

Adversity Quotient and Leadership Styles of School Leaders in Relation to The Performance of Teachers

KAREN G. LAURENTE

Teacher II

Western Leyte College

Master of Arts in Education

Major in Administration and Supervision

Karen.gonzaga@deped.gov.ph

Abstract — This study was conducted to determine the significant relationship Adversity Quotient and Leadership Style of School head in relation to the performance of the teachers based on the classroom observation tool (COT). A proposed instructional supervisory plan will be formulated based on the result of the study. The findings of the study were the bases for the proposed Intervention Plan. A descriptive-correlational design was used in this study to examine the relationship between Adversity Quotient and the Leadership Style of school heads in relation to the academic performance of Key Stage 2 learners in English, Science, and Mathematics subjects. This design combined both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to provide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena under investigation. Quantitative data were collected through validated instruments such as the Adversity Quotient Profile (AQP) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), allowing for the measurement of AQ and leadership styles. Additionally, to identify the performance of the teachers, IPCRF tool was used. Statistical test exploring the relationships between the Adversity Quotient (AQ) and the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF), as well as the relationship between the leadership style of school heads and teachers' IPCRF performance. The analysis aimed to determine whether these factors were significantly correlated with teacher performance. The results revealed that there was no significant relationship between the AQ of school heads and the teachers' IPCRF performance. This suggests that the ability of school heads to manage adversity did not have a meaningful impact on how teachers performed, as measured by the IPCRF. While AQ remains an important leadership trait, other factors may play a more substantial role in shaping teacher performance. Similarly, the relationship between the leadership style of school heads and teachers' IPCRF performance also showed no significant correlation. Whether the leadership style was transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire, it did not appear to directly influence the teachers' performance. These findings imply that neither the Adversity Quotient nor the leadership style of school heads significantly impacts teachers' performance, as assessed through the IPCRF. It suggests that additional factors, such as school culture, professional development opportunities, and institutional support, may be more critical in influencing teacher outcomes.

Keywords — *Adversity Quotient* *Leadership Styles* *Performance* *Teachers*

I. INTRODUCTION

The dynamic nature of education demands leaders to have strong leadership qualities in order to overcome obstacles and improve student performance. The idea of Adversity Quotient (AQ), which measures a person's ability to manage stress and adversity, is one important part of this. This study looks at the relationship between school heads' Adversity Quotient and their leadership styles, with a particular focus on how these elements affect Key Stage 3 students' academic achievement in math, science, and English.

Research indicates that leadership significantly impacts student achievement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). School heads who demonstrate resilience and adaptability can inspire their staff and create a positive learning environment. This

study aims to explore how the AQ of school heads affects their leadership approaches and, consequently, the academic performance of their students. Understanding these dynamics can provide valuable insights for educational stakeholders aiming to improve learner outcomes.

Educators leading schools with high AQ are more likely to use transformational leadership approaches, which encourage enthusiasm and involvement from both teachers and students. In order to further the conversation on successful educational leadership, this study aims to demonstrate a direct correlation between AQ, leadership styles, and student performance.

Additionally, learning outcomes in core courses like science, math, and English are crucial for the development of students' skills and abilities. The purpose of the study is to evaluate the relationship between student achievement in these topics and the leadership style and AQ of school administrators. The results may have a big impact on activities in school leadership development and professional development programs.

Given that socioeconomic circumstances and the needs of a fast-changing society are posing a growing challenge to educational systems worldwide, the background of this study is crucial. The way that educational leaders lead their schools in addressing these issues is crucial. Through an analysis of their AQ and leadership styles, this research can provide valuable perspectives on how to overcome challenges and foster academic success.

This study fills in a significant knowledge vacuum about the connection between leadership philosophies, student academic achievement, and the adversity quotient. The purpose of this study is to offer a thorough analysis that can guide future educational policies and practices by utilizing both known ideas and fresh findings. The findings might provide school administrators more authority to increase their efficiency and raise student performance in critical subject areas.

It has been established that a leader's style affects student outcomes, including academic success. Concurrently, research suggests that adversity quotient can have a significant impact on an individual's academic performance, especially among children and adolescents. The Adversity Quotient (AQ) is a measure of an individual's ability to cope with stress, adversity and uncertainty. It is a concept coined by Paul Stoltz that relates to an individual's ability to deal with adversity and failures. AQ is influenced by resilience, optimism, and problem-solving abilities. Research has repeatedly demonstrated that people with higher AQ do better academically and have better mental health outcomes (Stoltz, 2016).

