

# School Administrators' Adversity Quotient and Leadership Styles: Basis for Technical Assistance Mechanism

Ma. Christiane Marty Proyalde

Don Marcelo C. Marty Elementary School  
Sta. Cruz District, Division of Zambales  
machristiane.proyalde@deped.gov.ph

**Abstract:** *The study aimed to determine the adversity quotient and leadership style of school administrators in public elementary and secondary schools in Zone 1, Division of Zambales during the 2020-2021 school year. The research used a descriptive-correlational method and a questionnaire to gather data from 78 schools and 133 respondents. The majority of school administrators were female, married, in their middle adulthood stage, with a master's degree, adequate teaching experience, and above average earnings. The adversity quotient was above average, and there was a significant relationship between the adversity quotient and profile variables. The researcher recommended implementing these mechanisms, training administrators on financial literacy, rewards, and mentoring, and encouraging them to respond to different dimensions of adversity quotient in conscious patterns.*

**Keywords:** adversity quotient, leadership style, school administrators, resiliency

## 1. Rationale

Basic education institutions are often forced to deal with recurrent internal and external problems in their operation. How these problems are resolved is highly dependent upon the individual principal's personal qualities expressed in style of leadership. As the recognized leader in a school, the principal has a lot of responsibilities and accountability in the organization. The position is critical to the organizational development and academic growth of the students because the principal is usually the main source and the driving force that sustains the welfare of the organization (Williams, 2010; Rosenholtz, 2012; Stoltz, 2010).

As leadership issues continue to be at the forefront of education, it is imperative that research examines the responses of school principals to adversity as the new area of leadership training (Stoltz, 2011; Schmidt, 2010). The multi-faceted roles of being a principal could exert too much pressure on their psychological and social well-being, which in turn, could jeopardize the gainful existence of a school. Educational leadership roles according to Law and Glover (2010) take the form of being leading professionals who act as mentor, educator, advisor, ambassador, and advocate, and of being chief executive, who act as strategist, manager, arbitrator, executive officer and diplomat. The ability of individuals to be resilient is important in the field of education as the constantly changing environment provides many challenges and adversities for administrators to overcome.

At present, educational institutions have been facing different issues and adversities that school managers must deal with effectively and efficiently. Adversities, such as poor academic performance of students that affects the performance of the school, increasing dropout rates, drug addiction; early marriage, parental problems, bullying, and discipline are the most common. These adversities could greatly affect the entire school when not responded accordingly. As cited in the study of Canivel (2010),

advances and changes in technology, science, values, environment, and international relationship also hold a varied assortment of challenges and adversities in education. How a leader responds to these adversities not only affects the leader's performance but also the performance of those being led.

## 2. Statement of the Problem

This research study focused on the Adversity Quotient® and Leadership Styles of public elementary and secondary school administrators in Zone 1, Division of Zambales as basis for designing Technical Assistance Mechanism.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the school administrators in terms of:

- 1.1. Position Title
- 1.2. Highest Educational Attainment
- 1.3 Age
- 1.4. Years in service as teacher
- 1.5 Years in service as school administrator
- 1.6 Sex
- 1.7. Civil Status
- 1.8 Number of Faculty Supervised
- 1.9 Student Population
- 1.10 Monthly Income

2. How is the adversity quotient of the school administrators be described based on Adversity Quotient test scores?

3. How is the adversity quotient of the school administrators be described along the four dimensions:

- 3.1 Control;
- 3.2 Ownership;
- 3.3 Reach;
- 3.4 Endurance?

Volume 13 Issue 1, January 2024

Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal

[www.ijsr.net](http://www.ijsr.net)

4. How is the Filipino leadership style employed by the school administrators be described with regards to:

- 4.1 Leadership by Kayod;
- 4.2 Leadership by Libro;
- 4.3 Leadership by Lusot;
- 4.4 Leadership by Oido and
- 4.5 Leadership by Ugnayan?

5. Is there a significant difference on the Adversity Quotient of School Administrators as cited in problem no. 3?

6. Is there a significant difference on the Leadership Styles of School Administrators as cited in problem no. 4?

### 3.Objectives of the Study

The study focused on determining the relationship between the school administrator’s adversity quotient and leadership style in public elementary and secondary school in Zone 1, Division of Zambales during the school year 2020-2021 as basis for designing Technical Assistance Mechanism. Also, this study intended, to generate facts, analyze, and present data that will help school administrators and policy makers to formulate new policies and putting in place appropriate decisions for the benefits of the school community and the learners. Henceforth, the researcher hoped through the results of this study may add knowledge to school administrators and DepEd Officials to eventually bridge the identified gaps in leadership aspects.

