and functions in school. Likewise, they can be insight-filled on how they may support and assist their school leaders in ensuring the improvement of their school in general.

Also, identifying the issues and challenges encountered by the school administrators can scaffold the Human Resource Training and Development (HRTD) of the DepEd towards the capacity building in educational planning and management. To this end, the HRTD can use the result of this investigation in creating strategies like training of educational planners and school administrators; providing support to national training and research; encouraging a favorable and supportive environment for educational change; and cooperating with others in the design of educational policies and plans. More significantly, by knowing the adversity quotient and leadership behaviors of school administrators, the HRTD can provide technical assistance to them towards improving their performance.

Finally, the development of a management plan incarnated and made tangible through the results of the study can showcase implications in honing and crafting a systematic coordination and linkage among stakeholders such as but not restricted to the academic and non-teaching personnel, learners, parents, and community in general. Likewise, school administrators can develop successful partnerships with school-based,
district-wide, area/division-based, regional, national, and international networks of individuals and institutions – in their different training activities, and also provide opportunities for extending the reach of institutional programs like research or related programs/undertakings.

**Definition of Terms**

This section of the paper provides both the conceptual and operational definitions of key terms towards a better understanding of the study.

**Adversity quotient®.** It is an inner ability that enables people to turn their adverse situations into life-changing advantage (Yazon and Ang-Manaig, 2019). In this study, the term refers to one of the variables to be determined describing public elementary school administrators in terms of control, ownership, reach, and endurance.

**Control.** It is the level of power that a person feels about an event that causes difficulties, this control questions some of the many controls that are felt over an event that causes difficulties, which begins with an understanding that whatever it is, this control can be given that gives strength (Aulia et al., 2020).
Endurance. It is the upper limit of survival time before a system's complete breakdown, which is highly related to system resilience (Zhongab et al, 2020). As referred to in this study, it is the ability of the school administrators to withstand challenges in their leadership to enable their staff to work effectively towards quality education.

Leadership behaviors. These include the traits and attitudes that leaders possess which affect public organizations not only in terms of organizational survival, success, performance, efficiency, and the creation of public value, but also influence how effectively and efficiently organizations provide services to their constituents (Demircioglu and Chowdhurry, 2020). In this paper, operationally, leadership behavior pertains to one of the areas by which public elementary school administrators were assessed in order to determine the success.

Leadership style. It is the approach of the total pattern of explicit and implicit actions performed by a leader (DepEd, 2015). In this research, the term refers to the assessed leadership approach in directing people towards a common goal.

Learning environment. This is the diverse physical locations, context, and cultures in which students learn, including but not limited to outside-school locations, outdoor environments and traditional classrooms
In this study, the term refers to the school setting and climate that have been established by school heads as manifested in their leadership behaviors which contribute to success in learning.

**Management plan.** It is the methodology that can be used by an organization to facilitate the delivery of strategic outcomes through development of capabilities that enables an organization to obtain expected benefits (Dubrin, 2013). In the present undertaking, the term refers to a plan which includes a systematic model to guide delivery of activities and tasks enhancing the leadership capabilities of school heads to run an institution.

**Organizational composition and strength.** This term refers to the set of activities, task allocation, coordination and supervision which are directed towards the success and fulfilment of organizational goals and objectives (Kolzow, 2014). In this study, this term refers to the described level and nature of directives of school heads among their respective schools.

**Ownership.** Ownership as one of the aspects seen in Adversity Quotient® (AQ®) refers to the what or who is causing difficulties and the extent to which an individual considers himself to influence himself as the cause of the origin of difficulties (Aulia et al., 2020). As used in this study, it
is described as the ability to take authority of school heads to be responsible in facing the issues of their respective schools.

**Personality.** This is the overall behavior and character of an individual which is considered an influential aspect to impact people (Stogdill, 2015). In this study, this refers to the aspect of behavior which describes the respondents’ mindset and behavior in leading their respective schools.

**Reach.** It is the impact of adversity on the impact of other aspects of someone’s life (Aulia et al., 2020). In the context of this study, it refers to the extent to which the behaviors of school administrators affect every aspect of their leadership in the institution.

**Technology challenge.** This term refers to the problems that are easy to identify and solve by the school administrators using existing resources (Gomez and Fishman, 2019). In this study, this refers to the functions or tasks being affected in the delivery of quality teaching and learning process using limited and outdated technological resources.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents the literature review, theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the study.

Literature Review

School leaders are the backbone of every educational institution for it is through them that directives and decisions come from in the pursuit of a school or a unit’s goals towards quality education given such responsibilities, school leaders are expected to be equipped with the necessary attributes and leadership behaviors to help them respond to challenges that may hinder their directional goal of effective delivery of good education. With this, their role becomes even more tough as they are expected to become the fountain of majority of the decisions in the school.

The accountability era has stimulated major reinventions and readjustments of the role of the school site principal, causing most of the pressure to create academic achievement to fall upon them. This accountability is stipulated in Republic Act 9155 otherwise known as an act instituting a framework of governance for basic education, establishing authority and accountability, and for other purposes. Shared governance is a principle which recognizes that every unit in the education bureaucracy
has a particular role, task and responsibility inherent in the office and for which it is principally accountable for outcomes. The act operationalizes the accountability of the school heads when it comes to the performance of their tasks as school leaders.

Consistent with the national educational policies, plans and standards, the school heads shall have authority, accountability, and responsibility so as to set the mission, vision, goals, and objectives of the school; create environment within the school that is conducive to teaching and learning; implement the school curriculum and being accountable for higher learning outcomes; develop the school education program and school improvement plan; offer educational programs, projects and services which provide equitable opportunities for all learners in the community; introduce new and innovative modes of instruction to achieve higher learning outcomes; administer and manage all personnel, physical and fiscal resources of the school; encourage staff development; establish school and community networks and encourage the active participation of teacher organizations, non-academic personnel of public schools, and parent-teacher-community associations; accept donations, gifts, bequests and grants for the purpose of upgrading teachers and learning facilitators’ competencies, improve and expand school facilities and provide
instructional materials and equipment; and perform such other functions as may be assigned by proper authorities (RA9155, 2001).

Thus, this accountability has transformed the role of school head to place greater emphasis on the core responsibility of schools such as the teaching and learning of students, with the school heads’ primary focus placed on their role as the leader of the school.

**Leadership behavior of school heads.** Rules and Regulations of Republic Act No. 9155 which is the governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 gave the tasks of elementary school heads on a new complexion in recent years. For this, the Department of Education (DepEd) emphasized that the School-Based Management (SBM) which is a thrust to decentralize the decision-making from the Central Office and field offices to individual schools was created to enable them to better respond to their specific education needs. This is also to achieve the Education for All (EFA) objectives of the DepEd which it pursues under the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA). The Key Reform Thrust 1 (KRT1) of BESRA is School-Based Management, which underscores the empowerment of key stakeholders in school communities to enable them to actively participate in the continuous improvement of school
communities towards the attainment of higher pupil or student learning outcomes (Abulencia, 2013).

School-Based Management (SBM) had been revised to better highlight the diverse realities of learning contexts defined and uniquely occurring within specific geographic, social, cultural, economic, political, and environmental make-up of the contemporary society; to enhance commitment of education stakeholders at all levels to their responsibilities and accountabilities in realizing the education outcomes for children; and to improve the school system’s capacity to be on track in achieving the Education for All (EFA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and sustain good performance (Department of Education, 2012).

In the context of the study, behaviors of the school heads making up the way of management is the totality of process necessary to challenge people to aim for a higher purpose, to involve them significantly in planning and decision-making and to help them develop effective working relationships among themselves that are satisfying and productive in accomplishing the aims of the system of which they are part (Pepito & Acibar, 2019).

One aspect of leadership behavior of the school heads is the ability to properly account executive and legislative function in school budgeting.
On formal adoption by the school board, the budget becomes a legal document that serves as the basis for annual expenditures, accounting and auditing. It was posited by Merrill (2016) and Fullan & Sarason (2017) that budgeting involves major steps such as preparation, submission, adoption, execution, and evaluation. In the third step, adoption, involves the school board, which appropriates specific amounts for specific categories. With this, the budgeting roles of the school head are classified into four major activities such as budget planning, assisting in identifying budget priorities and focusing on school needs at the planning stage; budget analysis, dealing with the goals, objectives, and evaluative criteria, suggestions for curriculum materials and instructional equipment, and communication concerns of the students, parents, teachers, and community about specific expenditures or special purposes, budget requesting. A trustworthy school leader is a treasure to keep given the issues nowadays regarding corrupt government officials in the different government agencies in the country.

The more control a school head has, the more likely he or she is to take positive action. According to Cornista & Macasaet (2015), control is the most crucial ingredient of the four core dimensions of adversity quotient because it is directly related to a person’s inclination to try hard in
response to a given challenge. Since its impact lies within empowerment as to whether any meaningful action will take place, the control dimension has a strong influence on all other core dimensions.

Deal and Peterson (2015) referred to a leadership characteristic of school heads based on cooperative leadership which is building collegiality, a sense of school identity, and a democratic and inspiring school culture. It means that the school head leads from the center, to be more democratic, delegate responsibilities, share decision-making powers, and develop collaborative efforts that bond students, teachers, and parents. In this same way, Sergiovanni (2015), emphasized that school heads’ duties and tasks have increased to an overload level, since they are to share responsibilities with and empower others in order to manage schools on a daily basis.

In a similar view, Spillane (2017) and Diamond (2017) posited that school heads often reported that the curriculum and instruction aspects on the job are top priority work areas and that they need to spend more time on the job related to these areas of development. Dealing with the daily operation of the school and attending meetings tend to take up most of their time. This hampers the school heads’ task as a curriculum instructional leader.
Another leadership behavior of school heads is being an influential leader who is persuasive with superiors, able to get additional consideration, and can proceed relatively unimpeded by the hierarchy. It was emphasized by Corwin Press (2015), Ubben, Hughes & Norris (2016) that resource support is the extent to which classroom supplies and instructional materials are readily available, and in fact even extra materials are supplied if requested. He or she is committed to both students and colleagues and accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm. High but achievable academic goals are set for students, the learning environment is orderly and serious, teachers believe in their students’ ability to achieve, and students work hard and respect those who do well academically.

With this, it was added by Lunenberg & Ornstein (2018) that schools can really make a difference in the achievement levels of students but a school is usually only as good or bad, as creative or sterile, as the person who serves as the head of that school. School heads of effective schools are strong instructional leaders who know how to manage time and money effectively. They concentrate on priority goals. They set as their main goal the acquisition of basic skills. Effective school heads have high
expectations for all students and they will enlist the support of others in meeting common goals.

Another characteristic of an effective school head is having technology skills and making early contacts with the school population. It was emphasized by Coleman, Glover & Derek (2017) and McNally (2019) that an effective school head is proactive and aware on what is going internally and externally in schools. Coordination is the process whereby two or more people or organizations work together to deal collectively with a shared task. The responsibility for coordination may be assigned to a single individual or team or group of individuals, in consultation with all the parties concerned. Likewise, the effective school head consults with school population and conducts constructive changes. He or she accepts the suggestions and good ideas from people, creates atmosphere that letting all people in the school participate in school development.

Likewise, Petrides (2019) and Nodine (2016) posited that effective school head instructs school population and accepts new ideas. He or she makes appropriate transformations and information that enable school people to achieve assignments required. He or she participates in school activities and encourages teamwork. The effective school head does not make decisions alone but asks people what to do, how to do, when to do,
and approves their suggestions. Primary stakeholders take an active part in planning and decision-making, implementation, learning and evaluation.

Another characteristic of effective school administrator is being able to attract school population and motivate them to learn and teach hard. He or she motivates slow learners and rewards hard working and talented ones. A positive school culture is the underlying reason why the other components of successful school were able to flourish. Ingle (2019) and Priada (2015) emphasized that a school head seeking ways to increase reading comprehension asked for and valued teacher suggestions. As a result, suggestions were developed into action plans that were then implemented. The positive culture the school head created enabled continuous improvement to occur. They also cited that the effective school heads lead school population to the right direction and learn from the teacher, or other people, too.

Meanwhile, as emphasized by Bolman & Deal (2015) and Sackney (2018), school heads must show strong leadership no matter what their style. Strong principal leadership is defined as having knowledge of teaching and learning processes and the power to motivate other members of the organization to achieve and work toward the common good of the
school. Strong administrators have the ability to know the leadership behaviors that match the needs of the school's stakeholders.

Jamon (2017) examined thirty school administrators’ leadership behaviors, styles, attributes and functions, as well as the issues and concerns they faced in Talisay City Division and found out that school administrators apply a conglomeration of leadership styles. It was also found that the perception of school administrators and teachers with regard to attributes, specifically to skill and attitude and to the functions of school administrators in basic education, education governance and regulatory and developmental have significant difference. Although school administrators apply different leadership styles, face different issues and challenges and have polar perceptions with their teachers with regard to their attributes and functions, they are still functioning and doing the best of their abilities to be effective and efficient leaders of the public schools.

Accordingly, Sackney (2018) added that school heads who are assertive instructional leaders promote high expectations for students by continuously focusing on instruction and emphasizing the importance of academics and student achievement. They must be excellent role models with a well-articulated mission statement. Culture-changing leaders use the collaborative process for decision making and maintain an on-going staff
development program that regularly receives and discusses staff performance. School heads need to be aware that schools need a culture that encourages productivity, high morale, confidence, and commitment.

In a similar vein, Covey, Miller & Miller (2016) emphasized that in order to have a total quality program, the school head must have a leadership that makes the difference between ordinary and extraordinary performance. Successful leader must understand and integrate the subcultures of an organization such as structural, human resources, political, and symbolic. An effective school leader must possess the wisdom to identify and successfully use each frame within that particular organization. He or she is visible, knowledgeable, and a promoter of programs and faculty. He or she provides a clear and common vision that puts students first and see that this vision is communicated clearly and effectively to all stakeholders. The cohesion among staff that encourages a productive climate and collaboration is also an important attribute.

The leadership of the school heads and the learning environment of the school are intimately linked. Trice (2016), Sashkin & Sashkin (2016) posited that a school's culture and learning environment can be developed, influenced and managed. They suggested that school head must be effective in shaping a positive school culture and learning environment that
continuously improve the school. They further suggested that school heads reweave old traditions and stories into present realities and new vision. The actions of a school head are central to the development of a school culture that is conducive to high levels of academic achievement and learning.

In relation to this, Deal & Peterson (2019) and Schein (2017) suggested that school heads mold and shape school’s learning environment in a daily basis. They emphasized that complacency regarding leadership or cultural management is unacceptable because they are both central to understanding organizations and making them effective. At the same vein, James (2016) added that enlightened leadership can change culture by changing the assumptions on which the culture is built. The leader who sets out to do this must have the knowledge of the existing culture and be aware of the organization’s key concerns. The goal will be to re-create a positive shared vision and trust.

Accordingly, Reitzug & Revves (2016) wrote that the school head, being in the leadership position, has great influence on a school’s culture. He or she has a profound influence on the work habits and perspectives that mark a successful school. It was also mentioned that empowering teachers enables them to examine and critique their own situations with a
view of improving educational situations. Blanchard & Randolph (2016) added that empowerment must start at the top or it will go nowhere. Leadership is no longer top-down. School heads should create a school culture in which decisions are made collaboratively. A school head’s primary task should focus on analyzing and understanding the existing culture and being aware of teachers’ needs, feelings, perceptions, and attitudes. Common vision, shared philosophies, and trusted leadership are all entwined in a successful organization.

Similarly, Lezotte & Bancroft (2015), Snyder & Wolf (2015) and Elmore (2016) added that school heads must influence the establishment and maintenance of a positive school culture for schools to be productive, and must be committed so that the culture can grow and endure. They further emphasized that the job of the school heads is primarily about enhancing the skills and knowledge of people in the organization, creating a common culture of expectations around the use of those skills and knowledge, holding the various pieces of the organization together in a productive relationship with each other, and holding individuals accountable for their contributions to the collective result.

It was highlighted by Peterson (2017) that school heads begin this process through influencing culture by recruiting and selecting teachers
with shared norms and values. Building collegiality and collaboration on the shared goals and values, encouraging staff development that is student oriented, modeling behaviors that encourage student achievement, and celebrating and rewarding teachers by sharing stories of success and accomplishments are also positive steps toward the building of culture and positive learning environment.

As to the technology leadership and challenges by the school heads, Rutkowski & Sparks (2015) mentioned that technology leadership is an indication of managing all technology usage in schools, and an essential component of effective educational administration. School heads with necessary skills of technology leadership are more likely to facilitate all stages of instruction and school management by effectively integrating educational technologies into school life. Dexter (2016) and McLeod & Richardson (2014) further added that the level of technology leadership highly reflects the quality of leadership in schools, as being good at technology leadership is associated with high quality school leadership. Technology leadership represents all activities about the technology in school, including organizational decisions, policies, and implementation of technology within the boundaries of the school.
In a similar view, Davies (2016) and Flanagan & Jacobsen (2016), highlighted that technology leadership roles for school heads enable them to integrate technology into educational contexts and list related responsibilities including leader of learning, leader of student entitlement, leader of capacity building, leader of community, and leader of resource management. These roles put together a set of aims such as student engagement, shared vision, equity of access, effective professional development, and ubiquitous networks.

Meanwhile, Thomas & Kzenek (2015) posited several technology challenges that faced the school heads such as lack of training, resistance, lack of resources, equity and bureaucracy. The lack of training in the use of technology is a major challenge for school heads. There is a need for technology training in teacher and administrator preparation to make technological innovation a reality in schools. The level of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) skills is very important for school heads to understand their role in its use in schools.

Additionally, resistance as stated by Dawson & Rakes (2017) is another technological challenge to school heads. It is not surprising that teachers would show some degree of resistance to changes in teaching practices as the process of technology integration requires teachers to
modify what they have been doing for years. However, they emphasized that it is still possible for teachers to accept the new ideas if they see the patience and support from the school administrators.

Meanwhile, the lack of resources is seen as another major challenge for school heads in their technology leadership. It was found out by Leonard & Leonard (2017) that the lack of technological facilities and human resources emerged as challenges for school heads since in many schools not having adequate technology creates a challenge for them. Many schools have poor physical facilities and outdated technology, coupled with unskilled technology coordinators.

Accordingly, Flanagan & Jacobsen (2016) mentioned that some school heads noted that equity issues were among the challenges in technology leadership. They indicated that school-based technologies are not equally distributed among all schools. While some schools received more funding and resources, others are poor in many of these. The disadvantaged schools are mainly located in areas where people with less income and diverse backgrounds live. These people are isolated due to their socioeconomic backgrounds. Bureaucracy was also cited as another challenge which highly slowed down the technology leadership practices.
In terms of organization composition and strength, relationships are the cornerstone of many aspects of educational leadership. Stronge, Richard & Catano (2018) posited that every situation involving school leaders requires some degree of relational behavior. Current topics in education such as trust, collaboration, professional learning communities, distributed leadership, supervision, mentoring, coaching, and family school-community partnerships, reflect the relational nature of the school leaders’ position. Furthermore, the increased involvement of parents and community members in educational processes requires school leaders to develop stronger relationships than ever before.

