

School Heads' Adversity Quotient And Performance: Basis For Personality Development Plan

Jerlyn G. Dela Cuesta*¹ Welson B. Caliat, PhD² Gerlinda G. Corpuz, PhD³ Jovit D. Comon, PhD⁴

¹*Student, School of Graduate and Professional Studies, PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College, email: jerlyn.delacuesta002@deped.gov.ph, ORCID ID: 0009-0009-2735-9447

²Professor, School of Graduate And Professional Studies, PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College email: wbcaliat.coc@phinmaed.com, ORCID ID: 0009-0002-5426-7096

³Professor, PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College ORCID ID: 0009-0002-7623-3268 email: gcorpuz.coc@phinmaed.com

⁴PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College ORCID ID: 0009-0008-7880-2499 email: jovit.comon@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

High workloads and multiple responsibilities of school heads can lead to excessive stress and limited time for self-reflection and personal growth, hindering the cultivation of resilience. This study aimed to assess the adversity quotient (AQ) and performance of school heads in the Division of Bukidnon for the School Year 2022-2023. The findings would serve as the basis for a personality development plan. A total of one hundred eighty-six (186) school heads were purposively selected as participants. The research utilized a descriptive-correlational design and modified questionnaires based on Stoltz and Grant's work (2019). Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed for data analysis. The study revealed that the majority of the school heads were females aged 51-60 years old, holding master's degrees. They mostly held the position of Head Teacher 1 and had attended international-level trainings. Overall, the school heads displayed a strong adversity quotient, effectively managing challenging situations and demonstrating perseverance. They exhibited outstanding performance in areas such as building connections, managing school operations and resources, and focusing on teaching and learning. However, there were areas, such as leading strategically, developing self and others, and plus factors, where they achieved only satisfactory performances, indicating room for improvement. Furthermore, age, sex, highest educational attainment, position, length of experience as a school head, and relevant seminars/training attended were significantly correlated with the school heads' adversity quotient. This suggests the importance of considering these factors when evaluating their ability to handle and overcome adversity. AQ ownership and endurance were found to be significantly correlated with school heads' performance, while AQ control showed a significant correlation with plus factors, implying that the ability to handle adversity influences overall performance and the presence of positive outcomes.

Keywords: *Adversity quotient and school heads' performance*

How to cite this article: Dela Cuesta JG, Caliat WB, Corpuz GG, Comon JD. School Heads' Adversity Quotient And Performance: Basis For Personality Development Plan. *Int J Drug Deliv Technol.* 2026;16(33s):298-312. DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.33s.35

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Many school heads demonstrate a lack of comprehensive training programs that specifically address the development of adversity quotient, leaving them ill-equipped to handle the complex and demanding situations they encounter effectively. Additionally, the high workload and multiple responsibilities of school heads can lead to excessive stress and limited time for self-reflection and personal growth, hindering the cultivation of resilience. Furthermore, the scarcity of resources and support systems at the institutional level can impede the implementation of strategies aimed at enhancing the adversity quotient, making it difficult for school heads to overcome obstacles and adapt to adverse circumstances.

Adversity Quotient (AQ), a novel and intriguing term introduced by Stoltz, Tansiongco, and Ibarra (2020), describes how one handles adversity and his capacity to

overcome it. AQ appears to be the key to success for both employees and leaders. People experience a variety of hardships throughout life that can be difficult to overcome. One may, nevertheless, possess the innate ability to turn adverse circumstances around and make them positive. Adversity Quotient was described as the process of one's success in resolving a particular educational issue.

Likewise, it is an established science, theory and approach for becoming more resilient in managing school-related apprehensions. Today, schools face various issues that school heads need to cope with. The most common of which include school-teacher-student related problems. According to Spillane et al. (2021), an important aspect of effective leadership is learning how to handle challenging situations. Educational institutions frequently encounter recurring internal and external issues, and resolving such concerns largely depends on the school head's personal qualities and leadership style.

*Author for Correspondence: : jerlyn.delacuesta002@deped.gov.ph

As a school leader, the school head has more responsibility and accountability in the organization. The foundation of instructional capacity lies in the teacher's ability, the administrator who serves as the leader, to handle the smallest unit in an organization. Managing a school is analogous to driving a car. It is often up-hill alongside what at times may seem overwhelming odds. According to Smith and Johnson (2018), assuming supervisory responsibilities requires unwavering dedication. They emphasize that the pivotal role of instructional leadership in educational institutions is instrumental in guiding them toward the path of knowledge and enlightenment.

Undeniably, school heads who form the core of the school leadership team are increasingly touted as important determinants of school effectiveness. Existing research on effective schools suggests that effective school heads influence a variety of school outcomes, including student achievement, through their recruitment and motivation of quality teachers, their ability to identify and articulate school vision and goals, their effective allocation of resources, and their development of instructional structures to support instruction and learning (Horng, Kalogrides & Loeb, 2019).

The position of school heads was chosen for investigation because it has been identified as an important component of an effective school. However, in spite of the endless and untiring efforts of the school heads, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders to address the issues confronting public schools, the ability of the Philippines, as one of the signatories in the United Nations Millennium Declaration, to meet the Millennium Development Goals for 2017 in the three areas most fundamental to human life (poverty alleviation, health, and education) is very remote. Improving the quality of basic education in the Philippines has become more critical and urgent than ever. For the majority of Filipinos who suffer from the various consequences of poverty, a good education is the only hope of it.

With previous studies on adversity quotient, the school leadership styles and the growing emergence of different tools in the assessment of leadership practices regarding its importance in the workplace, especially for school heads, the researcher realized that it is critical to study these variables. Given this scenario, this study hopes to address the current issues relative to the adversity quotient of school heads and how this might influence their capacity to perform as instructional leaders. Stoltz claimed that AQ measures will strengthen the effectiveness of leaders.

With this perspective, the researcher recognized that overall performance can be enhanced by assessing an individual or organization's responses to adversity, identifying areas for improvement, and implementing targeted interventions. Therefore, the results of this assessment can serve as a valuable foundation for designing and implementing capacity enhancement

programs to strengthen resilience and improve performance in the face of adversity.

Review of Related Literature and Studies **Adversity Quotient**

Adversity is one of the most potent forces in life. It shapes one's character, clarifies priorities, and defines an individual's path. It can also be fuel to greatness. Each person faces a rich assortment of adversities every day, ranging from minor hassles to major setbacks, even tragedies. In order to achieve success, whether in business or in life, it is crucial to develop the ability to transform adversity into a tangible advantage. Adversity often emerges unexpectedly, but it is an inherent aspect of human existence, and individuals have the power to determine their response to each adversity they encounter (Dweck, 2017).

Dimensions of Adversity Quotient

The adversity quotient encompasses four dimensions that exactly measure the AQ of an individual. They are control, origin, ownership, reach, and endurance, embodied in the acronym CO₂ RE.