### 4.Conceptual Framework

The focus of this study was on the Adversity Quotient® and Leadership Styles of school administrators in Zone 1, Division of Zambales as basis for designing Technical Assistance Mechanism. The Adversity Quotient® of the elementary and secondary school administrators was tested through Adversity Response Profile (ARP®) version 10.1 formulated by Dr. Paul G. Stoltz. The school administrators’ adversity quotient measures how one responds in the face of difficult problems encountered in school which can be understood, and distancing oneself from others (Bandura, 1995) that can affect leadership. The endurance dimension of AQ® (Peterson, Seligman et al, 1993) responds to the time adversities last which can affect performance. Leadership styles of the respondents were tested using a leadership style survey which was developed by Flordeliza A. Montalla. It

determines the styles of the respondents along their role as school administrators. It shows the leaders way of administration such as Leaders by Kayod, Leaders by Lusot, Leaders by Libro, Leaders by Oido and Leaders by Ugnayan. It determined the leadership style and Adversity Quotient® and their relationship for the improvement of the performance of the elementary and secondary school principals as technical assistance mechanism was made. This AQ® begins with individual’s behavior and it encompasses four dimensions: Control, Ownership, Reach and Endurance. The control theory (Podsakoff & Farh, 1989) affects their performance. Ownership and origin have something to do with accountability which influences leadership. Reach dimension assess how far adversity affects areas of life usually leading to poor decision making and distancing oneself from others (Bandura, 1995) that can affect leadership. The endurance dimension of AQ (Peterson, Seligman et al, 1993) responds to the time adversities last which can affect performance.

### 5.Methods

The researcher utilized a descriptive-correlational method of research. This method was the most appropriate because the study focused on the school administrators’ Adversity Quotient® and leadership styles as basis for designing technical assistance mechanism. Standardized instruments to gather quantitative data were utilized in this study. The instruments were as follows and consisted of three parts: Part I delved with the demographic profile of the respondents which include age, sex, position, civil status, educational attainment, length of service as school administrator, school level administered and school size administered; Part II pertained to Adversity Quotient Profile®. The Adversity Quotient Profile (AQP) will be used to measure the respondents’ adversity quotient. The AQP which was designed and developed by Paul Stoltz, is an oppositional, scale-based, forced-choice questionnaire designed to gauge an individual’s resilience – that is, their capability to respond constructively to difficulties – by eliciting their hardwired response pattern to a broad range of adverse events (Stoltz, 2000). Part III dealt with leadership style. The leadership style survey, which was developed by Flordeliza A. Montalla was used to assess the leadership style of the respondents. It was a 50-question self-assessment questionnaire which determined whether one’s leadershipstyle is Kayod, Libro, Lusot, Oido, and Ugnayan.

### 6.Findings

**Table 1:** Profile of the Respondents

Profile Variables		Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Position Title	Principal	61	59.20
	Head Teacher	42	40.80
	Teacher-In-Charge	0	0.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Highest Educational Attainment	Doctoral or equivalent	12	11.70
	Doctoral units	22	21.40
	M.A. or equivalent	44	42.70
	Master’s units	23	22.30

	Bachelor's degree	2	1.90
	<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Age (years) <b>Mean = 47.12 or 47 years old</b>	50 & above	45	43.70
	40-49	43	41.70
	30-39	12	11.70
	29 & below	3	2.90
	<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Years in Service as Faculty <b>Mean = 17.61 or 18 years</b>	21 & above	41	39.80
	16-20	29	28.20
	11-15	19	18.40
	6-10	12	11.70
	5 & below	2	1.90
	<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Years in Service as School Administrator <b>Mean = 8.00 or 8 years</b>	21 & above	3	2.90
	16-20	13	12.60
	11-15	11	10.70
	6-10	30	29.10
	5 & below	46	44.70

Position Title	Principal	61	59.20
	Head Teacher	42	40.80
	Teacher-In-Charge	0	0.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Highest Educational Attainment	Doctoral or equivalent	12	11.70
	Doctoral units	22	21.40
	M.A. or equivalent	44	42.70
	Master's units	23	22.30
	Bachelor's degree	2	1.90
	<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Age (years) <b>Mean = 47.12 or 47 years old</b>	50 & above	45	43.70
	40-49	43	41.70
	30-39	12	11.70
	29 & below	3	2.90
	<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Years in Service as Faculty <b>Mean = 17.61 or 18 years</b>	21 & above	41	39.80
	16-20	29	28.20
	11-15	19	18.40
	6-10	12	11.70
	5 & below	2	1.90
	<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Years in Service as School Administrator <b>Mean = 8.00 or 8 years</b>	21 & above	3	2.90
	16-20	13	12.60
	11-15	11	10.70
	6-10	30	29.10
	5 & below	46	44.70
	<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**1.1. Position Title.** The position title of most respondents is Principal with 61 or 59.20% of them; 42 or 40.80% are Head Teachers; and no one or 0.00% is a Teacher-In-Charge.