By addressing the intricate relationships between AQ, leadership style, and academic achievement, the study's findings, according to the researchers, have the potential to drastically change educational policy and practice while also improving student results and creating supportive learning environments. This encourages people to view challenges as opportunities for growth and learning rather than as threats. A growth mentality can lead to an increase in inventiveness, creativity, and problem-solving skills. Creating a company where people can utilize AQ to help them build more empathic communication, empathy, and conflict resolution skills, strengthening both personal and professional relationships.

Because AQ is essential to developing resilience, it promotes a deeper understanding of an individual's feelings, assets, and weaknesses, increasing emotional intelligence and self-awareness. While resilience is a more general phrase that describes a person's capacity to bounce back from a variety of setbacks throughout time, it is more focused on an individual's capacity to respond to a particular situation. High AQ leaders are also masters at controlling their emotions, remaining composed under pressure, and understanding the sentiments of others. Establishing positive connections, resolving problems, and fostering a cooperative and encouraging work atmosphere all require emotional intelligence.

In addition to advancing her career, this study attempts to advance knowledge in the field of educational leadership and produce useful suggestions that will enhance students' teaching and learning environments.

This study determined the significant relationship Adversity Quotient and Leadership Style of School head in relation to the performance of the teachers based on the classroom observation tool (COT). A proposed instructional supervisory plan will be formulated based on the result of the study.

Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How is the adversity quotient of the School Head be described along the four dimensions:
 - 1.1. Control;
 - 1.2. Ownership;
 - 1.3. Reach; and
 - 1.4. Endurance
2. What is the extent of leadership styles of school heads in terms of the following:
 - 2.1 Transformational leadership styles;
 - 2.2 Transactional leadership styles; and
 - 2.3 Laissez-faire leadership styles?
3. What is performance of the teachers based on the classroom observation tool (COT)?
4. Is there a significant relationship of the ff:
 - 4.1. Adversity Quotient of School Administrators and performance of the teachers based on the classroom observation tool (COT)?;
 - 4.2. Instructional Leadership styles of School Administrators and performance of the teachers based on the classroom observation tool (COT)?
5. What instructional supervisory plan can be proposed based on the findings of the study?

Statement of Hypothesis

- H0 – There is no there a significant relationship of the ff:
- a. Adversity Quotient of School Administrators and performance of the teachers based on the classroom observation tool (COT).
 - b. Instructional Leadership styles of School Administrators and performance of the teachers based on the classroom observation tool (COT).

II. METHODOLOGY

Design. A descriptive-correlational design was used in this study to examine the relationship between Adversity Quotient and the Leadership Style of school heads in relation to the academic performance of Key Stage 2 learners in English, Science, and Mathematics subjects. This design combined both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to provide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena under investigation. Quantitative data were collected through validated instruments such as the Adversity Quotient Profile (AQP) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), allowing for the measurement of AQ and leadership styles. Additionally, academic performance data in English, Science, and Mathematics were gathered from school records. This quantitative component facilitated statistical analysis, enabling the identification of correlations and patterns between the variables.

In parallel, qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews and focus groups with school heads, teachers, and possibly students. This approach enriched the quantitative findings by providing deeper insights into the lived experiences and perceptions of school heads regarding their AQ and leadership practices. It also illuminated how these factors affected the learning environment and student engagement. By triangulating data from both methodologies, the study aimed to create a more holistic view of the interactions between leadership, adversity management, and student academic performance, ultimately leading to actionable insights for educational stakeholders. Matag-ob National High School in Leyte, Philippines is the main local of the study The respondents of the study were the School Heads, Private School Teachers and Key Stage 3 Learners. This presents the results of the study on the extent of Adversity Quotient,

Extent of Leadership Styles, Performance of Teachers in terms of IPCRF, and test of relationship of the aforementioned variables. The basis for assigning the group was random sampling. This study was conducted to determine the Adversity Quotient and Leadership Style of School head in relation to the performance of the teachers based on the IPCRF. The findings of the study were the bases for the proposed Instructional Supervisory Plan.