Control

C stands for control over an adverse event. People who respond to adversity as temporary, external, and limited have optimistic explanatory styles and tend to enjoy life's benefits. With perceived control, hope and action are turned to reality, or learned helplessness shall pass. The more control one has, the more likely one has to take positive action (Montecalvo, 2018). It also measures the ability of the person to perceive control over adverse situations. It is how one manages difficulties in life. Intelligently, the person who perceives an adverse situation will have wider perspectives on events. People who respond to adversity positively will most likely have a greater performance than those who take adverse situations a worse scenario to encounter. The more control one has, the more likely one has to take positive actions. Individuals with higher AQ scores tend to exhibit a greater sense of empowerment and agency in adverse situations, perceiving themselves as having the ability to exert control and influence. Even when faced with seemingly insurmountable challenges, they actively seek out aspects of the situation where they can make a difference. In contrast, individuals with lower AQ scores tend to adopt a more passive stance, perceiving themselves as lacking control and often succumbing to feelings of helplessness or resignation.

Ownership

The O means ownership that reflects accountability. This answers the degree of owning the outcomes of adversity, whether good or bad. High AQ people enhance their accountability to control, empower and motivate action, while low AQ people disown the problem causing failure to act, give-up, pointing fingers, reduced performance and waves of anger at others, and many more actions that are negative. Owning the

outcome reflects accountability for achieving a specific result in response to a problem. High scores tend to accept responsibility for creating a specific outcome regardless of the causes (Safi'I et al., 2021). A person with a high AQ will enhance their accountability to control the situation and motivate positive actions, while a low AQ will most likely blame others and composite negative actions. Origin is something to do with blame. Blame has two benefits to people, which help them learn from and adapt to situations causing improvement. Accountability is the backbone of action. Those with higher adversity quotient hold themselves accountable for dealing with situations regardless of their cause. Those with lower AQs deflect accountability and most often feel victimized and helpless.

Reach

R stands for reach, evaluating how far adversity gets into the areas of one's life. Low AQ response allows adversity to affect another aspect of one's life, leading to financial panic, sleeplessness, bitterness, distancing self from others, and poor decision-making. But with a high R-score, one may limit the reach of the problem to the event at hand. A misunderstanding relationship is one misunderstanding, although painful and not a sign that life is falling apart (Montecalvo, 2018). A person with high AQ will keep adversity in its place, making adverse events, difficulties, and challenges more manageable. Those people with low AQ® will affect other aspects of one's life, leading to frustration, bitterness, failure, misfortune and may lead to poor decision-making. Keeping the fallout under control and limiting the reach of adversity is essential for efficient and effective problem-solving. The person with higher AQs keeps setbacks and challenges in their place, not letting them infest the healthy areas of their work and lives. Those with lower AQs tend to catastrophize, allowing a setback in one area to bleed into other unrelated areas and become destructive.

Endurance

E means endurance responding to the time adversities last. The attribution theory of Peterson and Seligman et al. (2018) indicated a dramatic difference between people who attribute adversity to something temporary versus something more permanent or enduring. Applying this theory, people who see their ability as the cause of failure (stable cause) are less likely to continue than people who attribute failure to their effort (a temporary cause). Endurance is the perception of time over good or bad events and their consequences that will last or endure. Seeing beyond even enormous difficulties is an essential skill for maintaining hope. Those with higher AQs have the uncanny ability to see past the most interminable difficulties and maintain hope and optimism. Those with lower AQs see adversity as dragging on indefinitely, if not permanently. Stoltz formulated a formula on how to improve AQ called LEAD - Listen, Explore, Analyze, and Do Something.

School Heads' Performance

Highly equipped school heads acquire the optimum level of the necessary competencies needed for the work they are expected to do. However, competencies would vary across contexts based on legal requirements, job demands, and factors related to organizational culture. It is not yet known in any country whether the highest degree obtained is needed for the work of a school head. But because of high expectations from people, for promotion purposes, and the evolving and pivotal roles (Ferrari, 2018), school heads tend to get the highest degree before or when they are into work.

Leading Strategically

All school heads are viewed to be effective, efficient, and competent in doing their tasks because they have met the standards set in their position. Such qualities enable them to practice to the highest level their duties and responsibilities as school leaders. Their competence may vary according to their demographic characteristics and the environmental condition where they are assigned. Leading the school system is one of the major functions of the school heads. According to Casareno (2017), the tasks of educational leaders in the school system cannot be taken for granted. They have a crucial role to play in achieving educational targets. Hence, they must be well-equipped to effectively and efficiently discharge their function. They have to see to it that the curriculum is relevant in terms of implementation. Leading the educational program is the school head's basic responsibility. They must be well-equipped to accomplish this task for the pupil's development. The basic responsibilities of the school heads include: assessing the community in the context of education; determining and implementing instructional improvement. They should be effective, efficient, and competent in introducing new and innovative modes of instruction to achieve higher learning outcomes. Likewise, Doctor (2018) said that effective school heads must be able to assess a changing external environment, interpret these changes and reduce their consequences for the organization, motivate others to work toward their goals set, and cooperate with others in the achievement of new directions. The school heads have direct responsibility for the operation of the school system. Effective leadership begins with the development of a school-wide vision of commitment to high standards and the success of all students. The school head helps spell out that vision and get all others on board.

Managing School Operation and Resources

The government has allocated funds for the maintenance and operation of the school. The school administrators have to distribute it to the different allocations such as allowances for travel, library service, laboratory, light, water, medical supplies and other miscellaneous expenditures related to the operation of the school. In the study of Gabuya (2019), the school administrators performed very satisfactorily in the adoption of authority measures that maximize the use of funds. They were

performing fairly in securing financial resources and assistance from different service organizations.

Aguilar (2017) revealed that total quality management of school principals was effective. They were competent and skilled in managing their school finances. They were skilled in planning, programming, and budgeting their school funds to meet their priority needs, especially in developing their staff. In addition, Zarate (2018) assessed the task performance of public elementary school principals in the six administrative tasks: planning and organizing work problems, analysis and decision-making, utilization, and allocation of resources, promptness and accuracy of reports, leadership and personnel management and public administrative difficulties and task performance. The public elementary school administrators were grouped according to sex, educational qualification, experience, location, and designation.

In addition, in managing the school funds, the government has allocated funds for the maintenance and operation of the school. The school principals have to allocate these to the different components such as faculty development, travel, library, light, water, repairs, medical, dental supplies, etc. They have to manage the wise utilization of the school funds.

Focusing on Teaching and Learning

Focusing on teaching and learning is imperative in the educational organization to support the school system for improvement. Burton and Bucker (2017) stressed that instructional, supervisory practice involves a systematic study of the entire teaching-learning situation. This carefully utilizes a planned program that has been cooperatively derived from the situation and adapted to the needs of those involved. The instructional, supervisory practices are primarily aimed at studying and improving cooperatively all the factors which affect child growth and development. Instructional supervision is aimed at improving directly and quality of education. Bondi (2019) pointed out that focusing on teaching and learning is a general leadership function that coordinates and manages curriculum instruction in the school system. In this sense, the master teachers as the instructional leader are imperative to assist teachers in improving learning instruction. Moreover, effective instructional supervision leads teachers towards a better achievement of the school goals and objectives in academic instruction.