Additionally, Christenson (2014) wrote that relational efforts of school heads are further complicated by many structural and psychological barriers such as the factors that limit access between educators and other stakeholders in terms of time constraints and lack of funding for outreach initiatives. Psychological barriers are the interpersonal factors experienced by educators, families and community members that impede relationship development. Examples of these are distrust, low self-efficacy, fear or conflict, and a blaming attitude.

Trust is very vital in relationship development at school leadership level. Tschannen-Moran (2015) defines trust as one’s willingness to be
vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent. Trust is ultimately dependent on the interplay between all of these factors. Understanding how to cultivate and demonstrate these qualities as school leaders is important in the development of trusting relationships.

Engaging stakeholders in decision-making processes also provides an opportunity to develop shared expectations. According to Bryk & Schenider (2017), individuals typically withdraw their trust when expectations are not met, leading to a weakening of relationships and, in more extreme instances, a possible severing of ties. It can be difficult for school heads to meet the expectations of others when the expectations are unknown or are inconsistent with their own expectations. It is important for school heads to invest time in understanding the expectations of others, as well as communicating their own expectations. These conversations provide opportunities to arrive at shared expectations, facilitate shared decision-making, and ultimately, foster trust.

Equally important, Baptiste (2019) posited that developing leadership behavior is critical in promoting support to students and the entire school community. Principals in the dimension of transformational leadership encourage teachers to think in terms of innovation and
creativity, while providing a culture void without fear of ridicule or punishment. School principals encourage teachers to be innovative and creative in the classroom, so they adopt a critical view of traditional methods and assumptions.

Moreover, Baptiste confirms that the concept of transformational leadership is one of the most significant leadership models put forward in relation to the advancement of the educational field. In education, studies suggest that transformational leadership has an effect on teachers’ commitment and on their attitudes toward their jobs. Transformational leadership is considered one of the most popular theories among the various inspirational theories of leadership. The four domains of transformational leadership are charisma or idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. These notions are built upon the proposition that transformational leadership is a more effective form of leadership than transactional leadership.

Likewise, Baptiste said that principal leadership plays a significant role in determining the experiences of teachers, the experiences of students, and the overall school climate. Previous research has shown that principals can influence teacher job satisfaction and work performance and
can impact student performance. Studies focusing on the experiences of principals emphasize the perceived characteristics of school leaders, including the ability to understand the politics of their positions and their capacity for meeting the expectations of the community. Furthermore, it is critical for principals to receive professional support and training from experienced school leaders.

At the same time, Ross and Cozzens (2016) stated that school administrators’ leadership that focuses on the school’s climate, culture, and instructional practices to diminish the educational gaps confidently forecasts the degree to which collaboration among teachers improves student achievement and the school’s environment. Instructional leaders recognize that school climate may not be seen or touched, but only felt. But then again, it is the quality of institutional life promoted by student learning through the emotional, physical, and social safeties of the school.

Likewise, they maintained that school leadership has significant effects on students’ achievement, and job satisfaction promotes academic growth. Therefore, school principal should demonstrate quality leadership behaviors in a manner that is consistent throughout the school and community in an effort to build trust and support from various stakeholders. Strong educational leaders bring clear and compelling plans and organize
people to achieve the goals through the execution of plans. A leader's job is to cultivate and amass the intellectual capital needed for the school's organizational IQ to increase.

Hence, effective school leaders must support their teams to do their best, restructure the organization to improve effectiveness, and share responsibility as data driven-leaders. Ross and Cozzens emphasized that students succeed under an effective instructional leadership that restricted disruptions and stakeholders who valued high expectations for teaching and learning. Instructional leaders found it beneficial to maintain a positive working relationship among teachers, students, parents, and community leaders, and chose to focus on school climate because it ultimately affected the school’s culture and student achievement.

Along this edge, Hayet, Woods and Martin (2016) pointed out that school leadership is about solving complex problems by raising achievement for all students and thus closing, and hopefully eliminating, the achievement gap. Schools could learn something from the qualities shared by other schools that have been successful in educating poor and minority students to high levels. In fact, effective leaders have as one of their highest priorities to learn from the best practices of high-performing schools.
However, according to Hayet et al., the achievement gap continues to widen between the students of poverty and other students. Thus, in an effort to avoid reinventing the wheel the behaviors of leaders within successful schools of poverty need to be examined. If the educational gaps remain, the workforce will display an abrupt decrease in the number of workers with high school diplomas and college degrees over the years ahead. It is important in this time of high accountability to understand the specific leadership behaviors that effect student achievement within a high poverty setting.

Similarly, Hayet et al. emphasized that regardless of the poverty level of students within a school setting, high achievement can happen for all learners. But it takes a principal who has an understanding of the change process, has created a shared vision, and one who emulates the behaviors of effective leadership. This principal by demonstrating leadership behaviors that enhanced the change process, which inspirationally motivated a collective vision, and provided a myriad of effective learning strategies, created a transforming effect on students, teachers, and parents.

In addition, Pricellas et al. (2016) stated that school administrators who build school capacity through an effective leadership style may
influence student achievement through teachers. The school leader must have or be able to develop the capacity to work with staff to focus on curriculum, instruction and student learning gains. The perception of the school administrator is often as a person who manages a school and not as a person who is an instructional leader. Leaders’ daily activities and decisions reflect the pervasive focus and style of the schools’ leadership. A teacher-focused leader works toward the development of school capacity which builds upon positive teacher capacity with the end results increasing student achievement.

They emphasized that a true leader, first and foremost must not only learn the skills but how to apply them correctly by being a justifiable example himself/herself. This is the correct interpretation of leadership by example which also means learning the skills by doing. Interestingly, the skills of every leader in whatever school institution have become subjects for criticisms down the occupational ladder. Therefore, a manager desiring to keep his job anticipating to move up the organizations ladder, must learn and continue to sharpen his leadership behaviors and skills.

Adjacent to this, their study also revealed that school administrators exhibited the need for improvement as evidenced by the lack of higher exposure particularly on seminars and trainings attended in the
international level. Insofar as leadership skills are concerned, the school administrators have also proven their effectiveness on such function. Similarly, they too possessed effectiveness in terms of their leadership behavior. Thus, school performance appeared to have strong correlations to selected socio-demographic profile variables and leadership skills of the school administrators.

Furthermore, according to them, although most of the school administrators are academically qualified, they may still continue to pursue higher studies like doctorate in order to equip them with advanced and more adequate knowledge, skill and competence to be able to perform their respective tasks inherent to their positions. The author suggested that parallel studies may be conducted by examining other aspects and nature of variables related to leadership skills and behavior so that further assessments on the reliability and validity of the data in this research could be ascertained.

In like fashion, Polatcan and Titrek (2014) said that leadership behavior goes beyond the management duty whose job definitions are stated by laws and regulations. School administrators can be defined as the persons who transfer their knowledge and skills to their subordinates and the roles that those leaders act in their organization. Leadership
behavior has two dimensions. Organizational development and alteration process and the circumstances such as the communication with workers in the organization or increasing efficiency of workers express its construction dimension. The authors examined the relationship between organizational cynicism and leadership behavior. In this regard, a negative relationship between organizational cynicism and leadership behavior is expected.

For Polatcan and Titrek, certain dimensions may be necessary in order to define leadership behaviors. These may include but not limited to integration, communication, the significance of the production, substitution, evaluation of the organization, the power of attempt and gaining superiority, construction, and being tolerant. Moreover, the style of a certain leadership has two dimensions like task-oriented behavior and people-oriented behavior. While some leaders are more task-oriented, others are more people-oriented. Most of leaders make a balance between these two orientations.

In truth, Polatcan and Titrek found out that all the relations between teachers’ attitudes towards organizational cynicism (cognitive, emotional and behavioral) and school principals’ leadership behavior (construction and indulgence) were significantly and negatively associated. The highest negative linear relation was found between the cognitive and the
indulgence dimensions while the lowest negative linear relation was found between the behavioral and construction dimensions. Those teachers’ attitudes towards cynicism are low; school principals’ leadership behaviors are high and the relation between them is negative.

**Adversity Quotient® of school heads.** Adversity Quotient® (AQ®) consists of the following four components such as control, ownership, reach, and endurance. Control measures the degree of control the person perceives that he or she has over adverse events. Ownership measures the extent to which the person owns or takes responsibility for the outcomes of adversity or the extent to which the person holds himself or herself accountable for improving the situation. Reach measures the degree to which the person perceives good or bad events reaching into other areas of life. Endurance measures the perception of time over which good or bad events and their consequences will last or endure. Curtis & Cicchetti (2016) provided a preliminary theoretical framework and outlined empirical strategies for studying resilience at a biological level. Different coping styles operate for different personality types. Low resilience correlates significantly with depression, and vicarious traumatization.

Adversity Quotient® designed by Stoltz in 2000 is a measure of how an individual responds to adversity. The AQ® is mainly composed of
CORE model which represents the four major facets involved which include control, ownership, reach and endurance (CORE). Control measures the degree of control a person perceives over adverse events. It is a gauge of resilience, health, and the ability to turn adversity into opportunity. Ownership measures the extent to which a person holds himself or herself accountable for improving a situation. It is a measure of accountability and responsibility to take actions and learn from the outcomes of the event. Reach refers to the extent one perceives good/bad events influencing other areas of life. It is a strong gauge on how likely the individual feels empowered and prepared to deal with adversity. Endurance is the perception of time over which good or bad events and their consequences will last or endure and a strong gauge of hope and optimism (Stoltz, 2000 as cited by Calles & Besoyo, 2015).

Adversity is the calamitous or disastrous experiences and a condition of suffering, destitution, or affliction (Dohrenwend, 2016). Adversity, then, may apply to conjunction of events that is the cause of unhappy change of fortune or to an ensuing state of distress. Adversity also means as great trial, hardship, and tribulation. There are two categories of adversity which are the inner adversity such as the internal, physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual that cause hardship; while the
outer adversity may include militancy, terrorism, kidnapping, and accident during a field trip. In view of this, the researcher used adversity as a difficult situation, affliction, misfortune or tragedy which emanate from within and outside the school that confronts the school heads in the course of their performance of duties.

With the implementation of school-based management as the decentralization of decision-making, elementary school heads are faced with many issues and emergent adversities which they have to contend with. These issues are, but not limited, to the poor academic performance of the pupils that affects the performance of the school as a whole, increasing drop-out rates, drug addiction, early marriage, parental problems, bullying, indiscriminate use of mobile phones, and indiscipline cited as the most common. The DepEd asserted that how school heads respond to these adversities not only affects their performance but also the performance of those being led. Learning to deal with adversity in the school in one’s life career is an essential element of effective leadership.

In a broader perspective, Aquino (2013) examined the relationship of the adversity quotient®, leadership style, and performance of secondary school heads and commitment of teachers to organizational values. The author revealed that secondary school head-respondents had significantly
little control and influence in adverse situations. They often deflected accountability and most often felt victimized and helpless. Reach and endurance dimensions of secondary school heads were in the average level. Secondary school heads leadership style of transformational and transactional had the same descriptive level.

Usha & Praseeda (2014), Awan & Naureen (2013) posited that adversity quotient® is an aspect of self-esteem, motivation, fighting spirit, creativity, positive attitudes, optimism and emotional stability. Such qualities are important because schools in the twenty-first century have become increasingly challenging than ever. In addition, constant changes in educational institutions can lead to disappointments and frustrations. School leaders with strong adversity quotient tend to be proactive and committed in adverse situations and are capable of turning adversity into opportunities. Quitters were characterized by minimal motivation, non-innovativeness, lack of ambition and inability to take risks and new responsibilities. Campers were those who have stopped moving forward towards career progression as a result of burn-out, tended to settle in what they think was good enough and rarely ventured into bigger challenges. They were already satisfied with the current state of affairs in their stations, letting greater opportunities pass unnoticed.
Employing a cross-sectional design and descriptive-correlational type of research, Bautista et al. (2016) examined in their study the relationship between Adversity Quotient® and Leadership Style among 96 student leaders in Bulacan State University. It was posited that there is a significant relationship between Leadership Styles and Adversity Quotient®. The leadership styles among Student leaders of Bulacan State University are affected by their Adversity Quotient®. The findings reinforce the statement of Dr. Paul G. Stoltz (1997) that AQ® strengthens the effectiveness of leadership style and enhance the effectiveness of subordinates. It also concludes that having low level of AQ® might have negative effect on how leaders handle their organization and subordinates.

Moreover, the control dimension of adversity quotient® refers to the extent to which a person is able to influence a difficult situation positively. It is how much control a person perceives to have over the adverse events. School heads who respond to adversity as temporary, external, and limited are optimistic and tend to enjoy life’s benefits (Canivel, 2015). People with high adversity quotient® tend to handle overwhelming situations compared to those with low adversity quotient who usually give up.

In addition, Baroa (2015), using the descriptive-correlational method of research assessed the level of Adversity Quotient® among forty (40)
public elementary school administrators and ten (10) public secondary school administrators in the Division of Cadiz City in the AQ dimensions of control, ownership, reach, and endurance. Baroa documented that the public elementary and secondary school administrators in the locale are within the Below Average level of Adversity Quotient® which is far below the Average. Also, the author unravelled that the public elementary and secondary school administrators in the said division performed High level of leadership skills. The author disclosed further that one’s leadership skills is not affected by his/her level of adversity, since handling adversities are just part of leadership skills.

Castillano (2017) in his study examined the adversity quotient® of 80 SEEDS trainees in eight selected Jollibee restaurants in Cavite and its relationship to the work-related challenges encountered as basis in creating a proposed coping mechanism model. It was found out that several work-related challenges encountered by the participants included hours of sleep, financial, work and school hours, time management, road traffics, work and school productivity, work, school, and social life balance, work and school schedules, health problems concerning attendance and punctuality, and work and academic performance. Majority of the participants belonged to the low level of adversity quotient® and were
described to give up easily by abandoning their dreams when they encountered hardships with weak tolerance to stress.

Likewise, the study of Calles & Besoyo (2015) found out that the academic administrators had low control and ownership dimensions which was below average level of reach and endurance. They have low adversity quotient® which indicate the low capacity of the respondents to be resilient on adversities and challenges. Age, civil status and highest educational attainment are the best predictors of reach. Only academic rank was a significant predictor for endurance. The level of control and reach of the respondents had significant relationship to adversity quotient®. It was concluded that to overcome adversities and be resilient, there is need for control over adverse events and view them positively to take necessary actions to counteract upon the situation and assure themselves that adversities will not affect other areas of his/her life.

Bakare (2015) examined the profile of adversity quotient (AQ®) of SS III students in the Southwestern States of Nigeria; and whether student-teacher psychological constructs like their adversity quotient (AQ®), students’ attribution, students’ school connectedness, teachers’ self-efficacy, school ownership type, gender, geographical location such as the state where school is located and age are predictive of students’
academic achievement. It was found out that the moderate level of adversity quotient (AQ®) was identified among students in this study, and according to him, the implication of this for academic achievement in WASSCE was that students were likely to be performing averagely due to the moderate level of their AQ®.

In like fashion, the study of Olila (2012) examined the interrelationships among the Adversity Quotient®, personal characteristics and personality-temperament traits of 193 educators composed of college deans, school principals, school heads, academic heads and classroom teachers in selected private and public educational institutions in the Province of Aurora. It was revealed that educator respondents have below average AQ® which indicates that they have less than the ideal capacity to resolve challenges difficulties, setbacks and demands and to make every effort to overcome them so as not to affect their work. Gender, age, civil status, educational attainment, and length of service are not significant factors in differentiating the AQ® profile of the educator respondents.

**Issues and challenges.** Today’s school administrators are confronted, on a daily basis, with a variety of issues from the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM), to handling irate parents, to supporting overwhelmed teachers. How they react to issues
and challenges determines their success or failure as school administrators.

The job expectations for school heads are enormous and compel them to take on many roles including the role of a teacher, psychologist, social worker, facilities manager, assessment expert, educational visionary, diplomat, mentor, public relations coach, and even as a cheerleader. This ever-increasing variety of roles makes their daily work inherently complex and the demands on them are increasingly fragmented, rapid fire, and voluminous. On average, elementary school heads work fifty-one hours a week while secondary school heads work at an average of about fifty-three hours a week (Mendels, 2016).

In this context, their levels of motivation and efficiency to achieve greater things in the job that they do are put at stake. It is noteworthy that school heads today encounter some difficulties as to responding to challenges besetting their school or their people in general. To add, among the many issues and challenges they face also include things related to their leadership behavior specifically their style and their knowledge on the use of technology.

In this modern-day era of educational accountability, school leadership has become increasingly stressful, politically complex, and
time-consuming (Duke, Grogan & Tucker, 2015). For within the school environment, there is great emphasis on implementing centralized policies, commissioning continuous school improvement goals, and documenting improved student achievement as gauged through the standardized test results such as the National Achievement Test (NAT) taken by the pupils, all of which have intensified the workload of school heads. These educational priorities require administrative compliance through completion of reports, tables, charts, and other documents.

Furthermore, the recent introduction of outcomes-based education has necessitated that school heads possess sophisticated knowledge about data-driven decision making and student assessment practices (Hellsten, Nonan & Preston, 2016; Renihan & Noonan, 2017). School heads struggle with the increase in managerial duties and specialized instructional leadership knowledge that have emerged from the implementation of accountability policies.

Another issue that surfaced challenging the elementary school heads is that of forming school-community relations by promoting a sense of mutuality, understanding, harmony, accord, confidence, and respect between school and community organizations (DepEd, 2016; Hands, 2015). Elementary school heads must interact with parents and the
community to promote trust between the community and the school. A channel often used by the school heads to strengthen the school-community bond is parent involvement including, in particular, parent participation in the school programs and projects which are DepEd initiated like Brigada Eskuwela, Gulayan sa Paaralan Project, and Parent-Teacher Association (PTA). As the new normal education surfaces the world today, it is difficult for them to reach out to other stakeholders since not only that parents and students have limited access to technology but they also experience some barriers as to reach out to them.

Segredo (2014) utilized 57 principals and 850 teacher participants from elementary schools, assessed their leadership style scores of elementary school principals accounting for a significant amount of unique variance in predicting their schools’ culture independent of the principals’ emotional intelligence. It was found out that accountability standards imposed on schools’ results in districts employing differentiated support strategies limited or restricted the role of the principal to a greater degree in low performing schools. Furthermore, the implications of this study suggested that outside forces may have impacted the degree to which principals’ leadership style was associated with teachers’ perceptions of school culture.
On the other hand, lack of time to do what the school heads need to do or tasks that were time consuming was a significant challenge to them. Lack of time to complete administrative requirements and providing instructional leadership posed as one of the challenges facing the school heads. Meetings and trainings from the regional to district levels kept them away from the school and the daily tasks at hand.

As Renihan & Noonan (2017) pointed out, the most significant challenge for school heads is to find enough time to do everything well. There is simply not enough time to plan and present staff development, handle discipline, improve parent-involvement, reward students and staff, and complete necessary paperwork. Still another issue and challenge among the school heads is having too many responsibilities to be able to do an adequate job with many school heads feeling completely overwhelmed by these. Aragon (2018) further wrote that there are just too many initiatives in the school such as continuous improvement, feeding program, waste segregation and the like that overwhelmed the school heads. With this, the balancing of management duties and role as an instructional leader of the school heads put too much weight on them.

