

Adversity Quotient and Leadership Styles of School Heads in Relation to the Teachers Performance

SHEILA S. JUMAO-AS

Teacher II

Western Leyte College

Master of Arts in Education

Major in School Administration and Supervision

sheila.jumaoas001@deped.gov.ph

Abstract — This study determined the significant relationship between the School Head's Adversity Quotient & Leadership Styles in Relation to the teachers' performance. A proposed instructional supervisory plan was formulated based on the result of the study. A descriptive-correlational design was used in this study to examine the relationship between the School Head's Adversity Quotient and Leadership Styles in relation to teachers' performance. 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), which measured the levels of adversity quotient and leadership styles. Furthermore, the performance of teachers was assessed using the IPCRF. This quantitative component facilitated statistical analysis and enabled the identification of correlations and patterns among the variables. The Test of Relationship, which examines the correlation between (1) the Adversity Quotient of school heads and the teaching performance of teachers, and (2) the leadership styles of school heads and the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings of teachers. The table includes the correlation coefficient (r), computed t-values, critical table value at the 0.05 level of significance, the decision on the null hypothesis (H_0), and the interpretation of the statistical relationship. In the first relationship tested—Adversity Quotient and Teaching Performance—the computed correlation coefficient with a t-value significantly exceeding the critical table value. This led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating a very strong and statistically significant relationship. This suggests that school heads with higher adversity quotient scores—those more resilient and capable in facing challenges—are associated with teachers demonstrating higher teaching performance. Similarly, the second relationship—Leadership Style and IPCRF of Teachers—produced an even higher correlation coefficient of 0.88, with a computed t-value of 3.958, also surpassing the same critical value. This again led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, affirming a very strong and significant relationship. This implies that effective leadership styles—whether transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire—are positively associated with higher teacher performance ratings as reflected in their IPCRF results. The implications of these results are substantial. Both variables—Adversity Quotient and Leadership Style—were found to have very strong positive relationships with teacher performance. The average correlation coefficient which strongly implies that the better the school head's resilience and leadership approach, the higher the level of teacher effectiveness. These findings underscore the importance of leadership quality and personal adaptability in shaping school-level performance and instructional success.

Keywords — *Adversity Quotient, Leadership Styles School Heads Teachers, Performance*

I. Introduction

One of the key concerns in education today is ensuring that teachers remain engaged despite the challenges they face. Professional development, administrative support, and a nurturing school environment are all influenced by leadership. This research will provide valuable insights into what leadership strategies work best to keep teachers motivated and committed to delivering quality education. Additionally, learner performance is a major indicator of curriculum success. School heads who implement strong leadership strategies create an environment where students receive proper guidance, resources and support. Identifying which leadership contribute to better student outcomes can help in shaping policies that promote excellence in education.

Professionally, this study is also significant because it provides recommendations for future school leaders. Aspiring and current school heads can use the findings to refine their leadership styles, ensuring that they align with the goals of the MATATAG Curriculum. As education continues to evolve, having research-based leadership strategies will be essential in maintaining high standards in schools and ensuring the best learning experiences for students.

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.

The researcher, with a strong commitment to education, holds a deep interest in understanding how leadership influences the overall learning experience of students. Recognizing the MATATAG Curriculum as a timely and significant educational reform, the researcher aimed to explore the pivotal role that school heads play in ensuring its successful implementation. It is believed that while a well-structured curriculum can transform the quality of education, its effectiveness largely depends on the leadership strategies adopted by school administrators in supporting both teachers and students.

In the researcher's professional experience, varying leadership styles have shown considerable impact on school environments. Some school heads successfully foster a positive atmosphere where teachers feel empowered and motivated, while others struggle to provide the kind of support that drives meaningful change. These observations prompted the researcher to investigate which specific leadership strategies are most effective, particularly in the context of the MATATAG Curriculum. Such insights are crucial for developing leadership practices that are responsive to the needs of educators and learners alike.