Master's units; 22 or 21.40% are Doctoral units; 12 or 11.70% are Doctoral or equivalent degree holders and 2 or 1.90% are Bachelor's degree holders.

**1.2. Highest Educational Attainment.** Majority of the school administrator-respondents with 44 or 42.70% are M.A. or equivalent degree holders; 23 or 22.30% are with

**1.3. Age.** Most of the school administrator-respondents with 45 or 43.70% are from age group 50 & above years old; 43 or 41.70% are from age group 40-49 years old; 12 or 11.70%

are from age group 30-39 years old; and 3 or 2.90% are from age group 29 & below. The computed mean age of school administrator-respondents was 47.12 or 47 years old. This implies that the respondents are in their middle adulthood stage.

**1.4. Years in Service as Teacher.** There were 41 or 39.80% with 21 & above years in service as faculty; 29 or 28.20% with 16-20 years in service as faculty; 19 or 18.40% with 11-15 years in service as faculty; 12 or 11.70% with 6-10 years in service as faculty; and 2 or 1.90% with 5 & below years in service as faculty. The computed mean for years in service as faculty was 17.61 or 18 years.

**1.5. Years in Service as School Administrator.** Out of one hundred three (103) respondents, 46 or 44.70% are with 5 & below years in service as school administrator; 30 or 29.10% with 6-10 years in service as school administrator; 13 or 12.60% with 16-20 years in service as school administrator; 11 or 10.70% with 11-15 years as school administrator; and 3 or 2.90% with 21 & above years in service as school administrator. The computed mean for years in service as school administrator was 8.00 or 8 years.

**1.6. Sex.** Majority of the school administrator-respondents with 60 or 58.30% are females while 43 or 41.70% are males. The composition of respondents has more female school administrators than male. This is similarly observed in the Department of Education in the Philippines where female school administrators outnumbered male school administrators.

**1.7. Civil Status.** Most of the school administrator-respondents with 82 or 79.60% are married; 18 or 17.50%

are single; and 3 or 2.90% are widower. Clearly garnered from the data that majority of the respondents are married.

**1.8. No. of Faculty Supervised.** There are 31 or 30.20% school administrator-respondents with 6-10 no. of faculty under supervision; 15 or 14.60% with 11-15 no. of faculty under supervision; 10 or 9.70% with 16-20 and 21-25 no. of faculty under supervision, respectively; 9 or 8.70% with 26-30 and 36-40 no. of faculty under supervision, respectively; 4 or 3.90% with 31-35 and 51-55 no. of faculty under supervision, respectively; 3 or 2.90% with 5 & below; 46-50; and 56-60 no. of faculty under supervision, respectively; and 2 or 1.90% with 41-45 no. of faculty under supervision. The computed mean for the no. of faculty under supervision of school administrators was 21.40 or 21 faculty members.

**1.9. Student Population.** The student population of most school administrator-respondents ranges 151-300 with 22 or 21.40%; 17 or 16.50% with student population ranges of 50-150; 301-450; and 451-600, respectively; 8 or 7.80% with student population range of 751-900; 6 or 5.80% with student population ranges of 601-750 and 1051-1200, respectively; 4 or 3.90% with student population range of 901-1050; 3 or 2.90% with student population ranges of 1201-1350 and 1501-1650, respectively; and no one or 0.00% among school administrator-respondents with student population range of 1351-1500. The computed mean for student population of school administrators was 503.33 or 503 students.

**1.10. Monthly Income.** The monthly income of most respondents with 85 or 82.50% ranges from 30,000 Php& above while 18 or 17.50% whose monthly income ranges from 20,000-29,999. The computed mean for monthly income of school administrator-respondents was 33,251.93 Php.