According to Rivera and Ibarra (2020), empowerment of school heads to enhance school management is one of the major concerns of
Department of Education (DepEd) considering its gigantic bureaucratic structure for effective and efficient delivery of educational service. This can only be achieved if proper attention is given to the people who manage the different schools in the country, whether they are in the elementary or secondary level. Elementary school principals share the administrative and supervisory responsibilities of the division superintendent and district supervisors. Decentralization of power, duties and responsibilities paved the way to the empowerment of school principals.

Intimately linked with the focus on accountability and instructional leadership is the idea of change. It was posited by Anderson & White (2016) and Eady & Zepeda (2018) that the concept of change is often a contentious issue for the school heads. The Philippines adopted major change in the curriculum through the K to 12 educational system, constructivist pedagogical approaches, and the reporting of school goals and performance through the SBM implementation. Localization is also a mandate from the central office the school heads must contend with regarding the adoption of the pedagogical approaches in teaching.

Mendiola (2012) examined and measured the leadership practices of 89 public officials by utilizing Kouzes and Posner’s leadership model and the Leadership Practices Inventory as the research instrument. It was
noted that elected public officials hold one of the highest levels of leadership. They are voted into office with the belief that they embody the ideals of a good leader and are charged with the all-encompassing task of making crucial decisions that affect all sectors of society and its constituents. There is pressure to produce results, maintain credibility in their performance, and build trust with constituents. It is essential that an assessment tool be used to help leaders gain perspective and understanding in determining the effectiveness of their leadership practices.

Principals are considered the brain of the school for they know more in as much as needs, problems, and developments of their respective schools are concerned. In recent years, more attention has been given to the need to enhance school management system and strengthen the authority given to the school heads. The capacity of schools to improve teaching and learning is strongly influenced by the quality of power provided by the school heads. At the same time, policy makers in various educational organizations used these constructs to move towards more school-based management and autonomy.

With the capacity to manage their respective schools, principals have greater extent of empowerment on instructional and administrative
but less in fiscal matters. Hence, they are found better instructional and administrative leaders than financial managers. Instructional leadership defines principals' core functions like updating teachers' lesson plan, attendance, forms and student records. Principals who show high empowerment in terms of instructional have the greater tendency to become successful instructional leaders.

Similarly, educational qualification is imperative to implementing school security. Principals with higher degree may likely manifest greater concerns and accountability about school safety and orderliness. In the same manner with earned credentials, the length of service as school principal most likely may affect how they influence parents for school community involvement. Lastly, principals who carry high level of administrative and fiscal empowerment have the tendency to provide schools direction to establish a set of common core values among the instructional staff. School heads, being more committed to instructional empowerment, most likely may enhance and probably increase their school’s success to become a healthy, safe, orderly and disciplined school environment. Thus, instructional empowerment is imperative to implementing school security.
Many school officials seem to forget the DepEd mission declaring that they are stewards of the organization, rather than being owners of their schools and offices. Instead of caring for the welfare of relevant stakeholders like learners, parents, and teachers, they focus on amassing wealth, even through corrupt means. They demonstrate behavior that perpetuate the traditional view of public officials as corrupt and self-interested, rather than being genuine public servants. This kind of behavior inspires scorn and disrespect from the communities being served. Faced with other issues like student discipline and many other ‘innovations’ to implement, school principals forget that their main task is to ensure that learning happens in their schools. The overlapping tasks that drive school officials to forget their core function adversely affect the department’s mandate of providing high quality learning.

To intensify school-based management (SBM) implementation, the push for higher levels of performance in SBM is sustained. Schools are expected to implement matured levels of practices in dimensions such as but not restricted to leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, resource management, and accountability/continuous improvement. SBM also demands that the School Governing Councils (SGCs) are operationalized to assist the principals in developing realistic school
improvement plans as the challenges that school leaders face are herculean. But they are succeeding in their efforts towards a positive organizational culture because the teachers, school officials, and stakeholders have embraced an advocacy for Transparent, Ethical and Accountable (TEA) governance. The journey towards a transformed organization is never ending. With strong resolve to create a government agency that delivers, supported by an openminded DepEd Executive Committee ably headed by the leadership of the current DepEd Secretary, the organization is hopeful that DepEd will prevail.

According to Alvarado et al. (2019), amid the multitude tasks of a school administrator lies the many constraints that they find the work a difficult one. Most popular clamor is about the stressful nature of their administrative function with many paper works to do, leaving behind more critical tasks such as curriculum development and instructional supervision. The situation is generally compounded by the passage of Republic Act 9155 otherwise known as Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 or School-Based Management that mandated school heads and principals in implementing various school programs and projects on their own. Following the concept of decentralization, this Act empowers school managers’ full autonomy to run the schools and assume their multi-faceted
tasks despite the many constraints. The writers claimed that limitations are boundaries and obstructions that may impede in correctly managing a particular organization. In addition, the source also noted these constraints might limit an organization’s performance relative to its objectives. However, the writers believed that successful school leaders respond productively to challenges and opportunities created by work accountability.

It was emphasized that there are different constraints met by school administrators including inadequate funding and physical facilities; process management implementation; curriculum management; and management and leadership roles. The writers posited that school leaders’ capacity matters and effective mechanisms will be of great help since constraints cannot be avoided. The quality of being a good administrator matters most to attract students to enroll in a particular school which would bring direct benefit to the school in terms of budget, i.e. the more the number of enrollees, the more significant share of the maintenance and other operating expenses (MOOE) allocation that is intended to finance the recurring expenses incurred every month. Besides, higher enrollment intake also enables the school to obtain additional continuous monetary
and in-kind support from parents and other stakeholders within the community.

It was forwarded that organizational change requires school managers to have a broad understanding of how systems and organizations work in carrying out their respective duties and responsibilities effectively. However, as noted, most of the instructional leaders working have a high level of difficulty in managing the areas of human resource, physical facility management, data handling and management, conflict resolution and management, establishing linkage including the performance of instructional, supervisory functions. Indeed, the role of the school administrators has continuously evolved from managerial to leadership functions. Currently, these instructional leaders remain to be perceived as the leader bringing change and transformation in their respective organizations. But with difficulties and challenges, the authors further concluded that the actual performance of principals, school heads, and head teachers may be below the expected standards and criteria of school-based management frame of reference.

According to Montecinosa et al. (2018), understanding the problems that principals confront when attempting to move their schools forward, may illuminate issues of recruitment, selection, preparation, and induction.
All these have been identified as critical stages to develop effective principals.

In particular, San Antonio (2019) pinpointed some perception and practice among many DepEd officials and teachers that securing a job or a promotion takes the recommendation of the influential. There have been instances that even those who are not qualified were allowed to head a schools’ division office. An official who does not possess the right qualification would also tend to base promotional and hiring decisions on things other than merit. This kind of situation constrains policy makers from allowing the most qualified candidates to get jobs and promotions. Eventually, the best people in the organization get demoralized and stop being valuable assets.

Furthermore, the increased societal expectations for schools to reach a more diverse student population, as well as national and international testing programs that rank schools and countries, have contributed to making the school principalship a highly demanding role. Increased demands on school principals are grounded on the premise that there is a positive relationship between effective leadership practices and students’ academic achievement. Leadership succession is a critical
aspect of school improvement and it has to be approached from a systemic perspective, considering that it has effects on the entire staff.

Another issue raised is on improving educational outcomes for all students. This entails reforms in principals’ work, concomitant with policies that provide breadth, depth, length, alignment, and coherence in other components of leadership across the system. Policymakers’ demands on school principals may be underpinned by unrealistic assumptions about the transformational role of school principals. Without a doubt, improving the quality of the public-school system requires a root and branch review of leadership capabilities, involving all actors in this complex educational system.

In the same way, Durban and Catalan (2012) posited that presently, the Philippine educational system is faced by several issues that need to be addressed in order to improve the delivery of education to the most number of the population. One of these is the quality and accessibility of education to its takers. However, it was noted the Philippine government, in spite of its inadequacy of providing some basic services to its people, is doing its best to provide the rudiments of basic schooling to its people for free. Access to public education is now a right of every Filipino child and a responsibility of the parents. Those who can afford still patronize private
institutions for the education of their children because of the issue of quality, which is another issue to contend with.

To provide quality education to all students is the most important mission of every educational institution. However, with the multifarious problems facing the public schools, delivery of instruction is hindered. Reality tells that even if the public school teachers are qualified to teach, the lack of instructional materials, inadequate facilities and lack of training for professional growth hinder them to perform at their best. It is sad to note that with students reaching up to sixty pupils and students in a classroom, the learning environment is distorted. This problem is also true even in the private schools. Private schools have to exert extra effort to attract a good number of enrolments to ensure their survival.

Rhoden (2012) studied 165 secondary school principals from the three largest school districts in South Florida, of which, 58 completed three online survey instruments. The author posited that accountability pressures and ambitious educational goals have placed districts and schools in the position of requiring rapid change to meet the new demands of secondary school reform. It was found out that positive partial correlations were found between the leadership variables of Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling Others to Act, Encouraging the Heart, and Challenging the Process and
the climate variables of Order, Leadership (Instructional), Instruction, and Expectation. Moreover, Rhoden emphasized that when school principals are explicit about behavioural expectations, provide support to help students meet expectations, monitor individual and school-wide behavior, and provide frequent positive reinforcement, student discipline can be reduced and instructional time recovered.

**Preparation of management plan.** A management plan is a document that guides all aspects of the program or project. Its purpose is to capture the current status of the project or the program, to establish goals and objectives for the future, and to articulate how those goals and objectives are prioritized and how they will be met. Management plan encourages more effective management by ensuring the management decisions are based on a clear understanding of the program or project, by providing guidance to managers in the form of a framework for the operations and long-term management. It can help make sensible use of resources by identifying, describing, and prioritizing management tasks required to achieve the objectives (Thomas & Middleton, 2014).

As posited by Adamcik & Bellantoni (2014), the management plan must include clear objectives to help ensure that problems identified are addressed. This also helps in focusing participants to the desired end
product rather than a problem – based approach that tackles individual problems one-by-one. A clear mission statement with specific goals and objectives leads to the development of integrated action plans that address multiple problems simultaneously in order to work toward achieving the desired end.

Furthermore, Anderson & White (2016) emphasized that the management plan contains five basic components such as the statement of priority problems to be addressed, goals and objectives, actual plan, monitoring strategy, and finance strategy or budget. The purpose of the management plan is to plan, coordinate and control the fulfillment of project objectives in the most efficient manner in accordance to the needs of the stakeholders (Harris & McCaffer, 2013).

Moreover, the effectiveness of the management plan is defined as a measure of degree with which the objectives have been attained. It is the extent to which the goals of a project are attained or the degree to which a system can be expected to achieve a set of specific requirements. Hyvari (2016) cited there are various factors that need to be met to assure achievement of meeting objectives such as if the objectives of the project have been achieved to the full satisfaction of the users, all activities have
been completed, and all designated interest including project sponsor and initiator officially accepts the project results and closes the project.

As to the factors affecting the project management effectiveness, Westerveld (2013); Shah & Patel (2018) posited that project cycle, clearly defined roles and responsibilities, time management, economic factors, and risks are factors affecting the success of project management plan. All projects pass through different phases of life cycle which have a significant impact on the effectiveness of project management. The main phases of all projects include conceptualization, planning, execution, and termination. It is important for project managers to understand the life cycle in order to complete the project timely and successfully because it helps in understanding the rational series of events in the range of progress of the project.

In the same vein, Zou, Kamaraswamy & Chung (2014) emphasized that clearly defined roles and responsibilities are important in the management processes in a project to clearly define roles and responsibilities in order to ensure that they are implemented successfully. This leads to increase in responsibility of the team members towards their job since their roles have been clearly spelled out and their performance is
measured against the same. Responsibility matrix is a tool that is used for the purpose of clarifying the member's roles and responsibilities.

Andal (2020) conducted a phenomenological research which explored the experiences of seven first-time Jesuit school directors of mission high schools in the Southern Philippines and examined their perceptions about the leadership formation that they received as seminarians before being missioned to the ministry of leading high-needs schools in the peripheries of rural Philippines. It was revealed that those who were appointed to be school directors in mission schools in this area might arrive and work at their respective schools with little practical and effective educational leadership knowledge and skills if their seminary formation did not have any intentional and purposeful educational leadership formation program to prepare them as school leaders. Therefore, Andal recommended the institutionalization of programmatic leadership training modules for Jesuits before they are missioned as first-time school directors.

Time management is another important factor affecting the effectiveness of a management plan. According to Solis-Carcano et al. (2015), efficient time management is regarded as the most important factor which impacts management of project in its execution. It is measured by
checking the missed deadlines and unfinished deliverables. Ineffective time management leads to increase in stress as well as frustration in the project manager including his or her team members.

A study of Ugur and Koc (2019) on school principals’ perspective on use of technology showed that while some principals were confident with their abilities to implement the mission and vision for technology in their schools, others were not so knowledgeable about their roles. They believed that a variety of factors hindered their implementation, from the lack of proper professional development to the lack of funding for instructional materials, software, and hardware. Also, a lack of time management for learning the technology practices was a big issue for principals.

In the study of Napire (2019), the low Adversity Quotient® score along control dimension of the school principal’s pushes them to take negative actions over challenges and difficulties faced in the workplace. With the low score of Adversity Quotient® along ownership and origin dimension concluded that school principals would most likely to blame others and composite a negative action when dealing with adversities. Meanwhile, the below average score of the school principals along reach dimensions evidently displayed that it affected other aspects of their lives
leading to a bit frustration, bitterness, failure, misfortune and led to poor
decision making. Finally, the below average score of the school principals’
Adversity Quotient® along endurance dimensions could be concluded that
they see adversities as a bit dragging on indefinitely, if not permanently. By
combining the models to improve Adversity Quotient® and Management
Skills the researcher come up with this model; DEAL on Adversity
Quotient® and Systematic Approach in Management. By dealing
adversities and difficulties in the workplace and in – placing Systematic
Approach in management would dramatically improve Adversity Quotient®
and management skills of the school principals. This model could be
materialized also through training, seminars, lecture-discussion and
application.

Finally, risk refers to the possible external actions that can have a
negative effect on the project on their occurrence. It includes the different
combinations of the possibility that the event shall occur as well as the
impact it shall have on the project. The probability as well as its impact on
the efficient management of projects needs to be assessed as if it is too
high, it shall be detrimental to the successful execution of the project and
proactive plans need to be put in place to mitigate them (Uher & Toakley,
2018).
On the other hand, the related studies presented guided the researcher in the most appropriate way of investigation process of this study. They helped the researcher in making more productive and worth sharing to the bank of knowledge particularly in leadership and adversity quotient® of school principals. The similarities and differences were identified.

The study of Napire (2016) dealt with the Adversity Quotient® and the Management Skills of the school heads as a basis in coming up with a proposed model relevant to help institutional performance. Their study was found to improve the management skills of school heads and thereby deemed similar to the present undertaking as the latter also aims to propose a management model or plan to improve the adversity quotient and leadership behaviors of school administrators. The only differ was that the present study focused more on the leadership behaviors of the respondents and not with their skills.

On the other hand, the study of Mendiola (2012) focused on understanding the leadership practices of school administrators if those were aligned with the desired results that they aim for their institutions. It was found out that using an assessment tool to personally track their practice is somehow similar to the present undertaking as this focused on
allowing school administrators to review their own Adversity Quotient® Profile, through proposed Training Course and Management Plan for an improved leadership capability. On the other hand, the only differ was that the present study dealt more on responding to adversities rather than fulfilling standard goals for institutions.

School administrators undeniably played an important role in the entire school system; they must have enough time to perform their task for the welfare of the school children, teachers and the community. Concerted effort to improve school leadership is one of the most promising points of intervention to raise performance, the quality and efficiency of educational services of schools.

Meanwhile, the study of Ugur & Koc (2019) was found to be similar to the present undertaking as both showed how the knowledge on technology becomes a hindrance to solving challenges and difficulties coming along their way. Hence, it is noted from both studies that school leaders must be subjected to advanced trainings, thereby improving their levels of capabilities to respond to issues relevant to the aspect of technology. The two just differs in a way that the present study focuses on looking at the behavioral aspect of the leaders’ knowledge on technology use and not only on the cognitive one.
Baptiste (2019) posited in his study that in order to become successful in the field, school administrators have to employ the transformational style in leadership as suggested. It is found to be similar in the present study as it aims to understand the varying leadership styles of the respondents and from there provide learning opportunities for them to improve such style of administration. However, it was different from the former in a sense that the latter is focused as well in the ways they respond to adversities and not only on their leadership styles.

The present study to some extent is similar to the diverse studies conducted by different researchers in terms of its variables; the present study will have dealt on the Adversity Quotient® -and leadership behavior which aimed to correlate the two variables in improving the school heads’ leadership capabilities in the Schools Division of Batangas.

**Theoretical Framework**

The main concern of this study was to find the effect of the adversity quotient® of public elementary school administrators to their leadership behavior. This will serve as basis for the construction of a management plan / model to enhance the respondents’ leadership skills and adversity quotient. Premised on this, following were theories linked to the study and
used primarily for the purpose of helping to scaffold and shape the justification of the current research problem.

The following were the theories that are deemed essential in deeply understanding the foundations of the present undertaking. Since describing the leadership behaviors of leaders was integral in the study, the human relation theory by Mayo (1967) was deemed beneficial to be understood. As these behaviors were described, these were assessed through the theory of adversity quotient by Stoltz (1997, 2000) whether or not the leadership behaviors were significant or not amid these adversity concerns. On the other hand, The contingency model of leadership was also deemed important in the present study as it guides leaders to enhance their leadership behaviors and capabilities. In the end, after analyzing these important variables, a management plan was developed to address the needs of school leaders for leadership capability enhancement.

The human relation theory initiated by Elton Mayo (1967) takes consideration of human feelings and attitudes in carrying out specific tasks. For Bruce and Nyland (2011), they posited that as per this theory, humans have high-level psycho-social needs and their social relationship at work plays an important role in their productivity. Hence, understanding that
people have to be mentally and emotionally equipped allows them to perform duties that are assigned to them.

Premised on the theory, looking into the human relations bring people’s social needs into the limelight. Leaders in school should understand that they have needs to clearly determine what they have and what they lack. Understanding these needs would increase their capacity for collaboration at work. Hence, leaders should learn how to collaborate as well with their subordinates for this would definitely accomplish organizational goals. Arguably, this is essential in the present undertaking as it aimed to assess whether the school leaders have the kind of traits and behaviors for them to run a certain institution successfully.

On the other hand, Stoltz (1997,2000) provided theories on the adversity quotient of an individual to help resolve the challenge and strive to overcome it so as not to affect what someone may accomplish. Shen (2014) posited that the theory of adversity quotient® is deemed essential as this will provide clarification on the psychological reactions that people have when they encounter adversity. Hence, analyzing the level of adversity quotient of school leaders in the context of this study, would help them appropriately react to incoming adversities that may hamper their leadership and their school’s success at large.
After carefully understanding that school leaders have to know what they need in order to improve their leadership behavior, it is equally important that they understand their strong and weak points to allow them to appropriately react on certain adversities that come along their way. With this, it will be a lot better for them to take on paths to improve their management and increase the likelihood of successfully building great foundations in leading a school or a unit.