Developing Self and Others

Felismino (2017) posits that the function of developing self and others can be thought of in several ways. It may be thought of as leading by example. As such, it primarily involves planning, organizing, and implementing. Planning and organizing can also be thought of safely in terms of purpose as a means of unifying efforts to get things done. It is also a function of educational leaders in arranging and structuring

relationships in such a way that a unified effort is made to achieve educational goals and objectives.

In organizing and developing the teaching staff, the school heads should conduct a survey and analyze all factors and conditions requiring modification. It is the responsibility to encourage all the teaching staff to cooperate in organizing school programs or activities. The organizing of all these complex activities needs the cooperation of all concerned. Subingsubing (2020) revealed in his study on school-based management that in-service training for teachers was conducted to a large extent to improve teacher competence and innovative skills.

According to Jaffe (2018), educational leaders and managers set the tone of the operation of the school. Their leadership and management define, to a large extent, the kind of work environment the staff and the clientele will have. They play a major role in determining the atmosphere in which the school will function. Since the school is a dynamic organization, the school head must develop a leadership and management style that combines the best features of different leadership theories. In other words, they should be able to shift effortlessly from one style to another depending on the situation and the kind of people/ staff involved.

Building Connections

R.A. 9155, otherwise known as Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, Chapter 1- Section E emphasized the need for school heads to establish school and community networks and encourage the active participation of teacher organizations, non-academic personnel of public schools, and parent-teacher-community associations. Jimenez (2019) also noted that the support of the local communities, including parents, the local government units, and the local industry, is an important element in sustaining and maintaining the viability of improved learning outcomes.

According to King (2017), school heads should always involve the community members in school decision-making because these community members are usually parents of children enrolled in the school. They have an incentive to improve their children's education. Student achievement and other outcomes are expected to be improved as these local people demand closer match monitoring of school personnel, better student evaluation, a closer match between the school's needs and its policies, and more efficient use of resources.

Briggs (2019) further said that school heads often give parents and stakeholders opportunities to increase their skills where training in shared decision-making, interpersonal skills, and management skills is offered to school council members to become capable participants in the school process.

Plus Factor

The study of Bautista (2017) revealed that school heads' plus factor was demonstrated very satisfactorily in managing time and the implementation of policies, rules, and regulations of the school system. They involved

teachers in the preparation of school and class programs for scheduling of time for teachers to follow. They also performed very satisfactorily the following tasks: keep the physical plant safe, sanitary, and attractive; pay attention to repairs and replacement; provide leadership for their teachers in observing their schedule; plan for the testing program and its expansion; and submit promptly all required reports to the district, division, and central offices. There was a negligible relationship between the self-evaluation of the principal and the evaluation of the teachers on the performance of their school principals.

Saromines (2020) indicated that school heads' plus factor was shown in observing teachers' punctuality in coming to school, providing teaching load to all teachers in their subject of specialization, and monitoring teachers in their assigned scheduled time. They also set a schedule for class observation ahead of time. The reviewed materials on the management tasks of principals enriched the researcher's knowledge of how principals perform their duties. The readings provided insights into principals' management tasks so that the study's conceptualization becomes clear for the researcher. The readings further provided a basis and support for the findings of the study, especially in the discussion of the analysis.

In summary, the adversity quotient (AQ) demonstrates school heads' ability to think, manage, direct, and endure challenges and difficulties as instructional leaders. The adversity quotient significantly contributes to defining school heads' performance and leadership style in the educational system. It measures one's capacity to succeed in school challenges. It elucidates one's skills to positively address adverse circumstances within the scope of school supervisory management. The review and cited related works of literature and studies have provided the researcher with a clearer perspective on the understanding of adversity quotient, thus, helping her in the comprehensive conduct and conceptualization of the study.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

This study is anchored on the following theories: Adversity Quotient Theory by Stoltz (1997) and Trait Leadership Theory by Carlyle (1841). The adversity Quotient, defined by Stoltz (1997), is about how an individual responds to life, especially the tough ones. It measures how an individual reacts and deals with everyday hassles and big adversities that life can bring. It is also an established science, theory, and approach for becoming more measurably resilient." Adversity Quotient has four dimensions that describe the pattern of response to adversity. These are Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance (CORE). Control is the extent to which someone perceives they can influence whatever happens next. It is how much control a person perceives over the adverse event. Ownership is the likelihood of someone doing anything to improve the situation, regardless of their formal responsibilities. It is who or what the origin of the adversity is or the degree the individual owns the outcomes. Reach is the extent to which someone perceives adversity will reach into and

affect other aspects of the situation or how far it will go beyond. It is how far the outcome will affect the other areas of the person's life. Endurance is the length of time the individual perceives the adversity will last. It is how long the adversity will last and how long the causes of adversity will last.

As used in this study, a leader should be brilliant in creating a vision, strategizing for the smooth transition of the organization and inspiring his subordinates. However, these skills are useless if they are not able to go through adversities. If a leader has a low Adversity Quotient, there is a tendency to collapse of the institution where the leader belongs. On the other side, if a leader has a high Adversity Quotient, he has the power to cross over the barrier of difficulties in the work place. Also, this study can be attributed to the trait theory of leadership. The trait theory of leadership suggests that certain inborn or innate qualities and characteristics make someone a leader. These qualities might be personality factors, physical factors, intelligence factors, and so on. In essence, trait theory proposes that the leader and leaders' traits are central to an organization's success. The assumption here is that finding people with the right traits will increase organizational performance. Trait theory focuses exclusively on the leader and neglects the follower. While trait theory of leadership does not hold much weight today, there are key leadership qualities that this theory emphasizes: future-mindedness – a future-minded leader is a leader who approaches each situation with a sense of pragmatism and optimism; high emotional intelligence – successful leaders often have invested in their emotional intelligence; emotional regulation skills - the ability to keep cool; strong interpersonal skills – leaders, especially in today's workforce, are constantly working with people whether it is cross-functional communication or collaborating with team members; high cognitive agility and cognitive ability – leaders need to help navigate solving tough problems especially important in today's environment where things can pivot quicker than ever before; and strong decision-making skills – any leader can invest in building strong decision-making skills (Ganz, 2021).

The trait theory of leadership holds significance in understanding the relationship between school heads' adversity quotient and their performance. According to the trait theory, certain inherent characteristics or traits possessed by individuals can influence their leadership effectiveness. In the context of the adversity quotient, specific traits such as resilience, adaptability, and problem-solving skills are considered essential for effectively navigating challenging situations. School heads with higher adversity quotient, stemming from their inherent traits, are likely to exhibit greater resilience when faced with adversity. They can maintain composure, make informed decisions, and effectively manage crises, which positively impacts their performance.