One of the major challenges anticipated in conducting this research is the collection of accurate and reliable data from school heads, teachers. Given that leadership is a broad and often subjective concept, responses may vary significantly based on individual experiences and personal

perceptions. To effectively measure the impact of leadership strategies, it was necessary to carefully design survey instruments and ensure that data analysis was conducted with rigor and objectivity to capture meaningful insights.

Another challenge lies in the availability and willingness of respondents. School heads and teachers typically have demanding schedules, which can make participation in surveys or interviews difficult. Additionally, some may feel hesitant to provide honest feedback due to concerns about confidentiality or potential professional repercussions. To address this, the researcher must establish trust with participants, ensure the anonymity of responses, and clearly communicate the purpose and importance of the study to encourage open and candid participation.

This study determined the significant relationship between the School Head's Adversity Quotient & Leadership Styles in relation to Teachers performance. A proposed instructional supervisory plan was formulated based on the result of the study.

Specifically, this study sought 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 the extent of the teachers' performance based on their IPCRF?
4. Is there a significant relationship the following:
 - 4.1 adversity quotient and teaching performance; and
 - 4.2 leadership style and teaching performance?
5. What instructional supervisory plan can be proposed based on the findings of the study?

Statement of Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship the following:

- 1.1 adversity quotient and teaching performance; and
- 1.2 leadership style and teaching performance

II. Methodology

T Design. A descriptive-correlational design was used in this study to examine the relationship between the School Head's Adversity Quotient and Leadership Styles in relation to teachers' performance. 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), which measured the levels of adversity quotient and leadership styles. Furthermore, the performance of teachers was assessed using the IPCRF tool. This quantitative component facilitated statistical analysis and enabled the identification of correlations and patterns among the variables. The main locale of the study were selected schools in Isabel 2 District, in the Division of Leyte. The respondents of the study were 3 School Heads and 50 teachers. The information for the analysis was gathered using three distinct tools: one to measure school heads' levels of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles; another to assess their adversity quotient; and a third to evaluate teachers' performance. The assessment of the school head's leadership style by teachers was conducted through the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Avolio and Bass in 1991. This survey consisted of 20 items using a 4-point Likert scale, where participants rated their principals' leadership styles in three categories: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. The scale ranged from 4 (frequently), 3 (often), 2 (occasionally), to 1 (never). The second tool used was the Adversity Response Profile (ARP®) version 10.1 developed by Dr. Paul G. Stoltz, which measured the adversity quotient of elementary school administrators. This instrument assessed how school leaders responded to challenging situations, including their ability to cope with problems, maintain control, and avoid distancing themselves from others—factors that, according to Bandura (1995), may impact leadership effectiveness. The third tool utilized was the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) of teachers, which served as the basis for evaluating their performance in relation to school head leadership and adversity quotient within the context of the MATATAG Curriculum implementation. The proposed instructional supervisory plan was taken based on the findings of the study.

Sampling The respondents of the study were 3 School Heads, and 50 teachers that were involved in this study 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 In order to gather the necessary data within one month (30 days), the researcher sought permission from the Schools Division Office, headed by the Schools Division Superintendent, through a transmittal letter. The same letter content was provided to the Public Schools District Supervisor, the School Principal, and the teachers responsible for the respondents. The researcher distributed the survey questionnaires to the school heads to be answered by the teachers. After one month, the completed questionnaires were retrieved, consolidated, and subjected to statistical treatment using Pearson’s r . The data were collated and analyzed accordingly.

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 School Principal, and teachers were done. Participation was strictly voluntary. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained throughout the study. Results were used solely for research and educational improvement purposes.

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

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

The Simple Percentage and weighted mean was employed to determine the School Head's Adversity Quotient & Leadership Styles in relation to Teachers performance.

Pearson r Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the significant relationship between School Head's Adversity Quotient & Leadership Styles in relation to teachers performance.