Meanwhile the third theory which is the contingency model of leadership pioneered by Fiedler is essential as it clarifies that a leader’s effectiveness depends on a combination of two forces such as the leader’s leadership style and situational favourableness or what Fiedler’s theory considers as situational contingency.

As supported by Scouller (2016), Fiedler's theory considers the leader’s personality and the leader’s behavior from the extent to which a leader’s personality is fixed, and the extent to which a leader’s personality controls a leader’s behavior. This simply suggests that the theory enables leaders to see the effect of the situational adversities or contingencies on the kind of behavior they should possess. Hence, understanding that could control the leadership behavior of leaders, it can guide the researcher to coming up with certain strategies how to control or at least align their
behaviors to whatever challenge their schools are facing. All these theories presented are deemed remarkable as they allowed the researcher to understand the interconnectedness of leaders’ behaviors to how these are essentially used to endure adversities and how these situations leaders are put to can actually control or improve the appropriate behavior they should possess towards achieving success in the organization — a basis in the development of a management plan to improve the leadership capabilities of today’s school leaders.

Figure 1 presents the relevant theories which explains the connections of school heads’ human behaviors to the ways they lead their institutions and responds to adversities. Through understanding these ideas, the researcher aims to look for support in preparing the management plan to enhance their leadership capabilities, in hopes of achieving quality of education.
Figure 1
Theoretical Paradigm of the Study

The Human Relations Theory
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Conceptual Framework

Leadership in education takes a crucial role in the development and success of institutions. Hence, it is important to assess and describe the existing leadership behaviors of school leaders to identify what competencies and attributes they have or lack and how these are deemed essential to solving adversities that they commonly encounter in the school setting. Hence, the effect of school administrators’ adversity quotient on their ways of leadership and the identification of common issues and challenges they encounter were defined elements as the researcher delves into finding the appropriate action to improve their leadership capabilities.

It has to be understood that leadership behaviors specify the traits, attitudes and ways of thinking of leaders which guide them to supervise their organization. On the other hand, the adversity quotient® determines the level of tolerance of the leaders with some adversities besetting their leadership and, in this study was directly linked to the existing leadership behaviors.

In an expanded view, the study covered the issues and challenges encountered by leaders which were either personal or professional in nature. These specified the common problems they encounter relative to
relationship, supervision and organization. Hence, analyzing all these variables guided the researcher to come up with a management plan which includes tangible and realistic activities addressing the nature of the problems encountered by the leaders. Figure 2 is the conceptual framework of the study for better understanding of its variables.

**Figure 2**
Conceptual Framework of the Study
Figure 2 shows the conceptual framework of the study which includes variables like the leadership behavior, the adversity quotient®, its effects with each other, and the issues and challenges faced by school administrators which were all bases for the development of a management plan designed for school heads.

As presented in the figure, the directional arrow represents leadership behaviors of school heads are directly related to the adversity quotient® as these behaviors manifested by leaders greatly determine whether they are equipped with the right mindset and attitude to solve adversities happening in the leadership process. Moreover, apart from the internal factors that might affect the ways leaders handle their specific organizations, it is also important to note external reasons why certain plans and directives do not come smoothly as it is planned. Hence, the framework identified the common issues and challenges faced by these school heads to bring about clarification as to what appropriate measures shall be carried out to achieve success in the organization.

With the aim to enhance the leadership capabilities of public elementary school leaders, it is imperative that salient features like desirable leadership behaviors in existent and how these are beneficial in seeing adversities and other challenges definitely should be carefully
studied because these would serve as a guide for the researcher to develop a management plan that would cater for the leader-capability enhancement of public elementary school administrators.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD AND PROCEDURE

This chapter presents the research design, subjects of the study, research instrument, data gathering procedure and the statistical treatment of data.

Research Design

This study utilized the descriptive co-relationship method of research in the identification of the leadership behaviors and determination of the adversity quotient® and the issues and challenges encountered by public elementary school administrators in the Schools Division Office (SDO) of Batangas Province.

Premised on this context, Pulmones and Religioso (2017) contended that descriptive research involves collecting data in order to answer questions about the current status of the subject. They noted furthermore that this method of research is carried out to obtain information about the preferences, attitudes, practices, concerns, and/or interests of a particular group of people, and in the case of this inquiry, the group of public elementary school administrators.

Evidently, this research design was the most appropriate for the reason that, as mentioned earlier, the study focused on a correlational
analysis between the factors of reported adversity quotient® and leadership behavior responses of the respondents.

Subjects of the Study

The subjects of the study consisted of 232 out of 580 public elementary school administrators in the Division of Batangas during the school-year 2020-2021. The number of respondents was obtained through the use of Raosoft formula, a sampling procedure wherein the schools were randomly selected from the list of public elementary schools provided by and obtained with permission through the endorsement and indispensable approval of the Schools Division Superintendent of SDO Batangas Province.

Table 1
Respondents of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>School Administrators’ Population</th>
<th>School Administrators’ Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the two-hundred thirty-two (232) public school administrators who were randomly selected by the researcher under the
four area classifications namely Area 1, Area 2, Area 3, and Area 4 respectively as well as the various school districts under the jurisdiction of SDO Batangas Province. The number of samples taken from the population was deemed adequate to substantiate the results of the study.

**Data Gathering Instruments**

The present undertaking made use of self-made questionnaire and interview, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and the Adversity Quotient® Profile developed by Dr. Paul G. Stoltz as main data-gathering instruments. The researcher exhausted comprehensive readings from various sources related to the subject of the study which is leadership capabilities.

**Questionnaire.** In order to gather essential data for the study, the researcher employed the use of a self-made questionnaire which went rigorous process of validation from research experts and the dissertation adviser. Relevant concepts found on the questionnaire were based on relevant concepts on leadership and adversity quotient to suit the goal of the study. Moreover, the comments and suggestions provided were considered to improve the instrument for reliability and validity of the survey to be conducted.
**Validation.** This researcher-made questionnaire on the problems met by public school administrators was validated by a statistician to determine and ensure its reliability. To attain face and content validity, the questionnaire was submitted to the experts in the field, after which it was rewritten for enhancement following the suggestions put in place. After some episodes of revisions, the researcher-made questionnaire was readied for administration.

**Administration.** The researcher, through the permission sought from the SDO Batangas Province School Division Superintendent, informed the Public Schools District Supervisors (PSDS) comprising Areas 1-4 regarding the participation of 232 public elementary school administrators from the said divisions. Briefing and orientations were made via different online platforms to walk participants through answering an online AQ® Profile assessment and the researcher-made questionnaire at the same time. Since there were limited personal interactions as mandated by the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF), issues in the conduct of the assessment were met including poor internet connections and the duration of the assessment which left participants with fear of not being able to finish it in time.
Moreover, communications through the internet with the authors of Adversity Quotient® Profile, Dr Paul G. Stoltz at Peak Learning, Inc. California were also conducted.

In the administration of AQ® instruments, the researcher was led to sign an agreement sent and faxed it back to the address provided. The adversity response profile (ARP) was administered through the links to use granted along with the advice as regards the specific dates these links will be closed. Since respondents were all very busy with work, answering the assessment was done swiftly as most of them answered it before the links expired, hence with the garnered results of the study.

Scoring of responses. The researcher-made questionnaire consisted of five (5) parts describing the leadership behaviors of public elementary school administrators as regard (1) personality (2) leadership style (3) learning environment (4) knowledge on technology (5) organizational composition and strength. The scale used was 4– greatly manifested 3- moderately manifested 2- slightly manifested and 1- least manifested.

On the other hand, the questionnaire describing the issues and challenges of public elementary school administrators consisted the scale such as but not restricted to 4– strongly evident 3- moderately evident 2- slightly evident and 1- least evident.
The following scale continuum was used for the self-made questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Verbal Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50 – 4.00</td>
<td>Greatly Manifested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50 – 3.49</td>
<td>Moderately Manifested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50 – 2.49</td>
<td>Slightly Manifested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00 – 1.49</td>
<td>Least Manifested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results were measured using this scale continuum for issues and challenges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Verbal Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50 – 4.00</td>
<td>Highly Evident (HE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50 – 3.49</td>
<td>Moderately Evident (ME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50 – 2.49</td>
<td>Slightly Evident (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00 – 1.49</td>
<td>Least Evident (LE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, immediately after the online submission of the responses, the descriptive interpretations of AQP® were sent by Stoltz with the use of the electronic spreadsheet. The score range and its corresponding interpretation are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2**

*Adversity Quotient® Score Range and Equivalents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176-200</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158-175</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-157</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-135</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-118</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The explanation of the verbal interpretation is as follows:

*High.* The person probably has the ability to withstand significant adversity and to continue to move forward and upward in life.

*Above Average.* The person has probably done a fairly good job in persisting through challenges and in tapping a good portion of growing potential on a daily basis.

*Average.* The person usually does decent job of navigating life as long as everything is going relatively smooth. However, the person may suffer unnecessarily from larger setbacks, or may be disheartened by the accumulated burden of life’s challenges.

*Below Average.* The person is likely to be under-utilizing his potential. Adversity can take a significant and unnecessary toll, making it difficult to continue the ascent. The person may battle against a sense of helplessness and despair. Escape is possible by raising the AQ®.

*Low.* The person probably suffers unnecessarily in a number of ways. The motivation, energy, vitality, health, performance, persistence, and hope can be greatly revitalized by learning and practicing the tools in raising adversity quotient.

The AQ® is composed of the following four CORE dimensions namely: control, ownership, reach and endurance. The CORE equivalents
were provided by Stoltz, (2009). The CORE score range and its verbal interpretation are presented in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE Dimensions</th>
<th>Equivalents/Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>48-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>43-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>44-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview.** Interviews were also conducted among selected school heads to add substantial information to support the present undertaking. Google meets were scheduled by the researcher to meet the respondents online and also some were asked to come up with their answers on the questions asked as well via video. The information provided by the respondents were utilized to substantiate the results of the study conducted.

**Focus Group Discussion.** The researcher came up with a focus group discussion involving the school administrators coming from the four areas of the schools division of Batangas. Together, through google meet, they were asked to share their insights about the way they manages their respective schools and how they responded to issues and challenges
besetting them. Through this, the researcher was able to get the information served as first hand responses from the respondents and value-added inputs and from there, the researcher was able to determine key areas to improve their leadership styles and behaviors.

Data Gathering Procedure

After the approval of the questionnaire from the research adviser, the researcher processed a letter of request duly noted by the adviser which was sent to each school head from the Division of Batangas for the collection of data.

Upon the request’s approval, the researcher distributed the questionnaire to the selected school heads and asked them to answer the said research instrument. Clarification as to the purpose and directions of the activity were discussed by the researcher. Respondents were given enough time to answer the questionnaire.

Meanwhile, online interviews were also conducted to gather relevant information from select heads to substantiate the results of the study.

After the administration and collection of the questionnaires, the responses were collated, scored, tabulated and treated using different statistical tools.
Statistical Treatment of Data

To better provide clarity on the interpretation of the data obtained, the researcher employed the use of the following statistical tools:

**Weighted mean.** This statistical tool was used to assess the description of the leadership behaviors in terms of key aspects like personality, learning environment, learning style, technology and organizational composition and strength. Moreover, it also assessed the respondents’ adversity quotient, and the issues and challenges met by the school heads as basis in the development of a management plan to enhance their leadership capabilities.

**Multiple regression analysis.** This statistical tool also an extension of simple linear regression is a powerful technique used for predicting the unknown value of a variable from the known value of two or more variables- also called the predictors. In this case, the dependent variable is the leadership behaviors of school heads which are certainly affected by the independent variables which is their adversity quotient.
CHAPTER IV 
PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter presents the data gathered and collated to realize the objectives of the study. These data were likewise analyzed and interpreted in the light of the conceptual framework presented.

1. Description of Leadership Behavior of Public Elementary School Administrators

School administrators take an exponential part in the success of every academic institution. The roles they play are significant in the fulfillment of their goals and aspirations not only for their support staff but also to the student body at large. Hence, it is imperative to identify salient features of some behaviors that should be manifested by leaders in order to keep up with the demands and challenges of today’s pedagogy especially in this new normal education set-up.

1.1. Personality. The way school leaders think, feel and behave towards themselves and towards others greatly leave a mark on the work they do, which defines the personality they show to people. Hence, the success of every school lies on the kind of mindset leaders have on varying situations. Table 4 presents the leadership behaviors of the school heads in terms of their personality. The respondents revealed that they greatly manifested the attribute of being appreciative in every
accomplishment made by the members of their team. This implies that words of appreciation in the good works made by key members of the organization greatly help them in improving the work that they do. It is highly important that leaders show their members how they recognize their efforts in keeping up with the team’s desired goals. This action allows the members to realize that their micro-efforts create macro-effects for the organization at large. Moreover, it makes them recognize their important roles in the pursuit of the team’s success. Hence, it is imperative that leaders always make their subordinates feel that they are validated and valued for their contributions.

This is parallel with the insights of Ross and Cozzens (2016) who mentioned that school leaders should focus on building an environment where the culture and climate diminish educational gaps and improve collaboration between and among stakeholders. Looking at how important it is that support from the administrators has to be felt by simply appreciating the works they have done is integral already in the organization’s success. The organization greatly helps them in improving the work that they do. It is highly important that leaders show their members how they recognize their efforts in keeping up with the team’s desired goals.
Table 4
Leadership Behavior in Terms of Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appreciative in every accomplishment made by the members of the team</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transparent attitude is evident in showing open communication among team members</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Friendly and approachable</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Energized in doing tasks with the team</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Persuasive in leading the team to support what was conceived as the most practical approach to effect change</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Convincing enough in making the whole team accept needed changes for reforms promoting everyone's welfare</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Confident in acting as spokesperson of the team</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Straightforward in showing the way to attain desired goal</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Resilient in facing the challenges and emergent change in education in the new normal</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Smart in decision-making on the affairs and activities for school's Improvement</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Permissive to the members in using their own judgement to solve problems</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Self-assured in coaching key people in the team to achieve excellence in education</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Persuasive talker on behalf of the organization</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Keen in predicting what is coming next</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Proactive in making pep talks to stimulate the team</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Composite Mean | 3.70 | GM |

Legend:  
GM – Greatly Manifested  
MM – Moderately Manifested  
WM – Weighted Mean  
VI – Verbal Interpretation
Furthermore, the school heads greatly manifested transparent attitude in showing open communication among team members. This result indicates that communication is integral in achieving the desired goals of the team. It is equally important that they openly and transparently communicate the plans, challenges and endeavours of the organization to make them feel part of the group. In this case, school heads allow members to have insights on the development and rooms for improvement of the team. Conforming to the idea of Baptiste (2019), he emphasized that transformational leadership is far way better than transactional leadership. Transformational leaders, according to him are centered on impacting others the way they should view their jobs in school through open and transparent communication. As its tenets are anchored on its four dimensions namely: charisma or idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration; school leaders are expected to be more open in communicating proper expectations and feedbacks to improve their subordinates’ functions.

Likewise, it can also be deduced from the table that being friendly and approachable was a behavior greatly manifested by the school leaders. This indicates that they are all easy to work with in various school related tasks. Their ability to level with their members by acting not as
superior but as friends create likely a good working relation with their subordinates. As conformity to the starting principle, leaders are able to look within the levels of the teachers, hence giving them enough reason to understand their needs to achieve quality service. In turn, teachers are able to freely get in touch with them without feeling inferior over their leads. This supports the idea of Baptiste (2019) who has posited that the ability of school heads to understand the positions held by teachers and students in doing academic tasks and their capacity for meeting the expectations of the community positively influences teacher job satisfaction and work performance and can impact student performance. The connection built through openness and ease has easily allowed successes to be achieved by the team.

On the other hand, it can be gleaned from the results of the survey that school leaders greatly manifest energy in doing tasks with the team. This is also anchored on the result that leaders were friendly and approachable to be with. It indicates that the enthusiasm these leaders display allow the positive energy to be absorbed in the team as they, together attain the organization’s objectives. It is highly important that leaders model a positive attitude in dealing with certain tasks and
challenges so as to influence others to imbibe the same attitude towards work.

Congruent to Priscellas et al (2016) notion, they emphasized the need for the school leader to work alongside with the staff in aspects concerning curriculum, instruction, and student learning gains. Perceived as a school manager not an instructional leader, school heads have to work openly and enthusiastically with teachers to strengthen the teaching and learning process. In lieu of this, a teacher-focused leader should work towards the development of school capacity which builds upon positive teacher capacity with the end results of increasing student achievement.

The table also reveals that school leaders greatly manifested persuasion in leading the team to support what was conceived as the most practical approach to effect change. This is an indication that the respondents have the ability to influence the working behavior of the team in seeing changes in the organization. It has to be noted that the success of a team largely depends on the kind of influence left by the leader. It means that the ability to induce motivation to work and improve and persuade the team to view only success indicators for the team guides them to do better.
These findings conform with Coleman et al. (2017) and McNally (2019) who cited that effective school heads are proactive and aware on what is going internally and externally in school. They accept the suggestions and good ideas from people, create an atmosphere which lets people in the school participate in school development and guide them to doing the right action for the organization’s improvement. Their ability to positively persuade others bring about positive changes for everyone.

Meanwhile, data show that the respondents’ ability to practice persuasion and proactive pep talks to stimulate team members were moderately manifested. These results imply that school heads lack the integration of small talks to motivate team members which could be due to the load of work and the lack of time to engage in such communication modes. This supports the idea of Cerit (2009) who emphasized that a principal is considered a servant leader, one who can set the stage for the development of self-efficacy in followers through three main forms of influence: mastery experiences, various experiences and verbal persuasion. As leaders become effectual, the level of motivation they pour into the teachers, persuading them to be better and achieve greater has been considered a challenge nowadays as everyone becomes entitled of
their own judgment and decisions to carry out their personal and professional plans.

Supporting this contention was Basañes (2020) who also pinpointed that public school administrators lacked the knowledge and skills in performing their instructional leadership functions in developing programs and/or adopting existing programs. They were observed to have moderate competence in the assessment of learning, implementing programs instructional improvement, and instructional supervision, respectively. Hence, it was suggested to conduct an instructional leadership capability enhancement program to drive leaders to initiate small and focus group discussions that would definitely improve their levels of persuasion and communication to keep their teachers’ level of motivation high enough and help achieve the team’s desired goals. After all, the trust of the members largely depends on the capacities of leaders; hence capacity-building should start from the administrators.

In like manner, it was also revealed in the results of the study that the ability of school leaders to be keen in seeing what was coming next was manifested to a great extent. This is an indication that some leaders were caught off guard in unforeseen situations which challenged the way they run the institution. With the global pandemic that hit the world today,
education has largely been affected. Leaders are expected to be strategic as to the plans of still being able to carry out the organization’s goals without forsaking quality service. In these trying times, it has put the leaders’ shoes on critical decision times to think of ways and approach to respond to unexpected educational issues especially during this period.