Statement of the Problem

The study aimed to determine the level of adversity quotient and School Heads' performance in the Division

of Bukidnon, School Year 2021-2022. The results of the study would be the basis for the personality development plan.

Specifically, the paper sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of school heads' adversity quotient as rated by themselves based on:
 - 1.1 Control;
 - 1.2 Ownership;
 - 1.3 Reach; and
 - 1.4 Endurance?
2. What is the level of school heads' performance in terms of:
 - 2.1 Leading Strategically;
 - 2.2 Managing School Operation and Resources;
 - 2.3 Focusing on Teaching and Learning;
 - 2.4 Developing Self and Others;
 - 2.5 Building Connections; and
 - 2.6 Plus Factors?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the heads' adversity quotient and their performance in terms of:
 - 3.1 Leading Strategically;
 - 3.2 Managing School Operation and Resources;
 - 3.3 Focusing on Teaching and Learning;
 - 3.4 Developing Self and Others;
 - 3.5 Building Connections; and
 - 3.6 Plus Factors?
4. Based on the findings of the study, what personality development plan can be developed to improve school heads' performance?

Scope and Limitation of the Study

This study focused on the adversity quotient among school heads of the Division of Bukidnon, School Year 2021-2022. The independent variables of the study are the dimensions of adversity quotient, namely: control, ownership, reach, and endurance. Meanwhile, the dependent variable is the school heads' performance which is measured by leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, building connections, and plus factors. The moderating variable is the respondents' characteristics which include: age, sex, highest educational attainment, position, length of experience as school head, and related seminars/trainings attended on adversity quotient. The output is the personality development plan.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the method of how the research study was undertaken. The presentation centers on the research design, locale of the study, respondents of the study, sampling procedure, research instrument, data gathering procedure, and statistical treatment of data.

Research Design

The study employed the descriptive-correlational method of research. McCombes (2019) asserts that descriptive research aims to accurately and

systematically describe a population, situation, or phenomenon. Therefore, a descriptive research design is appropriate for this study in describing the school heads' profiles and identifying the level of school heads' adversity quotient and performance. In addition, Bhandari (2021) describes correlation as the degree of relation between two variables that the researcher does not manipulate. In this study, the researcher described the characteristics of the respondents, the level of adversity quotient, and the level of performance. Then, the significant relationship between the school heads' adversity quotient and performance was considered.

Research Setting

The study was conducted in Southern Bukidnon District, Division of Bukidnon. Bukidnon is generally an extensive plateau, but the southern and eastern boundaries are mountainous. Lofty and densely forested mountains cover the whole eastern and southern border adjoining the province. About 49% of the land resource of the province is of rugged hills and mountains and 33% of undulating to rolling terrain. The rest of the province comprises nearly level terraces, alluvial lowlands, canyons, and gorges.

Bukidnon has an agricultural economy. It is a major producer of rice, maize, sugar, coffee, rubber, pineapple, banana, tomato, flowers, cassava, and other fruits and vegetables. It is also a major producer of poultry, hogs, goats, and cattle. Almost all large firms operating in the province are into the production or processing of these agricultural products. Dairy products from water buffalos are being produced at the Philippine Carabao Center in Central Mindanao University (www.bukidnon.gov.ph, 2019)

The Southern Bukidnon District is one of the two main districts under the Division of Bukidnon. The southern part of Bukidnon with its ten (10) municipalities consists of the following school districts: Damulog with South and North Districts, Danggagan District, Don Carlos, which composes of Districts I, II, and III; Kadingilan with Districts I and II; Kalilangan with East and West Districts; Kibawe West District; Kitaotao with Districts I, II, and III; Maramag with Districts I, II, and III; Pangantucan with Districts West, South, and North; and Quezon with Districts I, II, and III. In sum, ten municipalities, twenty-four (24) districts, and thirty-five (35) high schools are in the Southern Bukidnon District of the Division of Bukidnon.

Respondents and Sampling Procedure

The respondents of the study were the school heads of the Southern Districts of the Division of Bukidnon, SY 2021-2022. The school heads were tasked to assess their adversity quotient and provide ratings for their performance. Purposive sampling was employed in selecting the school heads, which is more commonly used when the number of cases being investigated is relatively small (Etikan et al., 2018). The researcher used purposive sampling because she wanted to access a

particular subset of people, as all participants of a survey are selected because they fit a particular profile.

Research Instruments

The instrument for this study consists of three (3) parts. The first part is a questionnaire consisting of school heads' characteristics in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, position, length of experience as school head/teachers, and related seminars/trainings attended. The second part is the school heads' adversity quotient patterned and modified from the work of Stoltz and Grant (2019) entitled, *Adversity Quotient at Work: Make Everyday Challenges the Key to Your Success- At Work and in Life*. This questionnaire consists of four-factor variables: control, ownership, reach, and endurance. The items included in this questionnaire are the first six items and have been supplemented with four additional statements to create ten items. These items are designed to assess different aspects related to control, ownership, reach, and endurance, providing a comprehensive understanding of the variables under investigation. The third part is on school heads' performance which covers the following indicators: leading strategically, managing school operation and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, building connections, and plus factors.

Statistical Treatment of Data

As the study is quantitative in approach, the following statistical techniques were used to answer the problems of the study.

Descriptive statistics analysis, such as frequency and percentage, were utilized in describing the respondents' characteristics. In quantifying school heads' adversity quotient and performance, the weighted scores and mean values were used as the measure of the central tendency of the responses, while the standard deviation was employed as the measure of variations.

To determine the significant difference in the school heads' adversity quotient when grouped according to their characteristics, t-test and F-test were used. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was utilized to determine the significant relationship between the school heads' adversity quotient and performance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Problem 1: What is the level of school heads' adversity quotient as rated by them based on Control, Ownership, reach and endurance?

In the realm of education, school heads play a pivotal role in shaping the learning environment and fostering growth among students and educators alike. Amidst the ever-evolving landscape of challenges faced by educational institutions, the importance of adversity quotient (AQ) among school heads cannot be overstated. AQ, a measure of an individual's ability to navigate and thrive in the face of adversity, encompasses resilience, adaptability, and problem-solving skills. As leaders, school heads equipped with a high AQ can effectively address complex issues, make informed decisions during turbulent times, inspire their teams, and create a resilient school community that can not only withstand challenges but also transform them into opportunities for growth and progress.