III. Results and Discussion

Table 1
Extent of Adversity Quotient of School Head

Transformational Leadership	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. I believe I can influence outcomes even in difficult situations.	4.05	Agree
2. I stay calm and focused when facing adversity.	3.96	Agree
3. I take proactive steps to manage challenges.	3.95	Agree
4. I feel in control of my decisions despite obstacles.	4.10	Agree
5. I remain confident in my ability to handle setbacks.	3.70	Agree
Mean	3.95	Agree
Ownership		
1. I take responsibility for solving problems in my school.	4.35	Strongly Agree
2. I hold myself accountable for the outcomes of my actions.	4.44	Strongly Agree
3. I actively seek solutions rather than blaming others.	4.55	Strongly Agree
4. I admit mistakes and learn from them.	4.58	Strongly Agree
5. I encourage a culture of accountability among staff.	4.46	Strongly Agree
Mean	4.48	Strongly Agree

C. Reach		
1. Challenges in one area of my work rarely affect other areas negatively.	4.10	Agree
2. I contain problems so they do not escalate or spread.	4.45	Strongly Agree
3. I manage the impact of difficulties on my team effectively.	4.65	Strongly Agree
4. I limit the negative effects of setbacks to manageable levels.	4.60	Strongly Agree
5. I maintain a positive outlook even when issues arise in multiple areas.	4.44	Strongly Agree
Mean	4.45	Strongly Agree
D. Endurance		
1. I persist through challenges without giving up.	4.10	Agree
2. I maintain my energy and motivation despite ongoing difficulties.	4.05	
3. I recover quickly from setbacks.	4.00	Agree
4. I am able to sustain effort and focus over long periods of stress.	3.95	Agree
5. I stay optimistic about the future even when facing adversity.	3.98	Agree
Mean	4.02	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.23	Strongly Agree

Legend: 4.21- 5.00 – Strongly Agree
 3.41- 4.20 – Agree
 2.61-3.40 - Undecided
 1.81- 2.60- Disagree
 1.00-1.80- Strongly Disagree

This table presents the Extent of Adversity Quotient of School Head, which examines the self-reported perceptions of school heads regarding their ability to face, manage, and overcome adversity in relation to their leadership roles. The table is categorized into four key dimensions of Adversity Quotient (AQ): Transformational Leadership, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance. Each dimension is assessed through specific indicators, with corresponding weighted means and interpretations, using a 5-point Likert scale.

The results under the Transformational Leadership dimension revealed that school heads generally agreed with statements related to resilience, proactive problem-solving, and decision-making under pressure, resulting in a mean of 3.95. In the Ownership category, all items scored exceptionally high, with school heads strongly agreeing that they take full responsibility, promote accountability, and actively seek solutions, leading to a mean of 4.48. This indicates that school leaders perceive themselves as highly accountable and proactive in addressing school issues.

Under the Reach dimension, which measures the ability to contain challenges and limit their negative effects, school heads mostly strongly agreed, with a mean of 4.45. This suggests that they are capable of preventing isolated problems from affecting broader areas of school operation. The Endurance dimension, which reflects persistence and optimism in prolonged adversity, received a mean of 4.02, showing that school heads agreed on their capacity to stay motivated and resilient despite stress and setbacks.

The implications of these results are notable. With a grand weighted mean of 4.23, the data indicate that school heads overall strongly agree that they possess a high level of Adversity

Quotient. The result implies that they are not only equipped to handle difficult situations but also influence outcomes positively, maintain team stability, and promote a culture of resilience and accountability within their schools. The highest scores in Ownership and Reach emphasize the leaders' strong sense of responsibility and strategic ability to isolate and resolve issues effectively.