In a way, such insight on weak projection was tackled by Hayet et. al (nd), who pointed out that achievement gap continues to widen with some poverty related concerns that both impede success in the educative process. Although it is not poverty which hampers today’s educational setting, but the global pandemic, it is equally important for school leaders to examine plans to carry out solutions during these unforeseen situations that are besetting the system today. Hence, it is important in this time of high accountability to understand the specific leadership behaviors that affect teachers which are the immediate drivers of student achievement.

The composite mean for the school heads indicates that the leadership behavior indicators reflective of personality were greatly manifested. This suggests that the school heads in the Division of Batangas portray desirable attitudes considering leading an organization. Hence, the kind of leaders they are, results to the kind of work they produce and the kind of members they grow.
1.2. Leadership style. The ability to impact change does not only end in proper mind setting. It also has to end up realizing this mindset with actions to positively create a difference. Hence, school leaders have to look into reviewing their leadership styles in order to provide better assistance to their immediate subordinates. Leadership styles delineate the manner and approach of the total pattern of explicit and implicit actions performed by a leader. Table 5 presents the indicators of the school administrators’ behavior in terms of their leadership style.

Results of the survey reveal that observing ethics in advocating transparency and accountability in the school management was manifested to a great extent. This is a clear indication that school heads place honesty and responsibility at a greatest importance in terms of the decisions and processes they make within the organization. It is necessary that they communicate honestly and openly every move and decision they will make because those will either directly or indirectly affect their subordinates. Similarly, it is also imperative that leaders take the initiative to face consequences of whatever decision was made. This is premised on the notion of Sancar (2009) who emphasized that effective leadership consideration and initiation of structure behaviors go hand in hand. The role played by school leaders centers on engaging teachers and other staff
in a transparent school management process that allows them to be accountable for whatever success or failure the institution will experience. With this, it allows each member of the school to see their part as a great help in achieving the goals of the school community such is the essence of ethical behavior.

Moreover, it was revealed in the results of the survey that being open-minded in inspiring team members for enthusiasm with school’s programs and project to a great extent. This clearly implies that the way leaders supervise their subordinates have to be enthusiastically encouraging them to take part in small or big victories of the organization. Allowing the teachers to work with them and succeed with them inspires them to do better and be better. If leaders exude great energy and positivity for work, it directly transcends to the workers until it becomes a natural part of the system. This attitude is a beautiful butterfly effect which allows leaders to ask for participation on the part of their people in various school related programs and projects.

Relative to this is the idea of Sancar (2009) which emphasized that effective leadership comes from the school administrators’ job to provide possibilities for work engagement and satisfaction. This is done by opening the minds of team members to positively support achievement of
organizational goals, and to remove impediments blocking need satisfaction. The success of a community lies on the ability of leaders to promote inquiry and dialogue, encourage collaboration and team learning and empowering people toward a collective vision.

School heads mentioned that dialogue and open communication through regular meetings allow their teaching and non-teaching staff to be openly engaged in decision making. According to them, they see it a fit to discuss important matters to their subordinates as it allows everyone to share responsibility in the fulfillment of the organization’s goals.

It can be gleaned likewise from the survey that being compassionate in demonstrating empathy when teachers needed help was greatly manifested by the respondents in their respective school. This reflects that they are easy to work with as their supervision is backed up with consideration and understanding, which makes the work for everyone a lot more easier. In like manner, it is imperative that school leaders demonstrate a high level of understanding in knowing where problems of the teachers come from to arrive at a tangible and feasible help to solve those challenges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ethical in advocating transparency and accountability in the school management</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Open-minded in inspiring team members for enthusiasm with school’s programs and projects</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compassionate in demonstrating empathy when teachers need help</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Visionary in promoting DepEd vision, mission and goals</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Democratic in ways actively involving everyone on the implementation of school’s programs and projects</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assertive in allowing consultations making colleagues feel they are involved in decision-making</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inspiring in empowering team members utilize their skills and talents</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Patient in guiding poor performance</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Result-oriented in keeping the tasks completed as schedule</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Optimistic in predicting trend of events</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gentle in speaking from a strong inner conviction</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Captivating in influencing team members embrace the desired change</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Steadfast in settling conflicts when occur in the group</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Systematic in planning for the future</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ambitious in strategizing actions to achieve DepEd’s goals</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Precise in focusing on mentorship and training to achieve goals</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Authoritative in supervising work environment</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Perfectionist in valuing highly structured work environments</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Deceitful in establishing predetermined rewards for success and disciplinary action for failure.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composite Mean**: 3.57 GM

**Legend:**
- GM – Greatly Manifested
- MM – Moderately Manifested
- WM – Weighted Mean
- VI – Verbal Interpretation
This insight of comparison supported by Reitzug & Revves (2016) who underscored that school administrators, being in the leadership position have a great influence on a school's culture. They have a profound influence on the work habits and perspectives that mark a successful school. It was also mentioned that empowering teachers enables them to examine and critique their own situations with a view of improving educational situations.

Meanwhile, the table shows that school leaders manifested to a great extent their visionary perspective in promoting the DepEd's vision, mission, and goals. This result signifies that head of the schools in the Division of Batangas highly conform to the mandates of the country's education sector in terms of delivering quality service, particularly instruction. The very foundations of the work that school leaders and teachers do are greatly anchored on the core of DepEd, which is to promote quality education. Although some leaders show varying ways to lead their organizations, they still go back similarly on the very essence of DepEd's service.

As supported by Rivera & Ibarra (2020), empowerment of school heads to enhance management is one of the major concerns of the DepEd considering its gigantic bureaucratic structure for effective and efficient
delivery of educational service. As mandated, elementary school principals are envisioned to share both the supervisory and administrative responsibilities with the division superintendent and district supervisors which pave a way to the empowerment of school administrators.

On the other hand, school leaders greatly manifested democracy in their ways of actively involving everyone in the implementation of school’s programs and projects have been highlighted as well in the results of the study. This is a clear indication that school heads take important roles in delivering the services of education. It explains that teachers and other drivers of education are led independently by school heads who are established on giving everyone the freedom of participation and choice. It is important that teachers are directed to work independently as the works that they usually do becomes even more a success. Moreover, it is when teachers have options and freedom to improve their service as supported by school administrators, success in the teaching and learning is likely to occur.

As supported by Deal & Peterson (2015), they highlighted leadership is based on cooperation which builds collegiality, a sense of school identity, and a democratic and inspiring school culture. It means that school head leads from the center, to be more democratic, delegates
responsibilities, shares decision-making powers, and develops collaborative efforts to bond all stakeholders.

As shown in the table, school head also greatly manifested assertive style in allowing consultations making colleagues feel that they were involved in decision-making. This implies that creating important decisions in an institution is not a one way process. Teachers and other key drivers decide together along with leaders as their roles are also significant in the success of the organization. School heads who open up opportunities for their colleagues to suggest solution on certain challenges allow them to seek insights on how problems can be solved. Since teachers have direct access and contact to students, deciding on which teaching strategies and or assessment that might be applicable for them can be greatly provided by teachers. Hence, it is important that principals conduct regular and proactive consultations for them to identify best practices and recommendations from teachers as to how education can be best served in the interest of the students.

This conforms to the idea of Savage (2008) who contended that the traditional roles of teachers and principals have changed and improved organizational teamwork and is fostered by all members of the learning community assuming decision making roles. The level of shared decision
making referred to the areas of planning, policy development, curriculum and instruction, student achievement, pupil personnel services, staff development, and budget management. All these responsibilities allow leaders to create an optimistic impact on the roles of the teachers to do the tasks willfully and wholeheartedly in the pursuit of the institution’s dreams.

For the school heads, it is important for them to be precise in focusing on mentorship and training to achieve goals but was moderately manifested among the leadership behavior indicators. As expressed by the school heads, it was a challenge for them to conduct personal and professional trainings among their subordinates especially during this pandemic as time has been considered a major constraint. For them, time is a major constraint as not every teachers are encouraged to dedicate their time to improve themselves.

In view of the results, leaders have to focus more on equipping their teachers with substantial materials and intensive training to improve the quality of their teaching. In today’s time, it is very important that teachers are exposed to provide them updates on new teaching strategies. As shared by some respondents in the interview, although sometimes they lacked budget to send teachers to training, they make it a point that they looked for possible ways on how to equip their subordinates without
thinking of financial constraints. Looking for support from other key players allow them to send their teachers to these capacity-building initiatives.

As supported by Ganad (n.d.), school administrators need no disciplinary action to better works done, rather constructive support should be provided alongside with resources and materials necessary for classroom success. Engaging the teachers in development programs and trainings allow them to become transformational in various facets of education like teaching, learning, assessment, motivation and classroom management. School heads and administrators must provide opportunities for collaboration of school’s internal and external stakeholders, to develop leadership and shared responsibility for student/pupil outcomes and must instill intensive supervision to achieve higher academic achievement as its instructional functionality. As expressed by the school heads, the fulfilment of their school’s goals are directly connected to the ways teachers are being encouraged to work in collaboration with the visions of the heads. According to them, through shared responsibilities, they get desired outcomes for the students.

School heads exhibited that authoritative approach in supervising work environment establishing the goals of the organization moderate in their everyday running of the school. This clearly suggests that firm
management leads to a conducive working environment. This does not mean that leaders should be too strict nor too lax in handling their subordinates, but the leadership has to be regulatory enough in handling both discipline and fun while learning and improving at the same time. The ability of leaders to turn a working environment in a place where they place their people at the highest importance in leading the institution clearly suggests work success in the team. It was supported by the respondents that they assure that as their teachers see the reason of learning as something enjoyable amid challenges they encounter. They see to it that as they engage their teachers to trainings, they choose activities which they see meaning from it.

In like manner, this is parallel with Ganad’s (n.d.) idea who contended that school effectiveness is predicted by the factors of leadership behavior, organizational support, and team-building practices. It was found out that an authoritative leadership guided by people-centered approach to guide teachers to success and perfection are key players in the success of an institution.

Meanwhile, one leadership style which was moderately manifested by school heads centered in establishing predetermined rewards for success and disciplinary action for failure. This result implies that one way
to improve work services among teachers is for leaders to practice providing rewards to keep them motivated at work. These rewards may or may not be tangible, starting from words of affirmation to physical tokens. Just like students, it is believed that teachers, if motivated appropriately, are likely to do better in their respective works. On the other hand, corrective actions may or may not be deemed successful in reinforcing efficacy and efficiency at work. But it is also believed that these forms of negative reinforcements could possibly lead to positive effects since teachers are matured enough to handle criticisms.

It was shared by the school heads themselves that they have observed that their teachers have low level of motivation when they are not recognized. Hence, as a form of boosting their passion to deliver excellence in work, they make sure that their teachers’ efforts are recognized and rewarded in various forms like certifications, and or incentives.

For Sancar (2009), intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation operate simultaneously and are not necessarily reciprocal. Extrinsic motivation is affected by the way a leader behaves and can actually enhance intrinsic motivation. The author noted that leadership behaviors
operate as an integral factor on extrinsic motivation and teacher job satisfaction in forms of rewards or incentives.

It is highly evident that the composite mean for the school heads indicates that the leadership behaviors they showed expressed in their leadership styles were greatly manifested in different situations. As education evolves, the need for a stable support system from school administrators has to be revisited as well. Looking at how leaders stylize their leadership behaviors in various forms and manners allow their people to work in harmony with them. Hence, the success of every institution largely depends on how a leader runs it.

1.3. Learning environment. The kind of working environment in schools is crucial in the development of its success. When the school commits in harmony with the workplace as well as with the leaders at the same time positively impacts change and success in the fulfilment of the learning tasks. With this, school leaders should create a learning environment essential for growth and development. Table 6 shows the indicators of the school heads’ leadership behaviors as to the learning environment they produce.

Results show that school leaders focused on achieving school goals for safe teaching-learning environment manifested this leadership behavior.
to a great extent. This result implies that a healthy environment leads to healthy results. Success in the teaching and learning process is achieved when all key members work harmoniously with one another in an environment where teamwork and cooperation are given such importance. With this reason, leaders should build a workplace where communication is also considered as this leads to healthy working environment. Knowing the needs and challenges posted in the workplace through openly communicating them allows leaders to assess strategies to improve their supervision. This is congruent to the ideas of Trice (2016), Sashkin & Sashkin (2016) who posited that a school’s culture and learning environment can be developed, influenced and managed. They suggested that school heads should openly communicate to everyone the reweaving of old traditions and stories into present realities and new visions. The actions of a school head are central to the development of a school environment that is conducive to high levels of academic achievement and learning.

Moreover, transparency in providing open communication platforms for parents, stakeholders and the public was manifested to a great extent as well. This indicates that school head see the role of other stakeholders as integral in building a safe teaching and learning environment for both
teachers and the students. It places the key players’ participation as essential in building an integrative school environment where everyone for the organization’s success. It is when these important actors in education become aware of the progress of the school which essentially makes the learning environment safe for both teacher and students. It was emphasized by Coleman, Glover & Derek (2017) and McNally (2019) that an effective school head is proactive and aware on what is going internally and externally in schools. Coordination is the process whereby two or more people or organizations work together to deal collectively with a shared task. Likewise, the effective school administrator consults with school population, conducts constructive changes, accepts the suggestions and good ideas from people, and creates an atmosphere that let all people in the school participate in school development.

The respondents shared that as coordination becomes a key role in the success of their school, school heads make sure that everything is reported accordingly to all stakeholders. As parents-teachers associations are created, they aim to bridge the gap between transparency and honesty in the service that they provide.
### Table 6
Leadership Behavior in Terms of Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Focused on achieving school goals for safe teaching-learning environment.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Transparent in providing open communication platforms for parents, stakeholders and the public</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5. Responsible in managing school’s facilities, garden areas and ancillary service centers effectively and efficiently</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5. Determined in striving for maximum utilization of curriculum equipment and facilities</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Meticulous in allocating budget from MOOE and SEF based on priority needs for the improvement of learning environment</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Engaged in strategizing mechanisms for collaboration, support and partnerships to improve learning environment</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intuitive in enhancing support on the management of disaster preparedness</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Perceptive in empowering individuals and teams to consistently perform roles in achieving a child-friendly environment.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5. Enthusiastic in exhibiting exemplary practices providing support for learning resource management.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5. Goal-oriented in initiating benchmarking to schools with exemplary performance and Model of Excellence</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Innovative in crafting of School Improvement Plan (SIP) in collaboration with the School Planning Team (SPT)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Efficient on the management of school’s physical facilities and equipment with priority allocated MOOE budget on repairs and maintenance</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Persistent to solve issues on learners’ development and school’s improvement</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Decisive in institutionalizing continuous improvement on school’s learning environment</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Creative in putting up a school website as an organized platform for school profile, activities, and school announcements</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Composite Mean | 3.70 | GM  |

**Legend:**
- GM – Greatly Manifested
- MM – Moderately Manifested
- WM – Weighted Mean
- VI – Verbal Interpretation
As shown in the table, another leadership behavior which was manifested to a great extent was the ability to meticulously allocate budget from MOOE and SEF based on priority needs for the improvement of learning environment. This clearly implies that school heads decide on improving their learning environment by wisely using the school funds in essential learning equipment. As learning becomes integrative, leaders purchase equipment to cater to a technology-driven environment where learning becomes advanced and a bit competitive. Lezotte & Bancroft (2015), Snyder & Wolf (2015) and Elmore (2016) emphasized that the job of the school administrator is primarily about enhancing the skills and knowledge of people in the organization, creating a common culture of expectations around the use of those skills and knowledge, holding the various pieces of the organization together in a productive relationship with each other, and holding individuals accountable for their contributions to the collective result.

School leaders also manifested to a great extent, engagements in strategizing mechanisms for collaboration, support, and partnerships to improve learning environment. This result suggests that a safe teaching and learning place is highly achievable if everyone works with one another in the pursuit of fulfilling the organization’s goals. It is important that
leaders initiate collaboration and participation from other stakeholders to assure that the school’s environment is improved. This places the parents’ role in improving the learning environment because aside from the teachers, they also have direct contact with students which significantly can identify areas to improve in their children as to the manner or style of their learning. Collaborating with parents helps teachers adjust their teaching strategies to the learning styles and need of the children.

This finding supports Sergiovanni’s (2015) idea which emphasized that school heads’ duties and tasks have increased to an overload level, since they are to share responsibilities with and empower others in order to manage schools on a daily basis. This means that working together to come up with the desired goals comes from the joint efforts of all stakeholders. As shared by the school heads, it is important for them to come together with other stakeholders like the communities and families for them to greatly assess the needs of their students. Through interventions done among students in the concerted efforts of both teacher and parents, students are able to achieve in education.

On the other hand, school heads exhibited enthusiastic exemplary practices providing support for learning resource management to a great extent as well. This result implies that school head always strive to think
outside the box on how to improve the teaching and learning environment of the institution. They are seen to work closely with both teachers and students as they have the direct experiences in the educative process. Allowing leaders to see these processes enable them to provide necessary strategies to repair issues in instruction or assessment since they have more expertise on these concerns. This finding is parallel with the idea of Deal & Peterson (2019) and Schein (2017) which suggested that school heads mold and shape school's learning environment in a daily basis. They emphasized that complacency regarding leadership or cultural management is unacceptable because they are both central to understanding organizations and making them effective. Hence, leaders are expected to work in full bloom to achieve a healthy, safe, and competitive teaching and learning environment for both teachers and students.

In this study’s context, the school heads themselves supported the fact that as leaders they should not only act as overseers rather doers of the plans to be carried out in the institution. It is imperative for them that they take part in the littlest of details in the work that schools do to achieve quality education.
Meanwhile, school leaders manifest to a great extent their persistence to solve issues on learners’ development and school’s improvement. The result implies that school leaders work closely with other stakeholders to gain assistance from them to solve problems in the institution. Leaders who seek advice from teachers, who have the direct contact with students help them in identifying relevant teaching strategies for successful learning to take place. Moreover, working with the parents and the community as well allow them to look for relevant ways on how to adapt their teaching to the needs of the community. This makes the teaching and learning in the school more relevant in today’s time.

As shared by the respondents, since there are times that they lack resources to cover up the needs of the school most especially in monetary terms, they would seek help from communities and other stakeholders through holding fundraising activities to support the school’s projects. Through this, they see fit the roles of stakeholders in building a better educational community for the students.

This finding is parallel with the insights of Ross and Cozzens, (2016) which stated that school administrators’ leadership that focuses on the school’s climate, culture, and instructional practices to diminish the educational gaps confidently forecasts the degree to which collaboration
among teachers improves student achievement and the school’s environment. Instructional leaders recognize that school climate may not be seen or touched, but only felt. But then again, it is the quality of institutional life promoted by student learning through the emotional, physical, and social safeties of the school.

It can also be deduced from the table that school heads were goal oriented in initiating benchmarking to schools with exemplary performance and Model of Excellence cited as manifested to a great extent. This is an indication that leaders are open with learning new trends and strategies in improving the learning environment of their schools. It is important that leaders innovate their plans and approaches in handling various situations which concerns both the teacher and students so as to achieve success in the teaching and learning process. Learning from best practices from other leaders allow them to share the same excellence they achieve in their respective organizations. Hayet et al., (2016) stated that part of the leaders’ capacity building initiatives includes adapting innovative ways to educate and lead from performing institutions which have admirable leadership styles. Schools could learn something from the qualities shared by other schools that have been successful in educating poor and minority students to high levels. In fact, effective leaders have as one of their
highest priorities to learn from the best practices of high-performing schools.