Table 1
Summary of School Heads' Adversity Quotient as Rated by Them

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Control	1.86	0.647	Sometimes
Ownership	1.66	0.637	Never
Reach	1.70	0.721	Never
Endurance	1.82	0.636	Sometimes
Overall	1.76	0.660	SOMETIMES

Legend: 3.26 - 4.00 = At all times/Very Low 2.51 - 3.25 = Most of the Time/Low;
1.76 - 2.50 = Sometimes/High 1.00 - 1.75 = Never/Very High

Table 1 presents the summary of the school heads' adversity quotient. Overall, results show that the school head obtained an overall mean of 1.76 (SD=0.660), described as **Sometimes** and interpreted as **High**. This implies that on occasions, school heads encountered hardships such as budget constraints and financial pressures; maintaining high academic standards and student performance; addressing student behavior and discipline issues; managing relationships with parents and community members; adapting to changes in educational policies, regulations, and standards; navigating complex legal and ethical issues; balancing competing demands and priorities, such as meeting the needs of students, teachers, and parents, while also addressing administrative and operational issues, etc.

However, school heads have a strong ability to deal with difficult situations and remain resilient in the face of adversity. They are equipped to handle crises, such as natural disasters or emergencies, and effectively manage the school during times of uncertainty and change. Additionally, they may be better able to lead and motivate staff and students during challenging times and inspire a culture of resilience and perseverance. Gao and Greenberg (2018) emphasized that school leaders with higher adversity quotient were better able to manage change, develop a vision and mission for their schools, and build strong relationships with staff and students.

The indicator, **Control**, obtained the highest overall mean rating of 1.86 (SD=0.647), described as **Sometimes** and interpreted as **High**. This suggests that school heads have a mixed ability to control their

emotions and reactions during challenging situations. Adversity quotient in terms of control refers to school heads' ability to manage their emotions and reactions in response to adversity. When a school head experiences adversity quotient in terms of control, it implies that at times, they remain calm, focused, and on some occasions, they become agitated, unfocused, and irrational in response to adversity.

On the other hand, the indicator, **Ownership**, got the lowest overall mean rating of 1.66 (SD=0.637), described as **Never** and interpreted as **Very High**. This implies that school heads most likely never experience challenging situations where their sense of ownership is being tested. Therefore, school heads are able to take ownership of difficult situations, navigate challenges effectively, and remain resilient in the face of adversity. In the context of school leadership, having a high adversity quotient in terms of ownership is an important quality because it enables school heads to take responsibility for the success and well-being of their school community. When faced with setbacks, obstacles, or crises, school heads with a high adversity quotient are likelier to remain calm, focused, and solution-oriented and inspire their staff and students to do the same. Dulay and Esperat (2019) observed that school heads with higher adversity quotient scores tended to exhibit more focus on inspiring and motivating

followers, promoting innovation and change, and fostering a sense of shared purpose and vision.

Problem 2: What is the level of school heads' performance in terms of Leading Strategically, Managing School Operation and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, Building Connections, and Plus Factors?

School heads play a critical role in ensuring the success of schools and the academic achievement of their students. Their performance is essential in creating a positive school culture, fostering a supportive learning environment, and providing effective leadership for their staff. Therefore, researching the performance of school heads is crucial in understanding their impact on the success of schools and the academic achievement of their students. A research study focused on the performance of school heads can provide valuable insights into their leadership styles, decision-making processes, and management strategies. This can help identify areas for improvement and inform the development of effective leadership training programs. Overall, a research study on the performance of school heads can lead to the development of better educational policies and practices that can benefit schools and students.

Table 2
Distribution of School Heads' Performance

Indicators	Mean Rating	SD	Description
Leading Strategically	4.489	0.339	Very Satisfactory
Managing School Operation and Resources	4.557	0.286	Outstanding
Focusing on Teaching and Learning	4.506	0.333	Outstanding
Developing Self and Others	4.444	0.387	Very Satisfactory
Building Connections	4.733	0.303	Outstanding
Plus Factors	4.304	0.927	Very Satisfactory
Overall	4.505	0.421	OUTSTANDING

Legend: 4.500 – 5.000 = Outstanding 3.500 – 4.499 = Very Satisfactory
 2.500 – 3.499 = Satisfactory 1.500 – 2.499 = Unsatisfactory
 1.000 – 1.499 = Poor

Table 2 shows the distribution of school heads' performance. Overall, results show that the school heads' have an **Outstanding** performance, as indicated by the overall mean rating of 4.505 (SD=0.421). This implies that school heads can effectively manage their schools, promote a positive school culture, and achieve high levels of academic and non-academic success for the learners. Specifically, it can be observed that school heads can improve student academic achievement and maintain high levels of academic standards. Similarly, school heads manage their schools' administrative and financial aspects efficiently and effectively. This includes managing resources, implementing policies and procedures, and maintaining a safe and secure school environment. Salaver's (2019) finding emphasized that effective school leadership practices were positively associated with higher levels of academic achievement

and student attendance rates. Specifically, school heads who focused on improving instruction shared leadership responsibilities, inspired and motivated their staff, and promoted professional development opportunities were more likely to have schools with better academic and non-academic outcomes.

The indicator, **Building Connections**, obtained the highest overall mean rating of 4.7333 (SD=0.303), described as **Outstanding**. This implies that school heads are skilled at establishing and maintaining positive relationships with various stakeholders, including teachers, students, parents, and community members. Building connections involves effective communication, active listening, empathy, and the ability to collaborate and work cooperatively with others. School heads who excel in building connections can create a sense of community within the school, foster

a positive learning environment, and promote a culture of trust, respect, and inclusivity. As observed, school heads take the time to build relationships with all stakeholders, including teachers, students, parents, and community members. They make an effort to understand each person's unique perspective, needs, and concerns. School heads understand the importance of collaboration and encourage teachers, students, parents, and community members to work together to achieve common goals. They create opportunities for collaboration, such as parent-teacher conferences, student-led conferences, and community outreach events. Balmeo and Vilchez (2018) indicated that school heads who were able to build connections with other school leaders had higher levels of job satisfaction and were more likely to stay in their positions for longer periods of time.

Meanwhile, the indicator, **Plus Factor**, got the lowest overall mean rating of 4.304 (SD=0.927), described as **Very Satisfactory**. This generally implies that school heads have met or exceeded the expectations and standards set by the Department of Education. The plus factors refer to additional desirable qualities or characteristics in a school head, such as strong leadership skills, effective communication, excellent management of resources, innovative approaches to teaching and learning, and a commitment to continuous

improvement. When school heads demonstrate very satisfactory plus factors, it usually indicates that they have successfully fulfilled their responsibilities and duties as a leader in their school. This includes ensuring the quality of education, managing the school's resources, promoting a positive and safe learning environment, and fostering strong relationships with the community. Salazar and Helario (2018) confirm that plus factors, which include personal qualities, skills, and attitudes such as being resourceful, innovative, and proactive, are significant predictors of the performance of school heads.

Problem 3: Is there a significant relationship between the school heads' adversity quotient and their performance in terms of Leading Strategically, Managing School Operation and Resources, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, Building Connections, and Plus Factors? Testing the relationship between school head-respondent's levels of adversity quotient and performance is crucial in understanding how resilience and coping skills impact their effectiveness as leaders. By testing the relationship between school heads' levels of adversity quotient and their performance, researchers can identify whether resilience and coping skills are associated with better leadership outcomes.