Table 2
Extent of Leadership Styles

A.	Transformational Leadership	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	The school head inspires teachers to commit to shared educational goals.	3.50	Very High
2	Encourages innovation and creativity in teaching practices.	3.56	Very High
3	Leads by example in maintaining professional integrity and enthusiasm.	3.53	Very High
4	Fosters a collaborative school culture.	3.70	Very High
5	Recognizes and celebrates the achievements of teachers and students.	3.60	Very High
6	Supports teachers in their professional growth and development.	3.60	Very High
7	Encourages open communication and feedback from staff.	3.55	Very High
	Mean	3.58	Very High
B	Transactional Leadership		
1	Clearly communicates expectations and responsibilities to teachers.	3.75	Very High
2	Uses rewards and recognition based on teacher performance.	3.65	Very High
3	Monitors teacher performance based on set goals.	3.62	Very High
4	Provides corrective feedback when performance standards are not met.	3.76	Very High
5	Uses data to inform instructional decisions and strategies.	3.48	Very High
6	Holds staff accountable for following school policies.	3.56	Very High
7	Implements structured supervision plans and schedules.	3.53	High
	Mean	3.62	Very High
C	LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP		
1	Allows staff to make decisions without much guidance.	3.50	Very High
2	Rarely intervenes in instructional issues unless necessary.	3.60	Very High
3	Gives staff freedom in managing their classrooms and teaching styles.	3.70	Very High
4	Often delegates leadership responsibilities to staff.	3.60	Very High
5	Avoids micromanaging instructional activities.	3.45	Very High
6	Rarely enforces consequences for underperformance.	3.48	Very High
	Mean	3.51	Very High
	Weighted Mean	3.59	Very High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High
 2.51-3.25 – High
 1.76- 2.50- Low
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the Extent of Leadership Styles, which evaluates the leadership behaviors demonstrated by school heads across three key dimensions: Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership. Each leadership style is assessed through specific indicators, with corresponding weighted means and qualitative interpretations. The results reflect the perceptions of teachers regarding how frequently these leadership behaviors are practiced in their respective schools.

In the area of Transformational Leadership, school heads were rated as exhibiting “Very High” levels across all indicators. The highest-rated item was fostering a collaborative school culture (3.70), followed by strong support for teacher development and celebrating achievements. This suggests that school leaders are consistently motivating their teams, modeling ethical behavior, promoting shared goals, and encouraging innovation among their staff. The mean score of 3.58 for this dimension confirms the strength of transformational practices among school leaders.

The Transactional Leadership style also received a “Very High” rating overall, with a mean of 3.62. School heads were particularly noted for clearly communicating expectations (3.75) and providing corrective feedback (3.76). These results indicate that leaders are effectively implementing structured systems of accountability, using performance-based rewards, and data-driven decision-making to manage instructional performance. One item—implementing structured supervision plans—was rated slightly lower at 3.53 but still fell within the “Very High” range.

Interestingly, Laissez-Faire Leadership, often viewed as a less directive style, was also rated “Very High” with a mean of 3.51. School heads were recognized for allowing autonomy in classroom management, encouraging decentralized decision-making, and avoiding micromanagement. The highest score in this category was for giving staff freedom in teaching approaches (3.70), showing that teachers feel trusted to make professional decisions independently.

The implications of these findings are significant. With an overall weighted mean of 3.59, all three leadership styles were rated at a “Very High” level by respondents. The result implies that school heads are utilizing a balanced mix of leadership styles—transformational to inspire and empower, transactional to manage and evaluate, and laissez-faire to allow professional autonomy. This multifaceted approach may contribute to a more adaptive and supportive school environment that promotes both accountability and innovation.

Table 3
Performance Rating of the Teachers

A.	Performance Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.49	Outstanding
2	Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	4.52	Outstanding
3	Curriculum and Planning, Reporting and Assessment	4.58	Outstanding
4	Community Linkages & Professional Engagement	4.42	Outstanding
5	Professional Growth and Development	4.55	Outstanding
	AVERAGE	4.51	Outstanding

Legend: 4.21- 5.00 – Outstanding
 3.41- 4.20 – Very Satisfactory
 2.61-3.40 - Satisfactory
 1.81- 2.60- Fairly Satisfactory
 1.00-1.80- Needs Improvement

This table presents the Performance Rating of the Teachers, which shows the overall assessment of teacher performance across five key performance indicators. These indicators are aligned with the Department of Education’s standards for quality instruction and professional practice. Each area was evaluated based on weighted means and corresponding qualitative interpretations, using the performance categories ranging from “Needs Improvement” to “Outstanding.”

In the dimension of Curriculum and Planning, Reporting and Assessment, teachers received the highest weighted mean of 4.58, indicating exceptional skills in planning instruction, assessing student learning, and aligning teaching with the curriculum. This is followed by Professional Growth and Development (4.55), which highlights teachers’ consistent efforts in improving their professional practice through continuous learning. The indicator Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners scored 4.52, showing teachers’ strong capability in fostering inclusive and supportive learning spaces.