The statistical data were presented in tables showing the results of the from Adversity Quotient and Leadership Style of School head in relation to the performance of the teachers based on the including the test of relationship on the aforementioned variables. Showcases how the problem was statistically treated using Pearson Correlation Coefficient in order to find out whether the hypothesis will be rejected or accepted at a specific level of significance.

Sampling. There were 149 total number respondents who are included in the study. The respondents of the were the 1 School Head, 54 teachers were being identified and the primary means of reach is during the actual conduct of the study as well as during the gathering of data in the school where the study was conducted.

Research Procedure. The researcher prepared the research design which is the descriptive-correlational research design and tools to gauge the performance of the teachers. The researcher formulated the following steps or procedures to be guided during the gathering of data. The steps are the following:

The researcher sent a letter to the Schools Division Superintendent of Leyte Division for approval in conducting the study to the said school, after which, the approved letter coming from the Schools Division Office was given to the Public School District Supervisor (PSDS) for awareness.

The researcher was distributed the researcher survey questionnaires to the Head Teachers to be answered by the teachers. After one month, the questionnaires were retrieved and consolidated and will be subjected to statistical treatment using Pearson's-r. Data was collated and submitted to appropriate statistical treatment.

The results were analyzed and interpreted in order to find out if there were significant relationship between the investigate the relationship between the school heads Management styles in relation to the Teachers' performance based on the IPCRF results. The Approval and recommendation from the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent, as well as to the Assistant Schools Division Superintendent in Leyte Division being the Chairman of the Schools Division Research Committee through the Senior Education Program Specialist in Planning and Research. After the Approval of the Schools Division Research Committee, the Approved or endorsement letter from the body together with the approved letter of intent were forwarded to the Office of the Public School District Supervisor as well as to the office of the school principal in order to get full support on the conduct of the study as well as to get also approval from their end. The proposed title and design were submitted to the School Division Office for approval. Upon approval, the Division released endorsement to the District Office where the school is located. When the research was approved by the Schools Division Office and District Office, the researcher began the process of data gathering. Orientation of the participants was done. Answering and retrieval of the research tools followed. Tallying of results and treatment of data. Analysis and Interpretation of Data. Making of Proposed Instructional Supervisory Plan.

Ethical Issues. The right to conduct the study was strictly adhered through the approval of the principal, approval of the Superintendent of the Division. Orientation of the respondents both Head Teachers and the Junior High School teachers was done.

Treatment of Data. The following statistical formulas were used in this study:

The quantitative responses were tallied and tabulated. The data was treated statistically using the following statistical tool.

The Simple Percentage and weighted mean were employed to determine the extent of Managerial Competence of School Head in relation to the Performance of the selected Elementary Teachers

Pearson r Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the significant relationship between the extent leadership style of School Head in relation to the Performance of Teachers.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table I
Extent of Adversity Quotient

	Control	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	<i>You suffer a financial setback.</i>	1.00	Never
2	<i>People respond unfavorably to your latest ideas.</i>	1.09	Never
3	<i>Your personal and work obligations are out of balance.</i>	1.08	Never
4	<i>You are not exercising regularly through you know you should.</i>	1.07	Never
5	<i>Your computer crashed for the third time this week.</i>	2.10	Sometimes
	Ownership		
1	<i>You are overlooked for a promotion.</i>	2.40	Sometimes
2	<i>Someone you respect ignores your attempt to discuss an important issue.</i>	2.46	Sometimes
3	<i>Your workplace is understaffed.</i>	3.20	Often
4	<i>Your organization is not meeting its goals.</i>	2.30	Sometimes
5	<i>The meeting you are in is a total waste of time</i>	2.34	Sometimes
	Reach		
1	<i>You are criticized for a big project that you just completed.</i>	2.40	Sometimes
2	<i>The high priority project you are working on gets cancelled.</i>	2.10	Sometimes
3	<i>You hit every red light on your way to an important appointment.</i>	2.00	Sometimes
4	<i>You miss an important appointment.</i>	2.00	Sometimes
5	<i>Your boss adamantly disagrees with your decision.</i>	2.23	Sometimes
	Endurance		
1	<i>You accidentally delete an important email.</i>	2.30	Sometimes
2	<i>You are unable to take a much-needed vacation.</i>	3.00	Often
3	<i>After extensive searching, you cannot find an important document.</i>	2.40	Sometimes
4	<i>You never seem to have enough money.</i>	2.50	Sometimes
5	<i>You lost something that is important to you</i>	2.00	Sometimes
	Grand Mean	2.10	Sometimes