Table 3
Result of the Test on Relationship between School Heads' Adversity Quotient and Performance

Respondents' Adversity Quotient Indicators	Level of Performance Indicators						OVERALL <i>r-value</i> <i>p-value</i>
	Leading Strategically <i>r-value</i> <i>p-value</i>	Managing School Operation and Resources <i>r-value</i> <i>p-value</i>	Focusing on Teaching and Learning <i>r-value</i> <i>p-value</i>	Developing Self and Others <i>r-value</i> <i>p-value</i>	Building Connections <i>r-value</i> <i>p-value</i>	Plus Factors <i>r-value</i> <i>p-value</i>	
Control	0.122 (WPR)	0.098 (NLR)	0.087 (NLR)	0.001 (NLR)	0.011 (NLR)	0.211 (WPR)	0.051 (NLR)
	0.096 NS	0.183 NS	0.239 NS	0.999 NS	0.882 NS	0.004* S	0.491 NS
Ownership	0.006 (NLR)	0.087 (NLR)	0.143 (WPR)	0.204 (WPR)	0.048 (NLR)	0.135 (WPR)	0.186 (WPR)
	0.932 NS	0.239 NS	0.051 NS	0.005* S	0.517 NS	0.067 NS	0.011* S
Reach	0.104 (WPR)	0.068 (NLR)	0.045 (NLR)	0.137 (WPR)	0.046 (NLR)	0.083 (NLR)	0.055 (NLR)
	0.156 NS	0.356 NS	0.543 NS	0.062 NS	0.534 NS	0.258 NS	0.454 NS
Endurance	0.057 (NLR)	0.011 (NLR)	0.034 (NLR)	0.132 (WPR)	0.041 (NLR)	0.256 (WPR)	0.211 (WPR)
	0.440 NS	0.878 NS	0.641 NS	0.074 NS	0.578 NS	0.001* S	0.004* S

Legend: *significant at $p < 0.05$ alpha level S – significant NS – not significant

Table 3 shows the relationship between school heads adversity quotient and level of performance. Overall, the school head-respondents' level of adversity quotient based on ownership and endurance showed a weak but significant relationship between their level of performance as indicated by the correlation r-value and probability value less than 0.05 alpha level, which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This implies that school heads who exhibit higher levels of AQ in ownership and endurance tend to perform better in their roles compared to those with lower levels of AQ.

In other words, school heads who take responsibility for their actions and persist in the face of challenges and setbacks tend to perform better in their job roles. This could have implications for school leaders' selection, training, and development. Yusof and Shahrill (2017) revealed similar findings when they concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between adversity quotient and job performance among the participants. Specifically, the study found that the sub-factors of the adversity quotient, including ownership and endurance, were positively related to job performance.

On the other hand, the school head-respondents' level of adversity quotient based on control showed a weak but significant relationship on their level of performance based on plus factors as indicated by the correlation r-value and probability value less than 0.05 alpha level, which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. AQ is a predictor of successful leadership and improved student outcomes. One aspect of AQ is the concept of AQ control, which refers to an individual's ability to control their responses to adverse situations. In terms of plus factors, these are often used to describe the skills, knowledge, and characteristics that contribute to effective school leadership. Plus factors can include things like communication skills, emotional intelligence, strategic thinking, and adaptability.

Therefore, it is possible that there could be a positive correlation between the two. For example, a school leader with high AQ control may be better equipped to navigate challenging situations and make strategic

decisions, which could contribute to their effectiveness as a leader in terms of plus factor such as personal traits. A study conducted by Ibrahim et al. (2021) examined the relationship between AQ control and school heads' plus factor which showed that there was a positive and significant relationship between AQ control and school heads' plus factors, suggesting that school heads with higher AQ control scores reported to have better plus factors.

However, reach did not yield significant relationship with school heads' performance. The lack of a significant relationship between AQ (Adversity Quotient) reach and school heads' performance can be attributed to several factors. First, AQ reach measures an individual's ability to navigate and thrive in adverse circumstances, which may not directly correlate with the specific demands and responsibilities of a school head. While resilience and adaptability are valuable traits, other factors such as leadership skills, educational expertise, and management abilities may have a more direct impact on a school head's performance. Additionally, the assessment of AQ reach may not capture the nuanced complexities and challenges faced by school heads in their day-to-day operations, making it less relevant in evaluating their overall performance. It is important to consider a comprehensive range of factors and metrics when assessing the effectiveness and success of school heads. According to the findings of De Leon and De Vera's (2021) study, the research failed to establish a significant contribution of adversity quotient to defining school heads' performance and their leadership style within the educational system. The study did not find a strong relationship between school heads' adversity quotient control and their effectiveness in areas such as instructional leadership and maintaining quality standards for the basic education program. This suggests that factors other than adversity quotient may play a more prominent role in determining the performance and leadership effectiveness of school heads.

Problem 4: Based from the findings of the study, what personality development plan can be developed to improve school heads' performance?

Key Result Area/s	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
	Activities	Persons Involved	Time line	Budget	Activities	Persons Involved	Time line	Budget	Activity	Persons Involved	Time line	Budget
Ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taking responsibility for decision-making and problem-solving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Heads Leadership Team Staff Members 	Year-round	19,500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encouraging accountability and fostering a culture of ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Heads Leadership Team Staff Members 	Year-round	19,500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fostering a culture of ownership and accountability among staff members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Heads Leadership Team Staff Members 	Year-round	19,500

Plus Factor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying strengths and areas of improvement 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultivating strengths and working on areas of improvement 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leveling strength for personal and professional growth 			
-------------	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

School heads are more resilient, adaptable, and able to persevere through difficult circumstances. This can be an important attribute for school heads, as they often face a variety of challenges in their roles, such as managing resources, dealing with conflicts, and responding to unexpected situations.

School heads appear competent and effective in managing the school's day-to-day operations, creating strong relationships with stakeholders, and ensuring quality teaching and learning. However, they may need to improve their skills and abilities in strategic leadership, self-development, and developing others to achieve even greater success.

School heads with high levels of ownership and endurance are better equipped to handle challenging situations and overcome obstacles, which can lead to improved performance. Similarly, AQ control is associated with plus factors, such as effective decision-making and problem-solving skills.

Recommendations

On the basis of the results of the study, the following are recommended:

1. Schools Division Superintendent should develop and implement training programs for school heads that focus on developing and enhancing their adversity quotient, specifically in the area of ownership.
2. School Heads may establish clear communication channels within the school, including regular staff meetings, newsletters, and email updates. This can help ensure that all staff members are informed and on the same page.
3. School Heads may prioritize building strong relationships with their staff, students, and parents to improve their plus factors. They shall make an effort to listen to and address concerns, recognize achievements, and create a sense of community within the school.
4. Public Schools District Supervisor may conduct a follow-up assessment of the school heads' adversity quotient after the completion of the seminar or training. This will help determine the effectiveness of the seminar or training and identify areas for further improvement since seminars/trainings related to adversity quotient obtained the lowest F-value among the significant characteristics.