It was noted from the respondents that to secure that their service are at par, they make sure they coordinate with other schools as to the best practices in the delivery of instruction, for example. Through working closely with performing schools, leaders get to acquire necessary strategies that may be helpful in their own setting.

On the other hand, the results also revealed that respondents moderately manifested their creative side in putting up a school website as an organized platform for school profile, activities, and school announcements. These results indicate that the school administrators lacked the technological platform to improve the teaching and learning process. Monetary issues were also raised as concerns in setting up online platforms for their schools to cater online services and activities, especially these times of the new normal.

Parallel to the idea of Leonard & Leonard (2017), lack of resources is seen as another major challenge for school heads in their technology leadership. It was even furthered that the lack of technological facilities and human resources emerged as difficulties since many schools have poor physical facilities and outdated technology, coupled with unskilled
technology coordinators. Accordingly, Flagnan & Jacobsen (2016) mentioned that some school heads noted that equity issues were also one of the challenges among schools as technology-based resources and funding are not equally distributed among them. Hence, it is indicative that schools need to be provided with the amount of technological support so that school administrators can become technology-driven leaders to help them advance in their quest to providing quality services for the students in general.

The composite mean for the school heads indicates that their leadership behaviors considering learning environment are greatly manifested. Evidently, in order to achieve educational success, it is imperative that the learning environment is conducive and that people working in it create a harmonious relationship with one another. Hence, school leaders are reminded to always keep an environment where cooperation and communication are existent factors for continuous growth and success of every member of the school community.

1.4. Knowledge on technology. As education today becomes integrative, a lot of advanced methods of teaching and learning have been introduced in schools. With everyone beset by the global pandemic where education has shifted online, it is a must to understand how the leaders’
behaviors address concern relating to the use of technology in school. Initiatives to take on advanced methods of teaching have to be introduced. Table 7 presents the leadership behavior of school heads relative to technology.

As shown in the table, school leaders manifested open-minded in learning new skills utilizing technology to a great extent. Results imply that school heads do not stop learning new technological skills which they deem important and necessary to improve the quality of the teaching and learning process. As demands of the 21st century education unfold, it has improved a lot of applications and technological platforms that are introduced to make education a lot easier for all its key members. Hence, school heads, although they find difficulty in learning these new technology and translating the knowledge to their subordinates, they are still positive and open-minded in order to adapt to the increasing advancements in education. Some platforms that are mostly used especially today are Learning Management System and other online platforms to deliver instruction even from the comforts of one’s home. These findings support the idea of Polatcan and Titrek (2014) whereby leadership behavior is said to go beyond the management duty whose job definitions are stated by laws and regulations. School administrators’ role can also be defined as
the persons who transfer their knowledge and skills to their subordinates and the roles that those leaders act in their organization. With this, it is noteworthy that school heads have to be open-minded in learning new things should be able to share the knowledge and technological skills they may get from advanced trainings and seminars attended. It should be understood that the roles of the administrators are not only managerial or administrative in nature but can also be task-based, delivering trainings and instruction to subordinates.

As shared by the respondents, they also subject themselves to trainings to enhance their technological skills so as to deliver appropriate actions in solving pedagogical issues. For them, advancing in today’s education is a must to respond to the increasing needs of the 21st century students.

On the other hand, school leaders manifested self-assurance in adhering for quality management service through the aid of technology to a great extent. This signifies that as part of improving the quality of education in a certain institution, it is important that leaders adhere to learning new technological skills that are essential in advancing to the teaching and learning processes.
### Table 7
Leadership Behavior in Terms of Knowledge on Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Open-minded in learning new skills utilizing technology</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-assured in adhering for quality management service through</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the aid of technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5. Adaptable in utilizing technology in the normal in education</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5. Receptive in accepting change on ways works and reports are</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Docile in submitting all required reports online on or before due</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5. Proactive in leading innovation prioritizing Instructional</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology for the professional growth and development of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5. Creative in utilizing zoom, Google meet, and similar platforms</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the conduct of meetings/conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5. Smart in recognizing curricular reasons on how important is</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology in the delivery of basic education services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5. Productive in accomplishing online reports using Google sheets</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in a span of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Resourceful in providing technical assistance utilizing the DepEd</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Portals, DepEd Commons and other teaching and learning websites/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Precise in doing online monitoring and evaluation on the</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress of school’s activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Clever in simplifying multiple tasks through the utilization of</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft excel format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Active in leading by example on hands-on experience in</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Innovative in researching new ways on how technology will</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve teaching-learning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Competitive in having a personal account on LR Portals, DepEd</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons and other websites for teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composite Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- GM – Greatly Manifested
- MM – Moderately Manifested
- WM – Weighted Mean
- VI – Verbal Interpretation
Moreover, the role of leaders to equip themselves with the 21st century skills highlighting technology may help meet the challenges of education in today’s time. School heads mentioned in interviews that technological literacy has been one of the major challenge faced not only by them but by teachers as well especially in this new normal set up. Thomas & Kzenek (2015) affirmed that school heads need technology training to make technological innovation a reality in schools. The level of information and communications technology (ICT) skills is very important for school heads to determine its role in the improvement of quality education.

Meanwhile, school administrators who showed their leadership skill greatly manifested technology in the new normal education. This implies that school heads and teachers had no choice but to adapt to the new normal set up of education. However, although generation gap and technological literacy may have been factors for not easily learning technological platforms, these key players in education strive harder to learn and effectively use those technologies in the delivery of their instruction. As shared by the respondents, learning technology has been a great challenge for them as their generations are far beyond what technology calls for today. Hence, what they normally do is tap their young
teachers to learn the skills and share it to their colleagues through seminars and trainings spearheaded by the school heads.

As to the technology leadership and challenges by the school heads, Rutkowski & Sparks (2015) supported that technology leadership, in spite of it being a major challenge is an indication of managing all technology usage in schools, and an essential component of effective educational administration. School heads with necessary technology skills are more likely to facilitate all stages of instruction and school management by effectively integrating educational technologies into school life.

As reflected in the table, school heads, to a great extent showed that they were proactive in leading innovation and prioritizing instructional technology for the professional growth and development of teachers. This posits that initiative in learning technology is exponential as technology is a difficult aspect to learn. Hence, it is important that school leaders take the first broad step in learning various technological platforms to guarantee success in leading the organization. It is undeniably true that school heads encourage their teachers to learn advanced ways of technology especially during the pandemic. For them, it is important to respond to the growing needs of students as response to the new normal education.
This finding supports the ideas of Dexter (2016) and McLeod & Richardson (2014) which mentioned that the level of technology leadership highly reflects the quality of leadership in schools, as being good at technology leadership is associated with high quality school leadership.

Results show that school heads manifested to a great extent being receptive in accepting change on ways works and reports were to be done. This is an indication that school leaders are amenable and open to a lot of new opportunities, helping teachers in improving their teaching methods and approaches. Since technology is viewed as a powerful tool to deliver success in education, it is highly important that leaders avoid resisting to these kinds of changes and developments. As expressed by the school heads, they see to it that there is cooperation between and among them and their teachers so as to see which aspects of education lack something and from there they they will work as groups to come up with feasible solutions.

These findings are cognizant to insights of Dawson & Rakes (2017) which stated teachers are expected to show some degree of resistance to changes in teaching practices as the process of technology integration requires teachers to modify what they have been doing for years. However, they emphasized that it is still possible for teachers to accept the
new ideas if they see the patience and support from the school administrators.

Likewise, school heads were observed to have greatly manifested being innovative in researching new ways on how technology will improve teaching-learning process. Results imply that leaders find ways on how to integrate technology in the educational process. As it has been considered a supplemental aid to facilitate learning, school heads try to learn new ways and methods to effectively deliver instruction through utilization of technology. They undergo seminars and trainings in order to look and apply innovative ways to achieve success in education. As per the school heads, since the pandemic has changed the ways education are looked now, they made sure that teachers get the appropriate trainings to learn new approaches in educational technology through encouraging them to join free webinars learning various platforms to deliver instruction.

Results are in conformity with what Davies (2016) and Flanagan & Jacobsen (2016) highlighted that technology leadership roles for school heads enable them to integrate technology into educational contexts and list related responsibilities including leader of learning, leader of student entitlement, leader of capacity building, leader of community, and leader of resource management. These roles put together a set of aims such as
student engagement, shared vision, equity of access, effective professional development, and ubiquitous networks.

Meanwhile, it was posted to a moderate extent, school heads were active in leading by example on hands-on experience in technology. Based from the respondents, they shared that they engage in various seminars online to learn multifarious platforms to share their teachers to improve the teaching and learning process. As leaders become role models of teachers and students in attaining quality education, they should be equipped and trained to use various online and technological platforms to supplement the teaching and learning process. Hence, the knowledge that they have may bring forth positive results in meeting the goals of the organization. As Thomas & Kzenek (2015) posited, several technology challenges are faced by school heads such as lack of training, resistance, lack of resources, equity and bureaucracy. The lack of training in the use of technology is a major challenge for school heads. There is a need for technology training in teacher and administrator preparation to make technological innovation a reality in schools.

School leaders were considered smart for greatly manifesting the leadership behavior of recognizing curricular reasons on how important technology is in the delivery of basic education services. This implies that
technology, as perceived by both leaders and teachers are integral in a regular basis especially in these times that classes are held online. Although school heads identify the need of technology as integrated in the curriculum, this is also viewed as a challenge, however lacking in terms of facilities. These findings are parallel to the insights of Leonard & Leonard (2017) which mentioned that the lack of technological facilities and human resources emerged as challenges for school heads since many schools do not have adequate technology equipment. Many schools have poor physical facilities and outdated technology, coupled with unskilled technology coordinators.

Meanwhile, results of the study showed that school administrators moderately manifested discovering innovative ways on how technology improves educative process and creates personal accounts on various websites to aid the teaching and learning process. These results imply that school administrators today still lack the necessary resources and trainings to adapt to the increasing changes and demands in the education sector as far as technology is concerned. This is primarily because of their lack of technology leadership as they were introduced in traditional modes in the earlier years. Technology leadership is considered a challenge faced by school administrators today. It is an essential component of effective
educational administration. Thus, school heads with necessary technological skills are more likely to facilitate all stages of instruction and school management by effectively integrating educational technologies into school life.

It is evident in the composite mean of the school heads that their leadership behaviors as to knowledge on technology were greatly manifested. As utilization of technology becomes one of the most important needs of today’s educational system, it is highly exponential that school leaders adapt to these developments. Integrating technology in education may lead to better instructional delivery.

**1.5. Organizational composition and strength.** School heads are managers of an institution. Their roles are significant as the flow and plans of an institution largely depend on how they run the school. For this reason, it is imperative that they have the right leadership behavior in organizing activities and managing people for different teaching and learning tasks available. Organizational composition and strength of school leaders are defined as the set of activities, task allocation, and supervision which are directed towards the success and fulfilment of organizational goals and objectives. Table 8 presents the leadership behavior of school head considering organizational composition and strength.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Honest and transparent in updating school’s transparency board to inform stakeholders on the MOOE disbursements, canteen reports, PTA financial report</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Accountable in effective delivery of basic education services</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Confident in telling the truth in a real and genuine way that people can verify</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meticulous in planning of school’s budget</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Focused on being aware of and in understanding personal strengths and weakness to be improved</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Active in mobilizing the school’s force to meet its end goal</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5. Organized in assuring the team is closely knit through team-building</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5. Cautious in working systematically to simplify and clarify issues in school organization</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assertive in providing technical assistance to teachers consistent with teaching standards and pedagogies</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vigorous in enforcing school memoranda and DepEd policies and guidelines</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5. Transformative in striving for change not allowing excuses for why improvement is not possible</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5. Articulate in setting expectations informing stakeholders about the school status</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ardent in setting “wall of excellence” recognizing awards received by the school, teachers, pupils, and non-teaching personnel</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Inquisitive and analytical thinker and base decision on research data-driven facts</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Persuasive in directing the school team to adhere with the International Standard of Organization (ISO) 9001</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composite Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>GM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- GM – Greatly Manifested
- MM – Moderately Manifested
- WM – Weighted Mean
- VI – Verbal Interpretation
It can be inferred from the results that being honest and transparent updating of school’s transparency board to inform stakeholders on the MOOE disbursements, canteen reports, PTA financial report was greatly manifested leadership behavior of the school leaders in the study. This indicates that their kind of leadership is anchored on the core values of truth and openness. It is very important that school leaders allow other stakeholders to know the movements and flows of processes and finances in an organization to make them aware of whatever success or failure experienced by the team. Hence, as decisions play a critical role in the success of the institution, school heads should openly run an organization known by its key members. As shared by the respondents, they would ask assistance from their local government units to finance their educational needs to deliver quality education. Moreover, they also make partnerships with other stakeholders like the parents and other institutions to come up with funds to support educational goals.

Ganad (n.d.) who emphasized this and cited that for schools to improve more, Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) must be well taken care of, among others, which pose challenges for school administrators. With these scenarios, school efficiency of public elementary school administrators is deemed appropriate and necessary to
be put in place involving factors such as but not restricted to school administrators’ leadership behavior, organizational support, and team building practices and cooperation.

Moreover, school heads manifested to a great extent the leadership behavior of being articulate in setting expectations informing stakeholders about the school status. As is indicated by the results, this implies that the accountability of the school heads has been recognized which means they reported whatever success or failure the school has reached or experienced so far as quality service is concerned. It is important that expectations are set and met so that there is transparency, thus building trust and confidence among school leaders. As shared by the respondents, regular meetings are imperative to the success of the school. It is important that leaders openly communicate the progress of the school for members to keep up with the institution’s desired goals.

Egley and Jones (n.d.) which expressed that school heads feel a bit pressured in being accountable with the failures and or success of the school. This springs from their inability to communicate and set proper expectations to its key members. Hence, it is recommended that leaders articulate every decision or plans the organization has for consideration of other stakeholders since they also play a part in the team’s success.
Moreover, school heads were organized in assuring that the team is closely knit through team-building described as greatly manifested. It suggests that supervision of an organization becomes even more bonded when there are activities to foster camaraderie and support with one another. Basically all these will be possible with the help of a leader who knows how to handle different personalities and who is able to bring people together for a certain goal or cause. For this reason, it brings about relationship as a cornerstone among many aspects of educational leadership. The school heads shared that once in a while before the school year opens, they may sure that schools hold team building activities to strengthen their relationship towards the goal of a better education.

As expressed by Stronge et.al. (2018), every situation involving school leaders requires some degree of relational behavior. Since a lot of important topics in today’s education include building trust and partnership with the stakeholders, it is imperative that school leaders increase their connection and involvement with parents and the community and that they have in-depth understanding of how each key players plays significant roles in educational success of the organization.

Meanwhile, as to budgeting, school heads were assessed to greatly manifest their meticulous attitude in planning the school’s budget. This is
an indication that leaders put so much importance in appropriately allocating budgets for the school’s improvement and transparently reporting it to their subordinates. As this involves a complex process, leaders are expected to pay much attention in using government funds for more serious concerns in the school. As clarified by Merrill (2016) and Fullan & Sarason (2017), budgeting involves major steps such as preparation, submission, adoption, execution, and evaluation. Planning the school budget entails a lot of thinking and decision together with the key players of the organization. Leaders should practice being trustworthy in aspects of finances because this is a clear manifestation of successful organization, a strength that can be considered in leadership as well.

The transformative behavior of school leaders which is characterized with the attitude in striving for change and not allowing excuses for not improving is a behavior assessed in terms of the heads’ supervision and organization skills which has been greatly manifested. This is an indication that leaders today are effective in dealing with certain challenges and views change as feasible and possible. As part of them being transformative, school heads direct people to accepting new ideas and trends that will improve the delivery of instruction and assessment. Moreover, they do not rest on stagnation as there is no way but up in
climbing the ladder of success in education. As shared by the respondents, they make sure that everyone’s ideas are encouraged and that there is always a room for sharing of insights so as to collaborate together with the desire to achieve the goals for the school.

In view of this, Petrides (2019) and Nodine (2016) stressed that effective school heads instruct school population and accept new ideas. They make appropriate transformations and information that enable school people to achieve assignments required and participates in school activities and encourage teamwork. Transformative leaders involve everyone in the decision making processes and implementation, hence allowing change to take effect in the organization and with members eventually embracing it to serve better.

It is likewise reflected on the table that school heads manifested to a great extent being aware of and understanding personal strengths and weaknesses to be improved by the key players in the organization. This reflects that school leaders are fully sensitive of the needs and demands of their subordinates in various aspects of assistance, from moral to technical aspects. Moreover, the ability to assess the strong and weak points in the leadership allows leaders to devise ways and strategies to even strengthen the strong ones and improve the weak aspects in the organization. This
makes it important that school heads coordinate appropriately with the others to share a collective effort of improving the quality service in the organization. As mentioned by the school heads, they make inventories of their staff in personal and professional areas of their career so as to keep track of which areas need improvement for the betterment of quality instruction.

As emphasized by Coleman et al. (2017) and McNally (2019), effective school leaders are aware of the areas for improvement in the organization. They emphasized the need for coordination to take place in collectively assessing the whole workings of the team including all its key players. It is also important to note that in order to achieve the group’s success, leaders have to accept suggestions and ideas from people to create an atmosphere of awareness and inclusion as well in the school development.

Similarly, school heads manifested to a great extent being assertive in providing technical assistance to teachers consistent with teaching standards and pedagogies. This expresses that school leaders are well-equipped and trained by the national education sector with strategies and methods to deliver better instruction as it is. They underwent rigorous trainings to deliver key methods and trends before their core group in the
organization. With the shared knowledge of technical assistance, leaders are able to share the same level of professionalism and excellence with their subordinates, with a common goal to excel.

Parallel to the idea of Sackney (2018), the author posited that assertiveness on the part of the school heads is imperative to promote high expectations for both teachers and students, emphasizing the importance of student achievement and teacher competence. Hence, school heads must become aware of promoting a school wherein a culture of productivity, high morale, confidence, commitment and support is highly encouraged.

Moreover, school heads manifested to a great extent in active in mobilizing the school’s force to meet its end goal. Results imply that leaders are able to engage other key members in key decision-making process in the organization. This does not apply the one man rule, as school heads consider the suggestions and insights of other members of the team to come up with innovative ideas to improve the teaching and learning process. Thus, it is imperative that heads should mobilize the knowledge and skills of others in order to achieve the desired goals of the organization. As expressed by the school heads, they make sure that all teachers and non-teachers are integral in the decision making process of
the school. With this, it is important for them to let their subordinate share their insights so as to come up with a unified solutions to solve educational issues.

The findings of the study support Blanchard & Randolph (2016) who emphasized that leadership is no longer top down. Leaders should start establishing a type of supervision which does not solely depend on the top management. Decisions have to be made solely and collaboratively by the organization’s key players. It is true that with a common vision, shared principles and effective leadership, successful organization is possible.