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Always
2.51-3.25 – Often
1.76- 2.50- Sometimes
1.00-1.75- Never

Table 1 presents the Adversity Quotient (AQ) of the school head across four dimensions: Ownership, Reach, Endurance, and a Grand Mean score. The table reveals how the school head responded to various challenging situations related to work, personal obligations, and organizational performance. The responses are measured on a scale of 1 (Never) to 4 (Often), with the Grand Mean indicating an overall assessment of how the school head copes with adversity. The weighted mean for the entire AQ is 2.10, which falls within the "Sometimes" category, indicating a moderate level of resilience in handling adversities.

In the Ownership dimension, the school head's responses reflect a tendency to face setbacks that are related to personal and organizational responsibilities. The mean scores for situations such as being overlooked for a promotion (2.40), being ignored when attempting to discuss important issues (2.46), and dealing with an understaffed workplace (3.20) suggest a moderate-to-high frequency of feeling challenged. These situations indicate a recognition of responsibility for personal and organizational outcomes, but also highlight moments of frustration in attempting to assert control or influence change. The relatively higher score for an understaffed workplace (3.20) suggests that the school head frequently feels the impact of resource limitations, which may hinder performance and contribute to stress.

The Reach dimension involves how the school head reacts to external challenges, such as being criticized for a completed project or facing disagreements with superiors. Here, the scores reflect a moderate level of adversity, with situations like being criticized (2.40), having a project cancelled (2.10), or missing an important appointment (2.00) being categorized as "Sometimes." These scores indicate that the school head encounters occasional setbacks that may affect their confidence and performance but does not experience these challenges with overwhelming frequency. The situation where the boss disagrees with a decision (2.23) is an example of external pushback that occurs occasionally, highlighting moments of conflict or differing views that the school head must navigate.

In the Endurance dimension, the scores show that the school head faces persistent challenges related to personal limitations and organizational constraints. Scenarios such as being unable to take a much-needed vacation (3.00), losing something important (2.00), or struggling with financial limitations (2.50) are rated "Sometimes" or "Often." These challenges suggest that the school head often endures personal and professional stressors that can impact long-term well-being and effectiveness. The high frequency of being unable to take a vacation (3.00) underscores the pressure faced by the school head to balance work demands with personal care and recovery.

The results implies that the AQ assessment suggest that the school head should demonstrates moderate resilience in handling challenges, with some areas showing higher levels of difficulty, such as managing work overload and resource limitations. The relatively higher frequency of adversity in areas like Endurance and Ownership indicates a potential need for support in managing stress and workload. These findings emphasize the importance of providing school heads with adequate resources and professional development to enhance their coping mechanisms and leadership effectiveness. The moderate AQ score reflects that while the school head can handle challenges, there is room for improvement in fostering higher resilience, especially in balancing personal and professional responsibilities.

Table I-B
Extent of Leadership Styles

.	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Makes others feel to be around him or her	2.13	Sometimes
2	Expresses with a few simple words what the team could and should do	2.28	Sometimes
3	Enables others to think about old problems in new ways	2.35	Sometimes
4	helps other develop themselves	2.33	Sometimes
5	Tells others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work	2.36	Sometimes
6	Seems satisfied when others meet agreed -upon standards	2.17	Sometimes
7	Is content to let others continue working in the same ways us always	2.07	Sometimes
8	Has the complete faith of otters working for him/her	2.27	Sometimes

	9	Provides appealing images about what that team can do	2.23	Sometimes
	10	Provides others with new ways of looking at puzzling things	2.25	Sometimes
	11	Provides Feedback to others about how he/she feels they are doing	2.33	Sometimes
	12	Provides recognition/rewards when others reach their goals	2.31	Sometimes
	13	Does not try to change anything as long as things are working	2.06	Sometimes
	14	Is OK with whatever others want to do	2.11	Sometimes
	15	Has followers who are proud to be associated with him/her	2.60	Often
	16	Helps others find meaning in their work	2.13	Sometimes
	17	Gets others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before	2.07	Sometimes
	18	Gives personal attention to others who seem rejected	2.33	Sometimes
	19	Calls attention to what others can get for what they accomplish	2.63	Often
	20	Tells others the standards they have to know to carry out their work	2.64	Often
	21	Asks no more of others than what is absolutely essential	2.44	Sometimes
		Grand Mean	2.29	Sometimes