**Table 2:** Distribution of Adversity Quotient Test Scores of the School Administrators

Descriptive Equivalent	Adversity Quotient Test Scores (points)	(f)	Percentage (%)
High	169-200	18	17.50
Above Average	137-168	56	54.40
Average	105-136	29	28.10
Below Average	73-104	0	0.00
Low	40-72	0	0.00
<b>Total</b>		103	100.00
<b>Mean = 149.08 points (Above Average)</b>			

The adversity quotient test scores of 56 (or 54.40%) school administrators ranged from 137-168 points, indicating above average adversity quotient. This indicates that the respondents have the capacity to resolve challenges, difficulties, setbacks and demands and make every effort to overcome them so as not to affect ones work. They probably has the ability to withstand significant adversity and to continue to move forward and upward in life(Amparo, 2015).

Findings revealed that the respondents have an average level of control over events that affect their life circumstances and see adversities as temporary- rather than enduring- set back. Respondents also sensed greater ownership regarding the outcome of adversity and they do not allow such adversity to influence other areas of their lives. (Lazaro, 2004)

There were 29 (or 28.10%) school administrators whose adversity quotient test scores ranged from 105-136 points, indicating average adversity quotient. This implies that the respondents usually do decent job of navigating life as long as everything is going relatively smooth. However, the respondent may suffer unnecessarily from larger setbacks, or may be disheartened by the accumulated burden of life's challenges (Amparo, 2015).

There were 18 (or 17.50%) school administrators whose adversity quotient test scores ranged from 169-200 points, indicating high adversity quotient. This indicates that respondents have the ability to withstand significant adversity and to continue to move forward and upward in life (Amparo, 2015).

Majority of the respondents has 137-168 points of adversity quotient test scores. The mean adversity quotient test score is 149.08. This can be interpreted that respondents have above average adversity quotient.

**Table 3: Adversity Quotient of School Administrators in Terms of Control**

Control		WM	DE	Rank
To what extent can you influence this situation:				
1	You suffer a financial setback.	3.22	Average	5
2	People respond unfavorably to your latest ideas.	3.60	Above Average	4
3	Your personal and work obligations are out of balance.	3.72	Above Average	2
4	You are not exercising regularly though you know you should.	3.65	Above Average	3
5	Your computer crashed for the third time this week.	4.09	Above Average	1
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>3.66</b>	<b>Above Average</b>	

School administrator-respondents obtained qualitative interpretation as Above Average on question item “5. Your computer crashed for the third time this week” with weighted mean rating of 4.09 (rank 1). The question item “1. You suffer a financial setback” was rated 3.22 (or Average, rank 5). Overall, the adversity quotient of school administrators in terms of control was Above Average with a mean rating of

3.66. This indicates that the respondents have above average on their control and influence in adverse situations. Even in situations that appear overwhelming or out of their hands, those with above average AQs find some facet of the situation they can influence. Those with lower AQs respond as if they have little or no control and often give up (Stoltz, 2000).

**Table 4: Adversity Quotient of School Administrators in Terms of Ownership**

Ownership		WM	DE	Rank
To what extent do you feel responsible for improving this situation:				
1	You are overlooked for a promotion.	3.77	Above Average	5
2	Someone you respect ignores your attempt to discuss an important issue.	3.83	Above Average	3
3	Your workplace is understaffed.	3.95	Above Average	2
4	Your organization is not meeting its goals.	4.32	High	1
5	The meeting you are in is a total waste of time.	3.79	Above Average	4
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>3.93</b>	<b>Above Average</b>	

School administrator-respondents obtained qualitative interpretation as High on question item “4. Your organization is not meeting its goals” with weighted mean rating of 4.32 (rank 1). The question item “1. You are overlooked for a promotion” was rated 3.77 (or Above Average, rank 5). Overall, the adversity quotient of school administrators in terms of ownership was Above Average

with a mean rating of 3.93. The findings indicate that accountability is the backbone of action. Those with above average AQs hold themselves accountable for dealing with situations regardless of their cause. Those with lower AQs deflect accountability and most often feel victimized and helpless (Stoltz, 2000).