5. The Department of Education may provide targeted training and support to school heads to address their specific areas of weakness, specifically on ownership, as this had the lowest correlation coefficient. This may include coaching, mentoring, or additional training opportunities.

6. Future researchers may conduct further studies on the relationship between adversity quotient and school leadership effectiveness and explore the impact of different types of training and support programs on school heads' adversity quotient.

REFERENCES

1. Adenuga, R. A. (2018). Principals' variables as determinants of administrative effectiveness and efficiency. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science*, 5(8), 799-802. <https://medwelljournals.com/abstract/?doi=pjssci.2008.799.802>
2. Aguilar, E. (2017). Total quality management (TQM) of school principals in the Division of Bulacan, Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 4(4), 71-77.
3. Ali, N. A. (2017). The Impact of Principals' Professional Development Programs on their Leadership Practices. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 7(2), 72-82.
4. Ali, S., Iqbal, M., & Ahmad, M. (2019). Exploration of decision-making styles exercised by heads of secondary schools in Punjab: An empirical study. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 6(1), 1-16.
5. Anderson, M. L., & Lu, F. (2017). Research: How leadership experience affects students. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2017/02/research-how-leadership-experience-affects-students>
6. Archbald, D. A., Porter, A. C., & Sheckley, B. G. (2019). Leadership age and principal effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 25(3), 27-47.
7. Arop, F. O. (2018). Principals' rank and their implementation of instruction in public high schools in South Sudan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(2), 95-100.
8. Balmeo, M. O., & Vilchez, M. R. J. (2018). The Role of School Head in Establishing Networks of School Leaders in Public Elementary Schools in the Philippines. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 4(2), 131-140.
9. Bantolo, K.H.J., & Arenga, J.B. (2021). School heads competencies and school performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Explorer*, 1(8), 17-29. DOI:10.13140/RG.2.2.36582.50241
10. Bautista, C. G. (2017). School heads' plus factors and their influence on school effectiveness. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 5(2), 27-33.
11. Bhandari, S. (2021). Correlation. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., Vol. 4, pp. 687-691). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.64071-3>
12. Bondi, J. C. (2019). *Leading for learning: Improving teaching and learning in schools*. Rowman & Littlefield.
13. Borden, V. M. (2021). The role of principal longevity and tenure in teachers' perceptions of school leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(3), 424-444. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220963846>
14. Briggs, A. R. (2019). The principal's role in promoting effective school councils. *School Community Journal*, 29(2), 119-132.
15. Burton, S. J., & Bucker, J. (2017). Instructional supervisory practice. In *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory* (pp. 1-5). Springer.
16. Canivel, A. (2019). Principals' adversity quotient: Styles, performance and practices. *Global Research and Innovation Conference Proceedings*, 1-14.
17. Casareno, J. H. (2017). Issues and Challenges of Educational Leadership. In B. S. Sodipe (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Leadership for Equity and Diversity* (pp. 1-18). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-8583-6.ch001>
18. Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI). (2017). *Assessment for Learning: The Case for Formative Assessment*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264007413-en>
19. Chen, C., & Huang, X. (2018). The influence of school leaders' strategic human resource management practices on teacher retention. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(3), 321-338.
20. Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2019). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 111(1), 180-213
21. Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8, 1-44.
22. Davis, A., & Kleiner, B. H. (2018). Meeting effectiveness 101: The complete guide to preventing wasted time and getting results. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 24(2), 38-41. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HRMID-11-2015-0168>
23. De Leon, R. L., & De Vera, M. C. (2021). Educational Leader's Adversity Quotient, Management Style and Job Performance: Implications to School Leadership. *International Research Journal of Education (IRJE)*, 9(2), 1-10.
24. Department of Education. (2007). DepEd Order No. 38, s. 2007: Revised Qualification Standards for Public School Heads. Retrieved from https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/DO_s2007_38.pdf
25. DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2020). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 627-647.
26. Doctor, J. (2018). New school leaders must have skills to succeed in a changing education landscape. *Education Week*, 35(28), 12-13.
27. Domina, T. (2020). Leveling the home advantage: Assessing the effectiveness of parental involvement in elementary school. *Journal of*

- Sociology of Education*, 78, 233-249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003804070507800303>
28. Dulay, K. M., & Esperat, C. C. (2019). Adversity Quotient and Leadership Styles of Public School Heads in Region VII, Philippines. *Journal of Educational Research and Studies*, 2(2), 57-64.
 29. Dweck, C. S. (2017). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.
 30. Emerald Insight (2020). Age and leadership: comparisons of age groups in different kinds of work environment. Retrieved from <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/MRR-01-2020-0040/full/html>
 31. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2018). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.
 32. Eyike, E. (2021). Impact of seminar/trainings on the leadership effectiveness of primary school heads in Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 13(1), 1-8.
 33. Fadekemi, O. A., & Isaac, O. O. (2021). Seasoned principals' years of experience and their effectiveness in managing teachers in secondary schools in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 9(1), 32-43.
 34. Ferrari, M. (2018). *Principalship: An international perspective* (Vol. 5). Springer.
 35. Feyisa, G., Duke, R., & Damtew, T. (2018). Principals' educational leadership practices and their effects on teachers' job satisfaction in Ethiopia. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 44(2), 214-231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214555361>
 36. Gabuya, E. T. (2019). Financial Management Practices of Public School Heads in Selected Secondary Schools in Iloilo City. *Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation*, 9(2), 1-15.
 37. Ganz, S. (2021). Understanding the trait theory of leadership. Retrieved from: <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-the-trait-theory-of-leadership-2795322>
 38. Gao, J., & Greenberg, R. (2018). Adversity quotient and its role in school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 54(5), 594-610. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-07-2015-0071>
 39. Horng, E., Kalogrides, D., & Loeb, S. (2019). Principal preferences and the unequal distribution of principals across schools (Working Paper No. 36). Washington, DC: Urban Institute, National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.
 40. Howley, C. B., Strange, M., & Bickel, R. (2020). Scheduling and course offerings in rural high schools. *Rural Educator*, 22(3), 12-19.
 41. Ibrahim, N. A., Mustapha, R., & Abdullah, M. (2021). Adversity quotient and leadership effectiveness among school heads in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(5), 587-602.
 42. IntechOpen. (2021). *Professional Development of Educational Leaders*. IntechOpen.
 43. Jaffe, E. D. (2018). Leadership and management of education. In *SAGE Handbook of Educational Leadership* (pp. 3-15). Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473957804.n1>
 44. Jeffers, E. (2018). Collaborative leadership and learning in professional learning communities: The relationship between context and demographic characteristics. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(3), 481-497.
 45. Jimenez, G. (2019). Community involvement in school education: a critical review. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 9(4), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.5590/jerap.2019.09.4.01>
 46. Khalid, A., & Khalid, M. (2021). Strategy and Strategic Leadership in Education: A Scoping Review. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 706608. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.706608>
 47. Kirianki, J. M. (2017). Influence of principals' position on their expertise in procurement in public secondary schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 5(1), 67-78.
 48. Kooi, K. J. (2018). Data-driven decision making: Improving student achievement. *Education Masters*, 55(1), 1-68.
 49. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2019). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37(5), 379-395.
 50. Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2018). *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*. University of Minnesota.
 51. Lunceford, J. L., & Lemasters, J. A. (2018). Building resilient educational leaders: The role of adversity quotient. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 15(2), 18-33.
 52. Martínez, P., Rojo-Ramírez, A., & Cerviño, J. (2020). Gender differences in the relationship between experience, leadership and management quality. *Personnel Review*, 49(6), 1336-1355. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2019-0125>
 53. McCombes, S. (2019). Descriptive research design. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/research-process/descriptive-research/>
 54. Mohammed, N. A., Aziz, A. A., Abdullah, N. A., & Yusof, N. M. (2020). Transformational leadership, organizational culture, and academic quality in Malaysian higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(6), 677-693.
 55. Montecalvo, R. (2018). Workplace democracy and employee well-being: A study of the moderating effects of locus of control. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 28(3), 171-187. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-015-9263-2>
 56. Mukinya, D. (2018). Principals' years of experience and their administrative effectiveness in secondary schools in Meru Central Sub-County, Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 6(1), 117-130.