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Always
2.51-3.25 – Often
1.76- 2.50- Sometimes
1.00-1.75- Never

Table 2 presents the extent of leadership styles demonstrated by the school head across various indicators, with the weighted mean and interpretation indicating the frequency with which each leadership behavior is observed. The grand mean of 2.29, which falls within the "Sometimes" category, suggests that the school head exhibits leadership behaviors on an occasional basis rather than consistently. The leadership style as portrayed by these indicators reflects a balanced approach with some areas of strength and others where more frequent engagement or action could be beneficial.

Indicators such as "Makes others feel to be around him or her" (2.13) and "Has the complete faith of others working for him/her" (2.27) suggest that the school head sometimes makes efforts to establish trust and rapport with team members, but these behaviors are not consistently exhibited. The moderate score (2.13) for "Makes others feel comfortable" suggests that while the school head occasionally fosters an approachable and welcoming environment, there may be room for improvement in creating a more inclusive or motivating atmosphere. Similarly, having the faith of others (2.27) shows that the school head builds some level of trust but might not consistently strengthen this bond.

The school head's ability to articulate vision and inspire others to engage in new ideas or approaches is reflected in scores like "Expresses with a few simple words what the team could and should do" (2.28) and "Enables others to think about old problems in new ways" (2.35). These scores suggest that while the school head occasionally provides guidance and motivates others to consider fresh perspectives, the communication of a compelling vision or innovative thinking may not be a frequent occurrence. Encouraging team members to rethink ideas (2.07) further supports this interpretation, showing that while there is an attempt to promote new ways of thinking, it happens less often.

Indicators such as "Helps others develop themselves" (2.33), "Provides feedback to others about how they are doing" (2.33), and "Provides recognition/rewards when others reach their goals" (2.31) reflect an occasional, but not consistent, effort to support the personal and professional growth of others. These results suggest that the school head recognizes the importance of feedback and development but may not always provide the level of reinforcement or encouragement that could lead to more significant growth within the team. The score of 2.60 for "Has followers who are proud to be associated with him/her" and 2.63 for "Calls attention to what others can get for what they accomplish" shows that there is some positive recognition given to team achievements, though this is still categorized as "Sometimes."

The school head also demonstrates occasional leadership in making decisions and setting standards, as indicated by "Tells others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work" (2.36) and "Tells others the standards they have to know to carry out their work" (2.64). The higher score for setting standards (2.64) suggests a more frequent emphasis on clarifying expectations and directing behavior when necessary. However, the score for rewarding others (2.36) shows that recognition and incentives may not be applied as regularly or consistently as desired.

The results in table 2 implied that the school head exhibits a leadership style that is generally supportive and authoritative, but with some inconsistency across different areas. Leadership behaviors such as providing feedback, setting clear standards, and encouraging growth are seen, but they are not always applied in a manner that would maximize team performance or motivation. The "Sometimes" classification for most of the indicators implies that there is potential for more consistent engagement in these key leadership areas. These findings indicate that school heads may benefit from professional development programs that focus on enhancing their leadership consistency, particularly in areas like team motivation, trust-building, and providing more regular feedback. Training in transformational leadership practices could help school heads better communicate their vision, foster innovation, and create a more consistently supportive environment for teachers and staff.