Further, it can be deduced from the table that school heads greatly manifested confidence in telling the truth in a real and genuine way that people can verify. This manifests that school leaders’ truthfulness in dealing with their subordinates. It is manifested in their ways of actions, words, and motives that they show genuine feeling to give positive impact to their organizations. Surely, it is important that school heads must show real feelings and emotions in talking with subordinates in processes of consultation and or feedbacking. Failure to do so might worsen relationships, eventually the loss of trust in the leadership. Aligned to this study is the idea of Bryk & Schenider (2017) which stressed that when expectations are not met, individuals lose their trust eventually. School
heads should openly, properly, and genuinely set expectations through communication with other members of the team. Failure to show genuine truth and consideration in improving other might affect the leader’s supervision.

As reflected in the composite mean of the school heads, it can be inferred that the respondents manifested to a great extent their organizational composition and strength. Hence, leaders are always reminded to become open with their members as communication solves every problem experienced in the institution.

2. School Administrators’ Adversity Quotient®

The challenge to school administrators especially in these trying times has been critical. Problems are met as per instruction and assessment since classes are mostly online or modular. With this, quality of education has been put at stake. Moreover, with the grave effects of the pandemic, other relevant school projects and policies are also severely affected. Hence, it is of great concern to know how leaders respond to these challenges and what ways are done to solve each problem.

2.1. Control. As heads of institutions, it is true that handling challenges has always been a tough job most especially in times that the work coincides with personal concerns. Hence, it is really important to
strike a balance between one’s personal life and work life. Apparently, the way one responds wrongly on certain situations of one’s life may create an impact with the way work has to be attended.

Control as one of the dimensions of adversity quotient® is the relationship between control over life’s events, motivation, and success. Separating personal from professional life is a great manifestation of how a school leader controls these aspects of the said dimension. Table 9 presents the school administrators’ adversity quotient® in the dimension of control.

It can be gleaned from the table that majority of the school administrators found it difficult to continue and surpass the adversities they face in the team, thus, reflecting which is categorized under below average control.

Table 9
Respondents’ Adversity Quotient® in Term of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQ Equivalents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 34.50 (Below Average)  S.D. = 6.10

This could be due to the amount of and weight of adversities coming
along their way. School heads could be overwhelmed by both personal and professional adversities besetting them which led to their inability to utilize potentials to possibly solve those issues. As shared by the respondents, this pandemic has affected the ways they respond to their challenges which brought them to some difficulties related to quality instruction.

These findings supported the study of Aquino (2013) who revealed that secondary school head respondents had significantly little control and influence in adverse situations. They often deflected accountability and most often felt victimized and helpless.

Meanwhile, only very few of the respondents had to a certain extent high level of control. This indicates the majority, are still working on how to handle controlling the adversities in their time of supervision. Little number of leaders from the survey is only capable of utilizing their potentials and capabilities to help rise from the adversities they are into. With this level of control, the administrators can battle out their sense of helplessness and despair in surpassing the problem rather than accepting it. The respondents mentioned that there are times that they see challenges as motivations to work better on some educational goals. They see to it that
they keep an eye on every situation they are into and that they never lose grip in solving those issues.

This finding supports the study of Bautista et al. (2016) who examined the relationship between adversity quotient® and leadership style among student leaders in Bulacan State University where it was found that control dimension mostly scored below average. This was attributed to the lack of stress management of the respondents.

Looking at all these, it can be gleaned that the composite mean indicates majority of the school heads had below average control and thus, had a hard time facing some adversities. It can be worked out by improving leaders’ motivation, and strengthening their capacity to cope with adverse situation. Hence, leaders should know how to significantly separate the line between work and personal life to solve the challenges besetting the education sector, and in turn positively impact the institution.

2.2. Ownership. In every challenge besetting the education sector, it is paramount that leaders take accountability in whatever success or failure schools may experience. The ability to take ownership of whatever consequence has taken effect largely depends on the stability of the leader to face challenges in the institution.
Ownership as one of the core dimensions of AQ® which refers to the perceived ownership of the outcome of adversity. Discontentment drives the individual towards taking accountability of their actions and therefore, the outcomes. Table 10 reveals the score of the respondents’ adversity quotient® in terms of ownership.

Table 10
Respondents’ Adversity Quotient® in Terms of Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQ Equivalents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>53.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 29.52 (Low)  S.D. = 9.45

Results from the table present that majority of the school heads had low level ownership which could be due to lack of motivation of the respondents, which then impacts their level of stability to stand still through the test of the adversity, owning it, and being accountable for it. The problems or challenges they have probably put their motivation, performance, persistence and even health at a great risk, hence the difficulty to own these uncertainties. As shared by the school heads, this pandemic has caused them a lot to oversee the challenges they have
encountered. Hence, this has caused them to have limited time and resources to work on the challenges as there were restrictions for travel.

The findings are parallel to Canivel (2010) who said that the low level of ownership of the school leaders in their adversity quotient could be due to the difficulties they have faced today. These come in various forms from personal to professional life which may include academic drawbacks, intimidation or either some educational adversities like technological changes and others. In view thereof, both the school leaders and the led are affected in accordance to how leaders may respond to these adversities. Hence, becoming equipped in dealing and owning these adversities in the organization are important ingredient and aspect of leadership.

On the other hand, only few of the school heads had high level of ownership inferring only few from the school heads are able to withstand significant adversities they have experienced. They might have limited or manageable amount of workload. As school leaders thrive to fulfil various roles in the school, assuming all possible positions and doing almost all tasks even not relevant the person, ownership of the challenges becomes neglected as the leader feel overwhelmed by the number of responsibilities
taken. This could be the reason why only few have a high level of ownership.

This supports the findings of Tripathi (2011) who discovered that professionals who have performed multiple roles have shown the highest mean AQ® value. With the increase of responsibilities, there is an increase in stress levels, impact on diet, health, and work-life balance. The daily adversities too increase and so does the opportunity to manage re-silently.

Looking at the results, it can be deciphered that the composite mean of the scores of respondents in terms of ownership is low. This is attributed to lack of ownership amid the adversities faced by the school heads which can be correlated to the number of responsibilities they take at the same time. It is undeniably true that when things get overwhelming heavy to carry, tendencies are to not be able to be accountable with all the possible consequences. It is suggested that workloads of school leaders be lessened and equal dissemination of work to be equally managed.

2.3. Reach. The challenges faced by school leaders in running an institution may go beyond the roles they play. Its effects can also go beyond their personal life, even can create adverse effects on various facets of their life. Hence, this part of the study allows readers to understand the need for realizing the importance of handling adversities
The core dimension reach refers as to how far the adversity gets into
the areas of one's life, the greater the perception of the scope of adversity,
the more handicapped such person will feel. Table 11 presents the score
of the respondents’ adversity quotient® in terms of reach.

From the results revealed on the table, it shows that majority of the
school heads had low level of reach.

Table 11
Respondents’ Adversity Quotient® in Terms of Reach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQ Equivalents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>41.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 25.92 (Below Average)  S.D. = 7.07

Results imply that the challenges faced by the school leaders have already
affected dimensions of life from physical to social even mental and
emotional well-being. With the adverse effects of adversities faced by
school heads, other areas of their lives have already been aggravated.
These findings are parallel to the insights of Kaur (n.d.) when he examined
the adversity quotient among undergraduate students and how
achievement motivation and learning behavior influenced this. It was found
out that adversities experienced by individuals take effects up to the mental and emotional stability thus far. It is suggested that instead of escaping from the problem, they need to face challenging situations with enough courage leading to creating the better version of themselves.

Meanwhile, only few of the school heads had high level of reach reiterating that a little number of the leaders are able to manage the adversities they are experiencing and they did not allow these problems to take control of their whole being. These school leaders would be those with high sense of responsibility in solving their problems and standing up amid these adversities. The ability to face and immediately solve the problems did not allow any more aspects of their well-being to be affected.

As expressed by the school heads, they look at challenges as motivations to keep going. With a strong mindset, they are able to withstand whatever adversity they are facing.

Relevant to this, Bumphus (2008) noted that the weight of workloads given to school heads produced grave effects as to how they managed their challenges. Since these adversities might also transcend its effects to other areas of man’s well-being, it is suggested that leaders take their problems one step at a time.
The composite mean of the school heads’ adversity quotient® in the dimension of reach was below average. Looking at the possible reach of the adversities met by school leaders, it is important to note as well, the loads of work that may be assigned to them. Moreover, reflecting on their leadership behaviors, it is also noteworthy that they allow cooperation and teamwork between and among members of a team so as not to leave a one-man rule set up.

2.4. Endurance. School heads, as the leaders of an institution, are expected to be the last man standing amid adversities faced by the education sector. As the management runs in their hands, it is important to note their level of endurance to the problems the school may experience along the way. This study, then, likewise assessed the school heads’ ability to disallow the cause of failure to subdue their effort. Table 12 presents the score of the respondents’ adversity quotient® in terms of endurance.

It can be inferred from the table that majority of the scores of the respondents’ adversity quotient® in terms of endurance was below average, an indication that school leaders were somehow having a hard time continuing the enthusiasm and grit to endure challenges of the
education sector. The low level of endurance of the school leaders with the adversities they encounter could be primarily caused by the number of responsibilities they have, which weakened their resolve to counter and endure the adversities less. As shared by the school heads, with the current pandemic, all plans and goals needed to be carry out were paused which led to some postponement of some projects. This supports the findings of Olila (2012) who revealed that educator respondents had below average AQ which indicated that they had less than the ideal capacity to resolve challenges difficulties, setbacks and demands and to make every effort to overcome them so as not to affect their work.

Meanwhile, only few of the school heads had high scores in terms of endurance suggests only a small number from the school leaders could endure the adversities they experienced in their time of supervision. Definitely, the ability of school heads to keep going in the midst of

Table 12
Respondents’ Adversity Quotient® in Terms of Endurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQ EQUIVALENTS</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 30.55 (Below Average)  S.D. = 7.11
adversities is considered a challenge as it has been hampering already all other aspects of their well-being. As conformity to this idea, although it is hard to endure the adversities given these situations, Olila (2012) furthered that these can be endured through self-improvement activities such as reading of self-improvement/self-help books and attending self-transformation seminars which specifically focus on how to handle challenges.

The composite mean indicates that endurance was below average inferring findings need for school heads to learn how to manage their tasks one at a time and assure that each task is thereafter fulfilled so as not to be burdened with the loads of work that may be assigned to them.

Table 13 presents the summary score of respondents’ total adversity quotient®. Generally, the scores of the respondents’ total adversity quotient® indicated majority of the school heads’ scores were below average in all dimensions.

Results indicate that school heads need more assistance in improving their ways of managing adversities. As challenges continue to hamper the education system, especially during this pandemic, it is very important that school leaders together with their key members hand-in-hand face all possible adversities that may hinder education success.
Moreover, it is also important that school leaders identify the appropriate behavior to attend to these adversities without losing efficacy and efficiency. As Baroa (2015) suggested, school administrators must clearly understand individual's AQ® and constantly review their own AQ®P as guide for better leadership performance. Additionally, they should always be guided by their leadership skills to be applied in their workplace taking into consideration their leadership strengths and weaknesses. Through this, with an established leadership behavior all other aspects of the supervision will go as smooth as possible.

### 3. Effects of Adversity Quotient® on Leadership Behavior

The success of an institution largely depends on the leaders who carry out the plans and objectives of the whole team. It is with a strong and stable leadership behavior that adversities can be surpassed. Hence, it is very important that leaders establish a strong sense of behavioural
foundations in order to meet the increasing demands of education in the four dimensions of adversity quotient® such as control, ownership, reach and endurance. Table 14 shows the effects of adversity quotient® on leadership behavior in terms of personality.

**Table 14**  
**Effects of Adversity Quotient® on Personality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Unstandardized Beta Coefficients</th>
<th>$t$-value</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.1347</td>
<td>3.0145</td>
<td>12.8121</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0074</td>
<td>1.8556</td>
<td>0.0648</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.3286</td>
<td>0.7428</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0042</td>
<td>1.1851</td>
<td>0.2372</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0097</td>
<td>3.4962</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be gleaned from Table 14 that there was a weak correlation between the respondents’ personality on leadership and their adversity quotient confirmed by the computed $R –$ value of 0.367. Result of the study also shows that only 13.47 percent of the total variability of the respondents’ personality was explained by their adversity quotient.

Results of the study also show that among the predictive variables only endurance was a significant predictor of the respondents’ leadership behavior in terms of personality with unstandardized beta coefficients of 0.0097; computed $t –$ value of 3.4962 and a $p –$ value (0.0006) less than 0.05. This indicates that for every unit increase in the respondents’
endurance the model predicts that the personality in leadership behavior will increase by 0.0097. This supports the study of Aquino (2013) which examined the relationship of the adversity quotient, leadership style, and performance of secondary school heads and commitment of teachers to organizational values. It was revealed that reach and endurance dimensions of the secondary school heads were the average which was an implication of their ability to bear adversities.

Meanwhile, Table 15 presents the effects of adversity quotient® on leadership behavior in terms of leadership style.

### Table 15

*Effects of Adversity Quotient® on Leadership Style*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Unstandardized Beta Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>3.3566</td>
<td>12.2986</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.0074</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.2596</td>
<td>0.7954</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>-0.0036</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.4890</td>
<td>0.1379</td>
<td>0.7727</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2892</td>
<td>0.1110</td>
<td>0.2892</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be gleaned from Table 15 that there was a weak correlation between the respondents’ leadership style on leadership and their adversity quotient®. This was confirmed by the computed R – value of 0.177. Results of the study also show that only 3.13 percent of the total variability of the respondents’ leadership style was explained by their
adversity quotient. Results of the study also show that not one among the four predictors was considered significant predictor of the respondents’ leadership behavior considering their leadership style. This conforms with the findings of Napire (2016) which revealed leadership styles of the school heads were not significantly related to the adversity quotient dimension of control, ownership, reach, and endurance.

Table 16 reveals the effects of adversity quotient® on leadership behavior in terms of learning environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Unstandardized Beta Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
<td>0.0395</td>
<td>3.2310</td>
<td>13.2049</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>-0.0026</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.2306</td>
<td>0.2198</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>1.1934</td>
<td>0.2340</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9997</td>
<td>0.3185</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that there was a weak correlation between the respondents’ learning environment on leadership and their adversity quotient® as validated by the computed R – value of 0.199. Result of the study also shows that only 3.95 percent of the total variability of the
respondents’ learning environment was explained by their adversity quotient®.

Results of the study also show that among the predictive variables only the variable of control was a significant predictor of the respondents’ leadership behavior relative to learning environment with unstandardized beta coefficients of 0.0099; computed $t$ – value of 2.3675 and a $p$ – value (0.0187) less than 0.0200. This indicates that for every unit increase in the respondents’ endurance the model predicts that the learning environment in leadership behavior will increase by 0.0099.

These findings support the idea of Cornista & Macasaet (2015) who posited that control is the most directly related to a person’s inclination to try hard in response to a given challenge. Since impact lies within empowerment as to whether any meaningful action will take place, the control dimension has a strong influence on all other core dimensions.

Table 17 presents the effects of adversity quotient® on leadership behavior considering technology.

There was a weak correlation between the respondents’ behavior on technology on leadership and their adversity quotient® confirmed by the computed $R$ – value of 0.143. Result of the study also shows that only 2.06
percent of the total variability of the respondents’ behavior in terms of technology was explained by their adversity quotient.

Table 17
Effects of Adversity Quotient® on Knowledge of Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Unstandardized Beta Coefficients</th>
<th>$t$-value</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2204</td>
<td>10.207</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0019</td>
<td>-0.6746</td>
<td>0.5006</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.4194</td>
<td>0.6753</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>0.9185</td>
<td>0.3593</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the study also show that none among the four predictors was considered significant predictor of the respondents’ leadership behavior in terms of technology. These findings are parallel to Bautista et al., (2016) who concluded that having a low level of adversity quotient® might have negative effect on how leaders handle their organization and subordinates.

Table 18 presents the effects of adversity quotient® on leadership behavior considering organization and composition strength.

Similarly, it can be gleaned from the table that there was a weak correlation between the respondents’ organization and composition...
strength on leadership and their adversity quotient® as affirmed by the computed R – value of 0.154. Result of the study also shows that on

Table 18
Effects of Adversity Quotient® on Organization and Composition Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Unstandardized Beta Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.0237</td>
<td>3.2657</td>
<td>11.4092</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5581</td>
<td>0.1206</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>-0.0040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.5915</td>
<td>0.1129</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4999</td>
<td>0.1350</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4915</td>
<td>0.6236</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.37 percent of the total variability of the respondents’ organization and composition strength was explained by their adversity quotient®.

Notably, none among the four predictors was considered a significant predictor of the respondents’ leadership behavior in organization and composition strength. In contrast with the insight of Canivel (2015), people who easily handle challenges have high level of adversity quotient® as compared to those who seemingly give up in situations with low level of AQ.
4. Issues and Challenges of School Administrators

School heads play an integral role in ensuring that objectives and plans of the school are successfully carried out to achieve educational success. The ways on how they lead the team has to be established on sound and logical disposition since there are issues and challenges that may hamper the fulfilment of the desired goals of each school. Each stakeholder then, through the supervision of the school principal has to work in harmony with one another to meet the increasing demands of education accreditation, a mandate and a requirement to monitor school improvement.

Table 19 presents the issues and challenges encountered by school administrators. From the results of the survey, it was revealed that principals had difficulties in the disbursements of MOOE and preparation of required documents on their utilization as this has been highly evident in schools. This result implies that most schools today do not have sufficient funds to finance their projects essential in the improvement of the school and its key members. Since budget is a serious challenge, school heads collaborate with the community and other stakeholders like the parents to ensure that someone will back them up for some programs they want to implement. These findings are parallel to the ideas of Malaluan (2019)
which revealed that the common issues and problems met by school heads and teachers in the implementation of institutionalized accreditation, programs and projects beneficial to the school’s development included insufficient budget allocation, and inadequate facilities and materials, insufficient supporting documents submitted by fellow teachers, lack of time to prepare the documents, and lack of educational facilities such as library, classroom and laboratories.

Similarly, school heads also experienced the challenge in budget allocation for the implementation of different programs and activities which was highly evident in schools. This indicates that funds provided to the schools were insufficient as leaders had hard times cost-cutting their resources for the respective programs to be implemented to address teachers’ and students’ development concerns. Moreover, school head also mentioned in interviews that basic repair of school facilities has also a problem since budget was not enough to cater to all those needs. These findings echo the findings of Charles and Mkulu (2020) which posited that one of the major issues faced by school heads concerned the budget allocation for some school projects and repairs that have to be done. It is evident that in some schools, students are asked to bring their own chairs as there are no available facilities to accommodate students.
On the other hand, while budget was a major concern, LGU and stakeholders support to school’s programs and projects was a moderately evident issue among schools. This suggests that not every time that stakeholders can be able to lend a help since there are also other societal sectors which need the support of local government units like the health, security, livelihood and other sectors. For this reason, it is up to the school heads to devise ways like coming up with fund-raising events that will help them mobilize their people to accumulate an amount for their school projects. For Charles and Mkulu (2020), lack of parents’ cooperation in provision of pupils’ development, lack of financial assistance for classroom facilities in school, and the lack of support to send teachers to advanced trainings for enhancement of delivery of their instructions were the identified concerns.