57. Mutisya, M., Ngware, M. W., & Oketch, M. O. (2017). School leaders' rank and ICT incorporation in secondary schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 31(7), 959-973. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-01-2016-0004>
58. Napire J. (2018). Adversity quotient® and leadership style in relation to the demographic profile of the elementary school principals in the second congressional district of Camarines Sur. (Master's thesis, University of Northeastern Philippines Iriga City). Retrieved in August, 2022, from: http://www.peaklearning.com/documents/PEAK_GRI_napire.pdf
59. Okpalugo, C. C. (2018). Principal's years of experience and students' academic achievement in secondary schools in Nsukka Education Zone, Enugu State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Research and Administration*, 1(1), 1-9.
60. Okwor, U. (2022). Principals' educational qualification and resource management in secondary schools in Anambra State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 9(1), 126-136. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v9i1.3826>
61. Onubuleze, F. K. (2018). An evaluation of the relationship between principals' demographic factors and their performance in the task areas of management of secondary education in Nsukka Education Zone. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(18), 39-45. <https://bit.ly/37fXHms>
62. Opdenakker, M. C., & Damme, J. V. (2018) Effects of education level and study discipline on teachers' performance in primary education. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 22(5-6), 264-283.
63. Oyebamiji, J. O., Oyebamiji, F. F., & Oyebamiji, T. O. (2020). Adversity quotient and organizational commitment of secondary school principals in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 11(6), 1-8.
64. Park, Y. K., & Park, J. H. (2017). The relationship between adversity quotient and job performance of high school principals in South Korea. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 7(1), 1-13.
65. Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2018). Positive psychology: An introduction. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 3-9). Oxford University Press.
66. Qi, H., & Li, J. (2020). Relationship between adversity quotient and work engagement of primary school principals: The moderating effect of job demands. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 552.
67. Republic of the Philippines. (2001). Republic Act No. 9155: Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2001/08/11/republic-act-no-9155/>
68. Rome, V. (2008). The management competencies of elementary school administrators as assessed by teachers and principals. *Journal of Research in Education*, 18(1), 86-98.
69. Safi'I, R., & Yudi, M. (2021). Work motivation and employee performance: The mediating role of personal responsibility. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 22(1), 177-192. <https://doi.org/10.33736/ijbs.8263.2021>
70. Salaver, L. (2019). Effective School Leadership in the Philippines: An Analysis of Principal Practices and School Outcomes. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47(6), 939-958.
71. Salazar, M. C., & Helario, M. G. A. (2018). Factors influencing the performance of public elementary school heads in the province of Batangas. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 97(2), 167-182.
72. Salmon, A., & Froyd, J. E. (2017). The Importance of Adversity Quotient in Educational Leadership. *Journal of Educational Leadership in Action*, 6(3), 15-25.
73. Saromines, V. R. (2020). School heads' leadership style and its relationship to the academic performance of teachers in Nueva Ecija, Philippines. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 19(1), 45-55. doi: 10.3860/taper.v19i1.882
74. Sawati, A., Anwar, M. N., & Majoka, M. I. (2013). Relationship between principals' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in District Jhang, Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, 33(2), 291-300.
75. Shaker, H., Schechter, C., & Kark, R. (2018). Gender disparities in educational leadership: Examining the relationship between sources of power and fostering educational leadership partnerships between principals and teachers. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(6), 902-920. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217737943>
76. Smith, T., & Johnson, L. (2018). The Role of Instructional Leadership in Educational Institutions. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 42(3), 123-145.
77. Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2021). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23-28. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X030003023>
78. Stoltz, P. G. (1997). *Adversity quotient: Turning Obstacles into opportunities*. United States: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
79. Stoltz, P. G., & Grant, A. M. (2019). *Adversity quotient @ work: Make everyday challenges the key to your success--at work and in life*. John Wiley & Sons.
80. Stoltz, P.G. (2000). *Adversity quotient at work: make everyday challenges the key to your success. Putting the principles of AQ into action*. New York: Morrow.
81. Stoltzfus, J. R., Nisly, L. M., Hostetler, A. J., & McGinnis, J. A. (2020). Adversity quotient and educational leadership: A correlational study.

- Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(5), 614-624.
82. Tansiongco, L.A., & Ibarra, F. (2020). Educational leaders' adversity quotient, management style, and job performance: Implications to school leadership. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education*, 4(2), 386-401.
 83. The UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2020). Women in science, technology, engineering and mathematics: barriers and opportunities. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373299>.
 84. Wagbara, P. E. (2004). Gender factors and the administrative performance of principals of secondary schools in Rivers State. Unpublished Master's Thesis (University of Port Harcourt).
 85. Williams, A. (2020). Education and the labor market. In *International Encyclopedia of Education* (4th ed., pp. 295-300). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102537-5.11396-1>
 86. Xie, T., Zhang, Y., Wang, X., & Liu, Z. (2021). The impact of leadership and management training on adversity quotient of primary school principals. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 660516.
 87. Yusof, Y. M., & Shahrill, M. (2017). Adversity Quotient and Job Performance among Educational Leaders in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(6), 239-250.
 88. Zarate, M. T. (2018). Task performance of public elementary school principals. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, 6(2), 23-32.