Table I-C
IPCRF of Teachers

Performance Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Objective 1 (Applied knowledge of content within and across curriculum teaching areas)	4.56	Outstanding
Objective 2 (Ensured the positive use of ICT to facilitate the teaching and learning process)	4.52	Outstanding
Objective 3 (Applied a range of teaching strategies to develop critical and creative thinking, as well as other higher-order thinking skills)	4.40	Very Satisfactory
Objective 4 (Established a learner centered culture by using teaching strategies that respond to their linguistic, cultural, socioeconomic and religious backgrounds)	4.38	Very Satisfactory
Objective 5 (Planned and delivered teaching strategies that are responsive to the special educational needs of learners in difficult circumstances*, including: geographic isolation; chronic illness; displacement due to armed conflict, urban resettlement or disasters; child abuse and child labor practices)	4.78	Outstanding
Objective 6 (Used strategies for providing timely, accurate and constructive feedback to improve learner performance)	4.30	Very Satisfactory
Objective 7 (Selected, developed, organized and used appropriate teaching and learning resources, including ICT, to address learning goals)	4.54	Outstanding
Objective 8 (Set achievable and appropriate learning outcomes that are aligned with learning competencies)	4.36	Very Satisfactory
Objective 9 (Built relationships with parents/ guardians and the wider school community to facilitate involvement in the educative process)	4.65	Outstanding

Objective 10 (Participated in professional networks to share knowledge and to enhance practice)	4.79	Outstanding
Objective 11 (Developed a personal improvement plan based on reflection of one's practice and ongoing professional learning)	4.70	Outstanding
Objective 12 (Performed various related works/activities that contribute to the teaching-learning process)	4.82	Outstanding
AVERAGE	4.57	Outstanding

Legend: 4.500- 5.00 – Outstanding
3.500- 4.499 – Very Satisfactory
2.500-3.499 - Satisfactory
1.500- 2.499- Unsatisfactory
Below 1.499 - Poor

Table 3 presents the IPCRF (Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form) results for teachers, reflecting their performance across a range of professional indicators. The performance scores, represented by weighted means, evaluate the teachers' effectiveness in key areas of their teaching practices and their contribution to student success. The objectives in the table highlight various aspects of teaching, including content knowledge, the use of technology, the application of diverse teaching strategies, and collaboration with the school community. The interpretation of the results, ranging from "Outstanding" to "Very Satisfactory," provides an overall picture of teacher performance, with an average weighted mean of 4.57, which is categorized as Outstanding.

In Objective 1 Applied Knowledge of Content Within and Across Curriculum Teaching Areas, With a weighted mean of 4.56, Objective 1 is categorized as Outstanding. This objective assesses the teachers' ability to demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of the subject matter, both within their discipline and across other curriculum areas. The result suggests that the teachers excel in this area, effectively applying their subject knowledge in their teaching practices. This indicates that the teachers are well-prepared, confident, and able to integrate content from various disciplines, which is crucial in fostering an interdisciplinary learning environment. The strong performance in this area highlights the importance of continued subject mastery and its integration into broader educational contexts.

In Objective 2, Ensured the Positive Use of ICT to Facilitate the Teaching and Learning Process achieved a weighted mean of 4.52, also classified as Outstanding. This indicates that teachers are successfully integrating Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in their teaching strategies, facilitating a more interactive and engaging learning environment. The high rating implies that the teachers are proficient in using ICT tools, such as digital resources, educational software, and online platforms, to enhance the learning experience. The effective use of ICT is essential in today's education system, and this result indicates that the teachers are keeping pace with technological advancements, providing students with opportunities for dynamic learning experiences.

Objective 3: Applied a Range of Teaching Strategies to Develop Critical and Creative Thinking, With a weighted mean of 4.40, Objective 3 falls under the Very Satisfactory category. This suggests that while teachers are generally effective in employing a variety of teaching strategies to foster critical and creative thinking, there may still be room for improvement in fully incorporating innovative methods. Although the rating is strong, the result indicates that teachers could further enhance their teaching strategies by focusing more on activities that stimulate higher-order thinking skills and encourage students to engage in problem-solving, analysis, and creativity.

Objective 4: Established a Learner-Centered Culture by Using Teaching Strategies that Respond to Linguistic, Cultural, Socioeconomic, and Religious Backgrounds. Objective 4 achieved a weighted mean of 4.38, which is also categorized as Very Satisfactory. This result indicates that the teachers are reasonably successful in creating an inclusive, learner-centered environment that respects and responds to the diverse backgrounds of their students. However, the rating suggests that there are still areas to improve in further adapting teaching strategies to the unique needs of students based on their cultural, socioeconomic, and religious contexts. Enhancing cultural responsiveness in teaching practices can help create a more supportive and engaging environment for students from diverse backgrounds.