It was also reflected on the table that planning, crafting, and preparation of the School Improvement Plan were also a highly evident issue in school managements affirming that school heads were having difficulties in devising ways to improve the school since their major consideration was budget. Results suggest government and assistance from other stakeholders improve schools. Rivera and Ibarra (2020) noted that school leaders as the brain of the school know what development the
### Table 19

**Issues and Challenges Encountered by School Administrators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Budget allocation for the implementation of different programs and Activities</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Resources to reach high standards of quality education</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Disbursements of MOOE and preparation of required documents on their utilization</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alternative work arrangement for teaching and non-teaching personnel</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Planning, crafting, and preparation of the School Improvement Plan</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parental and/or community involvement to support school’s initiatives</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5. Merit, promotion, and ranking of teachers</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5. Access and utilization of electronic data of learners, school personnel, school’s plant and equipment, and other records</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers’ preparation and readiness in the new teaching modalities</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Transition period from face to face to online or modular distance learning in the new normal in education</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. LGU’s and stakeholders’ support to schools’ programs and projects</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Learners’ mastery of skills taught on every learning area based on MELC</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Resiliency on handling emergent change affecting delivery of basic Education</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Attitudes and behaviors of teachers in performing their tasks, duties and responsibilities</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Virtual conduct of classes and conferences</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Establishing a culture of learning and concerns that social networking has brought to the development of students</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5. Time for instructional supervision due to overlapping tasks and Responsibility</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5. Availability of educational technology to support and upgrade Instructions</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Growing number of non-readers, slow and struggling readers</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Growing number of at-risk pupils due to poverty, broken families, bullying, child abuse and labor</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composite Mean**: 3.36 ME

**Legend**:  
- HE – Highly Evident  
- ME – Moderately Evident  
- WM – Weighted Mean  
- VI – Verbal Interpretation
school needs to develop further, however, there is the inadequacy for the capacity building such as advanced trainings which may guide them in making plans based on sound judgement and management.

Schools today are said to produce non-readers, slow and struggling readers; however the study revealed this was a moderately evident issue. Nevertheless, public schools need to have a strong foundation and quality reading program which can cater to the reading and comprehension needs of the students. Also, teachers need to be given trainings for better approaches in communication arts. It is very essential that while students learn, teachers together with leader, should also be engaged in improving themselves, to lessen the number of slow readers. Bush and Oduro (2006) supported that the main reason why students got low reading and academic performance, which eventually leads to dropping out, was primarily caused by lack of financial support to calibrate their educational needs.

Relative to student drop outs and slow readers, findings also reveal that there were a growing number of at-risk pupils due to poverty, broken families, bullying, child abuse and labor but was also a moderately evident issue. However, this implies that schools need to recalibrate their regulations and implementations to aid students in improving themselves.
Moreover, the kind of leadership school heads should portray is something that should be revisited to make sure students are given enough guidance and security while in school premises. As propositioned by Beale and Hall (2007), school administrators are responsible for ensuring that all students are provided an opportunity to attend school free from fear and intimidation. This includes ensuring that students are using a school network or mobile devices that does not cause harm to others. Moreover, school heads also are obligated to devise plans on how students can consider school as their second home.

Moreover, school heads also posited that merit, promotion, and ranking of teachers were also moderate evident challenges that they faced in schools caused maybe by the lack of credentials of their teachers which DepEd seeks from them. It is considered a challenge for school heads to push their teachers to have specialized trainings and advanced graduate studies to increase the competence of the instruction they provide to students. Since budget becomes the forefront cause of all these, school head seem to see this as a challenge that still remains. However, in particular, these findings support the idea of San Antonio (2019) which pinpointed that securing a job or a promotion takes the recommendation of the influential. There have been instances that even those who are not
qualified were allowed to head a schools’ division office. Hence, it is important the teachers and school heads are legitimately equipped with essential credentials to make them acceptable for whatever forms of promotions.

Likewise, teachers’ preparation and readiness in the new teaching modalities was assessed to be moderately evident challenge among school heads. This could primarily be due to the lack of trainings that may equip them with knowledge and skills to utilize new teaching trends. Since teachers from public schools may lack support for their professional advancement, the capacity to improve also is hampered, leaving them unprepared to meet the new demands of teaching modalities, specifically those in line with technology. These findings are parallel to what Andal (2020) mentioned that those who were appointed to be school directors without the essential skills might arrive and work at their respective schools with little practical and effective educational leadership knowledge and skills, which, consequently, might lead to lack of competence and excellence that will also be transmitted to their teachers.

Moreover, it was also revealed that parental and/or community involvement to support school’s initiatives was also a moderately evident challenge among school heads today. This likewise implies that there was
available support from stakeholders although not expansive enough to assist school’s needs for improvement in various aspects. However, schools may create other means on how they can self-sustain their needs for improvement. This result is in support with the responses provided by school heads in the interviews conducted. According to them, fund-raising events and solicitation from willing donors were conducted to accumulate funds for future needs of the organization.

As assessed by the school heads, resources to reach high standards of quality education were highly evident as a challenge among schools. This reiterates common observation that public schools lack supplementary aids starting from facilities and equipment for use new trends and methods in delivering instruction and other technological support systems much needed to new trends in teaching. For this reason, schools have difficulties to keep up with the demands of the 21st century education especially with the new normal education which requires advanced resources from teachers. Based from the information shared by the respondents in the interview, school heads concurred that they lacked necessary facilities and advanced technology platforms like online learning management system to assist both teachers and students in the teaching and learning process.
Meanwhile, attitudes and behaviors of teachers in performing their tasks, duties and responsibilities were moderately evident challenges as well, implying that school leaders could somehow have a hard time to communicate with their teachers as per the tasks they assigned to them especially workloads and schedules. They understood the challenges set by the new normal today and were sensitive enough to direct their subordinates. This is supported by the responses in their interview which they said that in terms of giving workloads and schedules to their teachers, they made sure that they communicated these plans first to their subordinates before actually implementing what was planned. It could be deduced that as school heads, they did not decide on important educational matters alone, but made a participative decision making.

Educational technology to support and upgrade instructions was also found to be a moderately evident challenge among schools. Seemingly, although this indicates that most public schools had issues on this, there were assistance to schools making them ready to supplement the teaching and learning process. The support provided helped schools to purchase equipment and improve facilities or acquire online learning management system to upgrade instructions. But it still remains true, as noted by Durban and Catalan (2012), there is still a need of the quality and
accessibility of education to its takers are hampered if there are inadequate capacities to provide some basic services to its people. Hence, it is important that all key players of the school strive to look for other possible ways to improve its instruction.

Time for instructional supervision due to overlapping tasks and responsibility was also a challenge but moderately evident to school settings. It could be school leaders were having difficulties in balancing their time to personally supervise their subordinates due to the loads of school and paper works assigned to them but was not a key issue. The inference was that school heads could attend to crucial tasks such as curriculum development and instructional supervision, indicating good time management. Alvarado et. al (2019) takes on the scenario that multitude tasks of a school administrator lies the many constraints that they find the work a difficult one. Most popular clamor is about the stressful nature of their administrative function with many paperworks to do. The situation is generally compounded by the passage of Republic Act 9155 otherwise known as Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 or School-Based Management that mandated school heads and principals in implementing various school programs and projects on their own. But with resilient and systematic implementation, the problems may be resolved.
Resiliency on handling emergent change affecting delivery of basic education was also found to be a challenge that was moderately evident among school heads. This suggests that they are striving to become adaptive and resilient amidst the challenges brought about by the new system of education today. As observed, present school heads are still trying to get along with the new set up in education in these times of the pandemic, which involves much change in instructional delivery. Anderson & White (2016) and Eady & Zepeda (2018) expressed that the concept of change is often a contentious issue for the school heads. Localization is also a mandate from the central office the school heads must contend with regarding the adoption of the pedagogical approaches in teaching. In the case of the present set-up, blended learning and other forms of distance learning should be the new approach to education.

The composite mean indicates that the issues and challenges experienced by school heads were found to be moderately evident in school settings. This being so, although not serious challenges, it is important for leaders to always reflect on these challenges for them to understand where difficulties are coming from and also to arrive at tangible plans and solutions to pave a way for quality education to be served.
5. Proposed Management Plan to Enhance Leadership Capabilities of Public Elementary School Administrators

Leadership capabilities of school leaders are integral to the success of an institution. A sound and established leadership behavior is essential to successfully overcome adversities besetting a school. As part of the analysis made in the conduct of the study, the researcher came up with a management plan proposed to enhance the leadership capabilities focusing on the leadership style and knowledge on technology of public elementary school administrators and their level of Adversity Quotient®. The researcher believes that when these activities in the plan are integrated in the ways programs are implemented, success in schools may be best achieved.

Figure 3 displays a model to improve the level of adversity quotient® of school administrators anchored on the careful analysis and interpretation of data.

As reflected in the results of the study, the level of adversity quotient® of school administrators was relatively low (below average) suggesting difficulties in unnecessarily number of ways. Hence, their motivation and hope to fuel up in times of challenges need to be
recalibrated by learning and practicing the tools in raising their levels of Adversity Quotient®.

In reference to this, the researcher came up with this model dubbed as **L-E-A-D Adversities to Opportunities** where L - look into challenges positively, E - elevate one’s level of resilience, A - act on developing ways to overcome adversities and D - direct decisions to cope with adversities.

**Look into challenges positively.** School administrators are beset with a lot of works everyday which covers up both pedagogical and administrative tasks. Their perspective about challenges sometimes become so clear that their performance get severely affected. It is imperative that school administrators understand that challenges are always present and that a positive outlook in solving each of them should be the main thrust of their leadership. With the right mindset coupled with the necessary actions to take, adversities will then become opportunities to improve the management of an institution.

**Elevate one’s level of resilience.** The ability to withstand challenges is one of the key factors in determining success of an institution. As adversities become predominant, building that strength and endurance amidst conflicts and challenges becomes one of the gauging factors of a successful leadership. Hence, school administrators are encouraged to
always look at difficulties as challenges and facing and solving them one at a time is a clear indication of a resilient school administrator.

**Act on developing ways to overcome adversities.** Challenges are not solved by merely thinking and planning about it. Carrying a plan is integral in overcoming adversities in the leadership of every school administrator. As they are overcome with different struggles every day, it is a must that they learn to deal with existing challenges and devise ways to overcome them through collaboration of different teaching and non-teaching staff under them.

**Direct decisions to cope with adversities.** As leaders, school administrators are left with a great deal of strong decision making on various situations. It is important that they stand on their ground on every decision they make to solve everyday difficulties facing their administration. Hence, it is equally important that they take decisive steps and become even bolder to improve their ways of facing adversities, as it will be indicative of the future success of their institution.
In order to successfully improve the school administrators’ level of adversity quotient®, the researcher thought of integrating a School Management and Leadership Training Course in the Schools Division of Batangas implementing the following program content:

1. Personal Adversity Quotient® Profile Review;
2. AQ® Integration in School Management and Leadership;
3. Personal and Professional Management Approaches on Adversity Quotient®; and

4. Revitalization of School Principal's Range of Analytical Frameworks on Enhancing Adversity Quotient®

As adversities become common challenges in the educational setting, school administrators should find ways to improve their leadership behaviors. These attributes that they have allow for better management of an institution towards achieving its goals and aspirations. As reflected in the results of the survey, two areas for improvement have to be taken into consideration to further strengthen their leadership behaviors. The researcher crafted this management model focused on recalibrating their leadership styles and their knowledge on technology as avenues for better leadership.

Figure 4 presents the model guide as to how school administrators could better improve their leadership styles and knowledge on technology. This model dubbed as Model Map to Improve Leadership Styles and Knowledge on Technology follows principles on various effective leadership styles to guide them on improving the ways they manage their schools or units. The model highlights two zones namely: Enablement Zone and the Engagement Zone. In each zone are the styles which are
aimed to develop with the appropriate knowledge on technologies that they are expected to work on. This model can be used as guides for training programs that may be implemented to re-calibrate school administrators.

**Enablement Zone.** This zone highlights the importance of enabling the school administrators the necessary leadership styles that they should learn in the calibration process. It is expected that they should start in learning how to plan things out to come up with decisions for the benefit of the unit. Coupled in mastering the planning stage is training their researching skills through participation in various conferences which may focus on advanced trends in research through different online platforms. In addition, the next style which focused on the desire to help others aim to develop leaders with the MS processing skills to effectively help their subordinates in making sure information are understood and utilized through these technological skills. Last stage of the Enablement Zone is
focused on learning by doing. School administrators need to highly develop the skills in application through various web platforms so as to lead the school, its teacher and its students to interactive ways to teach and learn.
**Engagement Zone.** After having been through the enabling process of looking back on the basics from the leadership styles and the technological skills needed to help an institution, they will then be transported to the engagement zone which highlights the importance of application of the lessons and skills learned in every phase. To begin with, school administrators will start engaging not only themselves but other stakeholders as well in the fulfillment of every educational tasks. Learning the advanced Instructional Skills through the use of technology and thereby sharing it with others, all goals will become feasible. And finally, to complete the zones of developing leadership opportunities, school administrators will start working on with and among other stakeholders to communicate goals of a certain institution.

Combining the models to improve Adversity Quotient® and Leadership Style and Knowledge on Technology, the researcher came up with this model; LEAD Adversities to Leadership Opportunities. By dealing adversities and difficulties in the workplace and in – placing Model Map to Improve Leadership Styles and Knowledge on Technology would dramatically improve Adversity Quotient® and leadership behavior of the school administrators. Moreover, this model could also be used through training, lecture-discussion, seminars and applications.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations formulated on the basis of the research findings.

Summary of Findings

This study described the leadership behavior of public elementary school administrators and identified their adversity quotient® in various dimensions. It was directed to create a management plan to help school heads improve their leadership behaviors to be aligned to the demands of certain difficulties that may be experienced in the educative process. The study likewise identified the relationship of the leadership behaviors to their adversity quotient. Moreover, this present undertaking aimed to identify issues and challenges that might help these leaders solve these in the future.

This undertaking employed the use of a descriptive method of research with a researcher-made questionnaire as the main data-gathering instrument. More so, it also used an online questionnaire specialized and made by Dr. Stoltz called the Adversity Quotient®. Furthermore, to substantiate the results of the study, interviews were also conducted from among the respondents to verbalize those presented on the tables.
After careful and thorough analysis of the gathered data, the study yielded these salient findings:

1. **Leadership Behavior of Public Elementary School Administrators**

   1.1. **Personality.** School heads greatly manifested the leadership behavior of being appreciative in every accomplishment made by the members of the team. Composite mean revealed that the respondents manifested to a great extent the leadership behavior indicators as regards their personality.

   1.2. **Leadership style.** Respondents manifested to a great extent the ethical behavior in advocating transparency and accountability in the school management. Composite mean indicated that school head greatly manifested the leadership behavior indicators related to their leadership style.

   1.3. **Learning environment.** School heads greatly manifested transparency in providing open communication platforms for parents, stockholders and the public and were greatly focused on achieving school goals for safe teaching-learning environment. Composite mean showed that respondents manifested to a great extent the leadership behavior indicators related to the learning environment they create.
1.4. **Knowledge in Technology.** The respondents’ open-mindedness in learning new skills utilizing technology was manifested to a great extent among the leadership behavior indicators related to technology. Composite mean revealed that respondents greatly manifested the leadership behavior indicators as regard technology.

1.5. **Organizational composition and strength.** The aspect of being honest and transparent in updating school’s transparency board to inform stakeholders on the MOOE disbursements, canteen reports, PTA financial reports were manifested by the school heads to a great extent. Composite mean presented that respondents greatly manifested the leadership behavior indicators as regards the organizational composition and strength aspect.

2. **Respondents’ Adversity Quotient**

2.1. **Control.** Majority of the school heads’ adversity quotient® as to control was below average. Composite mean suggested that AQ® in the first dimension of control is below average.

2.2 **Ownership.** Majority of the school heads had low level in their adversity quotient® relative ownership. Composite mean revealed that AQ® in the second domain of ownership was relatively low.
2.3. **Reach.** Majority of the school heads’ adversity quotient® in terms of reach was found to be low. Composite mean registered that AQ® in the third domain of reach was below average.

2.4. **Endurance.** Majority of the scores of the respondents’ adversity quotient® in terms of endurance among the respondents was below average. Composite mean suggested that AQ® in the dimension of endurance was below average.

3. **Effects of Adversity Quotient® on the Respondents’ Leadership Behavior**

Based from the findings of the study, there were weak correlations between the leadership behavior of the respondents in terms of personality, leadership styles, learning environment, technology and organizational composition and strength and their adversity quotient®.

4. **Issues and Challenges of School Administrators**

Among the many issues and challenges besetting school administrators today include the need for resources to reach high standards of quality education alongside with the process of disbursements of MOOE and preparation of required documents on its utilization was highly evident among the experiences of the school heads. The issue on growing number of at-risk pupils due to poverty, broken
families, bullying, child abuse and labor was least evident among all identified challenges faced by school heads. Composite mean revealed that the listed issues and challenges were very evident in the school setting experiences of the school leaders in their respective institution.

5. Proposed Management Plan to enhance Leadership Capabilities of Public Elementary School Administrators

The proposed management plan to enhance the leadership capabilities of public elementary school administrators was proposed based on the key results of the study. It highlights two different models which the school administrators shall follow to develop both their leadership behavior and adversity quotient: the LEAD Adversities to Opportunities Model focused on how to use breakouts as breakthroughs to improve leadership and the second model on the other hand which is a model to improve leadership style and knowledge on technology highlighted two zones of development. In each zones are the expected leadership styles and technological skills to be developed. These two models combined produced the proposed model named as LEAD Adversities to Leadership Opportunities which can be used as bases to think about appropriate seminars and training relevant to re-calibrate the leadership capabilities of school administrators.
Conclusions

Based from the findings, the following are the conclusions drawn in this study:

1. School leaders involved in this study exhibit leadership behaviors in their aspects of personality, leadership style, learning environment, knowledge on technology and organizational composition and strength.

2. Adversity quotient of elementary school administrators is relatively low (below average).

3. It can be identified that the respondents’ level of adversity quotient has an effect on the leadership behaviors of school administrators.

4. School leaders’ input from elementary schools identify that the issues and challenges besetting them are those which involves mostly on budget allocation and resources to attain the goals of the institution.

5. The management plan proposed by the researcher contains guides to develop and improve both the leadership style and knowledge on technology of school administrators as a way to ready them on certain levels of adversities. These guides can be used as bases for seminars and training in the future sponsored by DepEd.
Recommendations

In view of the findings of the study, the researcher offers the following recommendations:

1. It is recommended that in the future studies, both the teaching and the non-teaching staff be subjected to surveys as well to help counter check and verify the school administrators’ executed leadership behaviors.

2. School Administrators must clearly understand individual’s AQ® and must constantly review their own AQ®P as guide for better leadership performance.

3. Researcher may develop a model or a plan to help school administrators realize the importance of dealing with adversities in improving their leadership behaviors.

4. School administrators may be exposed to more trainings and development programs in order to nourish their leadership skills and manage setbacks squarely.

5. Similar studies may be conducted centered to find the relationship of emotional intelligence on the leadership behaviors and adversity quotient® of public elementary school administrators.
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