**Table 5: Adversity Quotient of School Administrators in Terms of Reach**

Reach		WM	DE	Rank
To what extent does the adversity extend beyond the situation at hand:				
1	You are criticized for a big project that you just completed.	3.59	Above Average	2
2	The high-priority project you are working on gets canceled.	3.57	Above Average	4
3	You hit every red light on your way to an important appointment.	3.58	Above Average	3
4	You miss an important appointment.	3.72	Above Average	1
5	Your boss adamantly disagrees with your decision.	3.47	Above Average	5
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>3.59</b>	<b>Above Average</b>	

The findings imply that keeping the fallout under control and limiting the reach of adversity is essential for efficient and effective problem solving. Those with above average AQs keep 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 (Stoltz, 2000). The adversity quotient on Reach is the extent to which school administrator perceives an adversity will “reach into” and affect other aspects of the

situation or beyond. School Administrator with high AQ will put setbacks in perspectives, not letting them ruin the day or the weekend. He/she resolves to learn from the mistakes. A low AQ school administrator would extrapolate, turning the single failure into proof that he/she is worthless and stupid. This will affect other aspects of one’s life leading to frustration, bitterness, failure, misfortune and may lead to poor decision making. This dimension will determine their burden, stress, energy, and effort as it tends to have cumulative effect.

**Table 6:** Adversity Quotient of School Administrators in Terms of Endurance

Endurance		WM	DE	Rank
To what extent does the adversity endure:				
1	You accidentally delete an important email.	3.76	Above Average	2
2	You are unable to take a much-needed vacation.	3.65	Above Average	4
3	After extensive searching, you cannot find an important document.	3.56	Above Average	5
4	You never seem to have enough money.	3.83	Above Average	1
5	You lost something that is important to you.	3.72	Above Average	3
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>3.70</b>	<b>Above Average</b>	

School administrator-respondents obtained qualitative interpretation as Above Average on question item “4. You never seem to have enough money” with weighted mean rating of 3.83 (rank 1). The question item “3. After extensive searching, you cannot find an important document” was rated 3.56 (or Above Average, rank 5). Overall, the adversity quotient of school administrators in terms of endurance was

Above Average with a mean rating of 3.70. The findings indicate that seeing beyond even enormous difficulties is an essential skill for maintaining hope. Those with above average 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, 2000).

**Table 7:** Summary on Adversity Quotient of School Administrators

Dimension	OWM	DE	Rank
1 Control	3.66	Above Average	3
2 Ownership	3.93	Above Average	1
3 Reach	3.59	Above Average	4
4 Endurance	3.70	Above Average	2
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>Above Average</b>	

School Administrator-respondents were rated Above Average among the six (6) dimensions of Adversity Quotient as to Ownership (3.93, rank 1); Endurance (3.70, rank 2); Control (3.66, rank 3); and Reach (3.59, rank 4). Overall, the adversity quotient of school administrators was rated Above

Average with mean rating of 3.72. The findings imply that respondents have above average level of adversity quotient that affects their motivation, energy, vitality, health, performance, persistence, and hope in dealing with situations they are confronting as leaders (Amparo, 2015).

**Table 8:** Leadership Style of School Administrators as to Leadership by Kayod

Leadership by Kayod		WM	DE	Rank
1	Works day in and day out.	4.46	Always Practiced	6
2	Work with pleasure as administrator.	4.42	Always Practiced	7
3	Work seriously to attain organizational goals.	4.60	Always Practiced	2
4	Use experiences to teach members to become responsible in performing duties.	4.75	Always Practiced	1
5	Want to keep people busy all the time.	3.56	Often Practiced	4
6	Use directive question to lead subordinate to an expected action.	3.95	Often Practiced	9
7	Ensure that subordinates have a stake in knowing the goals and standards and monitor their performance to determine motivation.	4.59	Always Practiced	3
8	Bribe or commit self to any anomalous deals doesn't make sense at all.	4.51	Always Practiced	5
9	Interested in what, how, and why to do things.	4.36	Always Practiced	8
10	Assign tasks and activities quickly and demand for immediate results.	3.83	Often Practiced	10
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.30</b>	<b>Always Practiced</b>	

The leadership style “4. Use experiences to teach members to become responsible in performing duties” was perceived as Always Practiced (4.75, rank 1); while “10. Assign tasks and activities quickly and demand for immediate results” was perceived as Often Practiced (3.83, rank 10). Overall, the Leadership Style by Kayod was perceived by the School

Administrators as Always Practiced with mean rating of 4.30. This implies that school administrators always characterized as action-hungry, highly dedicated, but their manners are rather formal and that of an introvert. They are a serious worker and will not give in to bribing or any anomalous deals.