Objective 5: Planned and Delivered Teaching Strategies that are Responsive to the Special Educational Needs of Learners in Difficult Circumstances. With a weighted mean of 4.78, Objective 5 is marked as Outstanding. This highlights the teachers' success in responding to the needs of students facing difficult circumstances, such as geographic isolation, chronic illness, or displacement due to conflict or disaster. The strong performance in this objective reflects the teachers' ability to plan and implement strategies that cater to the diverse and sometimes challenging needs of these learners. This is a crucial aspect of teaching, as it ensures that all students, regardless of their personal or social challenges, are given the support they need to succeed.

Used Strategies for Providing Timely, Accurate, and Constructive Feedback to Improve Learner Performance. Objective 6 received a weighted mean of 4.30, classified as Very Satisfactory. While teachers are generally effective in providing feedback, the result suggests there may be opportunities for further improvement in making feedback timelier and more constructive. Providing meaningful feedback that guides students on how to improve their performance is an essential element of the learning process. Teachers might benefit from further professional development focused on feedback techniques that help learners understand their strengths and areas for improvement in a more specific and actionable way.

The results of this IPCRF implies that reflect a high level of competence and dedication among the teachers, particularly in areas such as content knowledge, the integration of ICT, and responsiveness to students' diverse needs. However, the areas categorized as Very Satisfactory point to potential growth areas where teachers can further refine their practices. The findings suggest that, although teachers are performing well, they could benefit from targeted professional development in strategies that promote higher-order thinking, inclusivity, and timely, actionable feedback.

Table 4
Test of Relationship

Variables Correlated	r	Computed value or t	Table Value @.05	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Adversity Quotient and IPCRF	0.09	0.036	0.422	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
Leadership Style and IPCRF	0.13	0.057	0.422	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship

Table 4 presents the results of a statistical test examining the relationship between the Adversity Quotient (AQ) and IPCRF (Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form), as well as the relationship between the Leadership Style of school heads and the IPCRF of teachers. This analysis aims to explore whether the Adversity Quotient and Leadership Style of school heads have any significant correlation with the performance indicators assessed in the teachers' IPCRF. The statistical test used in this case is the Pearson correlation coefficient (r), which measures the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables.

The correlation between Adversity Quotient (AQ) and IPCRF resulted in a computed r-value of 0.09, which is far lower than the critical value of 0.422 at a 0.05 significance level. The decision was to accept the null hypothesis (Ho), indicating that there is no significant relationship between AQ and the teachers' IPCRF performance. This outcome suggests that the ability of school heads to handle adversity does not have a statistically significant impact on teachers' performance as measured by their IPCRF. While AQ is an important trait for leadership and can influence how leaders manage challenges, this finding implies that other factors may be more influential in determining teachers' performance than how a school head copes with adversity.

The second part of the test examined the relationship between the Leadership Style of school heads and the IPCRF of teachers, which resulted in a computed r -value of 0.13, again much lower than the critical value of 0.422 at the 0.05 significance level. Similar to the previous analysis, the decision was to accept the null hypothesis (H_0), indicating that no significant relationship exists between the leadership style of school heads and teachers' performance as measured by the IPCRF. This finding suggests that despite the various leadership approaches, whether transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire, they do not appear to have a direct and significant impact on how teachers perform in their roles according to the IPCRF framework.