The indicator Content Knowledge and Pedagogy was rated at 4.49, reflecting teachers’ deep understanding of subject matter and effective teaching methods. Lastly, Community Linkages and Professional Engagement scored slightly lower at 4.42, yet still within the “Outstanding” range, suggesting teachers are actively involved in collaborative partnerships with stakeholders and contribute positively to their communities and professional networks.

The implications of these findings are highly positive. All five indicators received ratings within the “Outstanding” category, and the overall average rating of 4.51 confirms the high level of teacher performance in key areas of teaching and professional practice. The result implies that teachers are well-equipped with the necessary competencies to deliver quality instruction, support diverse learners, maintain strong professional relationships, and pursue continuous development. This level of performance is likely to contribute significantly to improved student learning outcomes and a thriving school culture.

Table 3
Test of Relationship

Variables Correlated	r	Computed value or t	Table Value @.05	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Adversity Quotient and Teaching Performance	0.86	3.697	0.928	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Very Strong)
Leadership Style and IPCRF of Teachers	0.88	3.958	0.928	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Very Strong)

This table presents the Test of Relationship, which examines the correlation between (1) the Adversity Quotient of school heads and the teaching performance of teachers, and (2) the leadership styles of school heads and the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings of teachers. The table includes the correlation coefficient (r), computed t -values, critical table value at the 0.05 level of significance, the decision on the null hypothesis (H_0), and the interpretation of the statistical relationship.

In the first relationship tested—Adversity Quotient and Teaching Performance—the computed correlation coefficient was 0.86, with a t -value of 3.697, significantly exceeding the critical table value of 0.928. This led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating a very strong and statistically significant relationship. This suggests that school heads with higher adversity quotient scores—those more resilient and capable in facing challenges—are associated with teachers demonstrating higher teaching performance.

Similarly, the second relationship—Leadership Style and IPCRF of Teachers—produced an even higher correlation coefficient of 0.88, with a computed t -value of 3.958, also surpassing the same critical value. This again led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, affirming a very strong and significant relationship. This implies that effective leadership styles—whether transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire—are positively associated with higher teacher performance ratings as reflected in their IPCRF results.

The implications of these results are substantial. Both variables—Adversity Quotient and Leadership Style—were found to have very strong positive relationships with teacher performance. The average correlation coefficient is 0.87, which strongly implies that the better the school head’s resilience and leadership approach, the higher the level of teacher effectiveness. These findings underscore the importance of leadership quality and personal adaptability in shaping school-level performance and instructional success.

IV. Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, the Test of Relationship, which examines the correlation between the Adversity Quotient of school heads and the teaching performance of teachers, and the leadership styles of school heads and the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings of teachers, revealed very strong and statistically significant relationships. The analysis led to the rejection of the null hypotheses in both cases, indicating that school heads who exhibit higher levels of resilience and apply effective leadership styles are strongly associated with improved teaching performance and higher IPCRF ratings. These findings imply that enhancing the personal adaptability and leadership competencies of school leaders directly contributes to the professional growth of teachers and, by extension, the overall success of school operations. Strengthening these areas among school heads is therefore essential in fostering a culture of excellence in teaching and learning within the context of the MATATAG Curriculum.

V. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed from the School Head's Adversity Quotient & Leadership Styles in relation to Teachers performance among the ff:

The Teacher should actively participate in professional development programs that align with their school head's leadership direction, and maintain open communication with their leaders to ensure alignment with the MATATAG Curriculum goals. They should also remain responsive to feedback and model resilience and adaptability in the classroom.

The School Head should continuously enhance their Adversity Quotient and leadership skills through targeted training, mentoring, and reflective practices. By fostering a positive school climate, they can support teachers in achieving higher performance.

The Public Schools District Supervisor should provide technical assistance and capacity-building initiatives focusing on strengthening school leaders' leadership styles and resilience. Support should also include systematic monitoring and evaluation of leadership practices that influence teacher performance and student achievement.