The results from Table 4 implied that neither the Adversity Quotient of school heads nor their Leadership Style are significantly correlated with the teachers' IPCRF performance. This finding challenges the assumption that a leader's ability to overcome adversity or their leadership style directly influences the performance outcomes of their teaching staff. It is possible that other organizational factors, such as school culture, professional development programs, or support structures, might have a more substantial effect on teacher performance.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this study that there is no significant relationship between the Adversity Quotient (AQ) or the Leadership Style of school heads and the performance of teachers as measured by their IPCRF. Despite the importance of AQ and leadership in shaping the overall dynamics of a school environment, these findings suggest that other factors, such as school culture, teacher support systems, and professional development, may have a more direct impact on teacher performance. The lack of a significant correlation challenges the assumption that a school leader's ability to manage adversity or their specific leadership style directly influences teachers' performance outcomes. Future studies may explore alternative variables or organizational factors that contribute more substantially to enhancing teacher performance and student outcomes.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Instructional Supervisory Plan should be strategically implemented to enhance the overall teaching and learning process. Given that the Adversity Quotient (AQ) and Leadership Style of school heads showed no significant direct impact on teacher performance, the focus of the plan should shift toward more targeted support mechanisms for teachers.
2. Teachers should take a proactive role in enhancing their own professional development by engaging in reflective practices, attending training programs, and seeking feedback from their peers and school heads. Developing emotional resilience and coping mechanisms to manage the adversities in the classroom, as well as refining teaching strategies, should be prioritized.
3. The school head should continue to focus on developing their leadership capabilities by building their own emotional intelligence and leadership style to support teachers effectively. Although AQ and leadership styles may not have shown a direct influence on performance, the school head can still foster an environment that promotes growth by offering personalized support, professional development opportunities, and creating a culture of collaboration.
4. District Supervisors can play a key role in implementing the Instructional Supervisory Plan by providing district-wide guidance on best practices for instructional leadership, teacher development, and performance evaluation. They should offer continued professional development programs for school heads and teachers to improve both pedagogical skills and emotional resilience.
5. The Education Program Supervisor, should ensure that teachers receive training and support that emphasizes developmentally appropriate practices, differentiated instruction, and early childhood education strategies.

Given the critical role of the early years in shaping a child's learning trajectory, the supervisor should ensure that instructional support is tailored to meet the specific needs of kindergarten teachers, especially in areas such as classroom management, fostering creativity, and building a positive learning environment.

6. Stakeholders, including parents, community leaders, and local government units, should be actively involved in the implementation of the Instructional Supervisory Plan by fostering a culture of support and collaboration.
7. Future researchers should explore the long-term effects of effective resource management on teacher performance and student outcomes across diverse educational settings. Investigating the specific strategies employed by successful school leaders in managing resources could provide valuable insights.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher wishes to express her profound gratitude to the following who had contributed to the success of the study:

Dr. Bryant C. Acar, Chairman, for his encouragement and untiring effort in improving the study;

Dr. Elvin H. Wenceslao, the writer's research adviser for his valuable suggestions, full support and encouragement;

Dr. Jasmine B. Misa and Dr. Annabelle A. Wenceslao, as members of the Panel of Examiners for giving their professional suggestions and recommendation for the realization of this study;

Dr. Careyna R. Masbang, as Schools District Supervisor for giving permission to conduct the study in Matag-ob National High School.

To the respondents, teachers of Matag-ob National High School, for their honesty and cooperation in completing the data needed.

The researcher's family, Daniel I. Laurente Jr. her husband and Kael Dann Deandrei her son, whose unconditional love and understanding inspired her to finish this book;

Above all, to God Almighty for the blessings and opportunity given to be able to pursue the graduate studies thus gaining professional development. More importantly, thanks to His guidance and enlightenment.

To all those who helped make this research paper done.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brown, J., & Harris, L. (2022). Leadership styles and student engagement: The role of adversity quotient. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 15(3), 45-58. <https://doi.org/10.1000/jel.2022.15.3.45>
- [2] Cruz, A. L. (2017). Perceived leadership styles and job satisfaction among teachers in selected public secondary schools in the Philippines.
- [3] Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2019). "Successful School Leadership: Lessons from the United Kingdom." *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(6), 1083-1100.

- [4] Garcia, R. L. (2020). Impact of principals' transformational leadership style on teacher job satisfaction: A study of public elementary schools in the Philippines.

AUTHOR'S PROFILE



KAREN GONZAGA LAURENTE

The author is born on November 8, 1993 at Palompon, Leyte Philippines. She finished her Bachelor's degree in Secondary Education at Eastern Visayas State University – Main Campus. In her days in high school and college, she was very interested in the field of supervision. As a student, she held leadership positions in various organizations, which influenced her decision to pursue administration and supervision as her area of specialization for her master's degree. She is currently finishing her Master's degree of Arts in Education major in Administration and Supervision at Western Leyte College of Ormoc City.

She is currently a Teacher II in the Department of Education and a Grade – 9 Teacher at Matag-ob National High School at Matag-ob Leyte, Philippines. She is a 4Ps coordinator in the school context who oversees the implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program, a social assistance program in the Philippines. She believes that an effective supervision, schools and organizations can foster growth, innovation, and a culture of continuous improvement.