The Parents should collaborate with teachers and school leaders by supporting learning initiatives at home and maintaining open lines of communication with the school to promote consistency in learners' academic progress and behavior.

The Researcher should disseminate the findings to relevant educational stakeholders and develop intervention programs based on the study's insights to support leadership enhancement and teacher effectiveness in MATATAG-aligned instruction.

The Future Researchers should explore related variables such as emotional intelligence, instructional supervision, or teacher well-being as these may further explain the dynamics between school leadership and teacher performance. Longitudinal or qualitative studies may also provide deeper insights into sustained impacts over time.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to God Almighty for the strength, wisdom, and perseverance to complete this thesis. Without His guidance, this endeavor would not have been possible.

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. Bryant C. Acar, Chairman of the panel, for his invaluable insights and guidance, which significantly contributed to the improvement of this study.

I am deeply and sincerely grateful to my research adviser Dr. Elvin H. Wenceslao for his patience, honest feedback, and encouragement. His guidance did not just refine my research, but also sharpened my perspective. His mentorship helped turn uncertainty into understanding, and hesitation into confidence.

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to the rest of the thesis committee Dr. Jasmine B. Misa and Dr. Annabelle A. Wenceslao for giving their assistance and recommendations toward the completion of this study.

To my dearest family, thank you for being my foundation and source of strength throughout this academic journey. Your encouragement and love gave me the courage to persevere. To my husband Aldwin S. Jumao-as, thank you for your unwavering support not just financially, but also emotionally and in countless practical ways. Your constant encouragement, quiet strength and readiness to take extra responsibilities allowed me to focus on my academic goals. You believed in me, even when I doubted myself, and your sacrifices made this accomplishment possible.

To my daughters Audrey, Madeline and Abigail —your love, patience and understanding during the times I was busy with my academic responsibilities have been my greatest source of inspiration. Your smiles and hugs reminded me why I had to keep going. I am truly blessed to have you all by my side.

To my beloved mother, thank you for your enduring sacrifices, for always believing in me. Your constant prayers have been my greatest source of strength. You are truly one of my greatest blessings.

To my amazing friends, the Power Puff Girls, thank you for being with me through every step of this journey - for the laughter, late-night conversations, shared deadlines and support both stressful and joyful celebration. Because of you, this journey was filled with not just learning, but joy and friendship too.

To the participants and respondents of this study, thank you for your time and cooperation. This research would not have realized without your valuable input.

Lastly, to myself — thank you for not giving up. This journey was never easy, but through it, you grew stronger and more determined. You didn't just survive, you became more of who you were meant to be.

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] Dela Cruz, A., & Garcia, R. (2018). Impact of directive supervisory leadership styles of school heads on the performance of teachers and students in Physical Science: Evidence from the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Educational Management*, 6(1), 45-58.
- [3] Martinez, A., & Garcia, L. (2018). The impact of supervisory leadership styles of school heads on the performance of teachers and students in Physical Science. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 45(3), 321-336.

AUTHOR'S PROFILE



SHEILA S. JUMAO-AS

The author was born on April 30, 1983, at Cebu Community Hospital in Cebu City, Philippines. She completed her Bachelor's degree in Elementary Education at the University of Cebu. Her strong passion for instructional leadership and her desire to grow professionally motivated her to continue her studies. She is currently completing her Master of Arts in Education, major in Administration and Supervision at Western Leyte College, Ormoc City.

With over 17 years of dedicated service in the teaching profession, she has taught across various grade levels, gaining invaluable experience and continuously refining her skills as an educator. Her commitment to lifelong learning is evident through her active participation in training programs, seminars, and professional development workshops. Presently, she serves as a Teacher II under the Department of Education and teaches Grade V at Matlang Central School in Matlang, Isabel, Leyte.

In addition to her teaching responsibilities, she also serves as the School Parents-Teachers Association (SPTA) Coordinator, where she fosters collaboration and engagement between the school and the community. Through her graduate studies, she has gained a deeper understanding of effective school leadership and the value of empowering teachers. She firmly believes that effective leadership starts with collaboration, support, and a shared commitment to excellence in education.