**Table 9: Leadership Style of School Administrators as to Leadership by Lusot**

Leadership by LUSOT		WM	DE	Rank
1	Ensure that staffs are performing well.	4.69	Always Practiced	1
2	Break rules of the organization to make decisions.	3.06	Sometimes Practiced	8
3	Assign tasks/ activities quickly without any explanations.	2.55	Seldom Practiced	9
4	Want the least hardship and sweat, paying off problems and making short cuts.	2.34	Seldom Practiced	10
5	Give the speaker full attention and a clean slate (no prior listener bias of assumption)	3.70	Often Practiced	5
6	Deal with subordinates formally.	3.87	Often Practiced	3.5
7	Expect people to be available whenever they are needed.	3.67	Often Practiced	6
8	Rule-oriented rather than result oriented.	2.89	Sometimes Practiced	2
9	Better at feeling the intentions of the subordinates.	3.87	Often Practiced	3.5
10	Manage according to what one feel and the desire of the higher ups or those in authority.	3.65	Often Practiced	7
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>3.43</b>	<b>Often Practiced</b>	

This implies that school administrators often on the lookout for loopholes of anything and will use them to avoid too much work, or as an excuse for failure. They are also given to make shortcuts and to do unconventional or even illegal ways to attain objectives. Generally, an extrovert, they often

deal with people informally. Relatively, Rise (2019) noted that good leaders want to ensure their team is engaged in their work, feeling satisfied, and performing at their personal best.

**Table 10: Leadership Style of School Administrators as to Leadership by Libro**

Leadership by LIBRO		WM	DE	Rank
1	Do what the manuals and other formal documents say in making decisions.	4.03	Often Practiced	10
2	Deal with staff when things go wrong and need to create strategy to keep the project running.	4.31	Always Practiced	9
3	Attend management trainings needed in carrying out organizational goals and objectives.	4.50	Always Practiced	7
4	Follow systematic and analytic processes to determine what should be done and how to do it.	4.65	Always Practiced	5.5
5	Consult readings first before deciding on matters affecting the organization.	4.45	Always Practiced	8
6	Believe that training can and should be given professional growth.	4.83	Always Practiced	1
7	Encourage teachers closest to the problem to solve and give training and coaching when necessary.	4.67	Always Practiced	3
8	Participate and coordinate to co-official on the upcoming plans and projects of the group.	4.65	Always Practiced	5.5
9	Integrate various styles of management depending on the need of the organization.	4.68	Always Practiced	2
10	Take time to weigh evidence, explore alternatives, test assumptions and evaluate the soundness of the decision.	4.66	Always Practiced	4
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.54</b>	<b>Always Practiced</b>	

The leadership style “6. Believe that training can and should be given professional growth” was perceived as Always Practiced (4.83, rank 1); while “1. Do what the manuals and other formal documents say in making decisions” was perceived as Often Practiced (4.03, rank 10). Overall, the Leadership Style by Libro was perceived by the School

Administrators as Always Practiced with mean rating of 4.54. This implies that the school administrators always operate by the dictate of the books --- what the manuals and other formal documents say. They are always systematic, though and analytical. They usually have adequate formal training in management.

**Table 11: Leadership Style of School Administrators as to Leadership by Oido**

Leadership by OIDO		WM	DE	Rank
1	Rely mostly in practical experiences rather than what the books or any formal documents say in terms of managing the organization.	3.98	Often Practiced	8.5
2	Believe that the vast field of practical experiences will compensate the lack of formal management education.	4.05	Often Practiced	7
3	Utilize experiences to become more performing and responsive.	4.50	Always Practiced	4
4	Integrate various styles of management and experiences to answer the needs and conditions of the organization.	4.54	Always Practiced	3
5	Reconcile philosophies and beliefs toward role expectations and tasks in the organization.	4.28	Always Practiced	6

6	Think and act accordingly in different situations.	4.59	Always Practiced	1
7	Give regular feedback both complimentary and corrective which is essential in shaping desired results.	4.43	Always Practiced	5
8	Make mostly of the decisions and expect employees to put the decisions into actions.	3.98	Often Practiced	8.5
9	See to it that subordinates feel confident on the decisions made.	4.55	Always Practiced	2
10	Make the subordinates feel that the principal is the person in authority.	3.90	Often Practiced	10
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.28</b>	<b>Always Practiced</b>	

The leadership style “6. Think and act accordingly in different situations was perceived as Always Practiced (4.59, rank 1); while “10. Make the subordinates feel that the principal is the person in authority” was perceived as Often Practiced (3.90, rank 10). Overall, the Leadership Style by Oido was perceived by the School Administrators as Always

Practiced with mean rating of 4.28. According to Myatt (2012) that great leaders are great listeners and should talk less and listen more. The best leaders are proactive, strategic, and intuitive listeners. They recognize knowledge and wisdom are not gained by talking, but by listening.

**Table 12:** Leadership Style of School Administrators as to Leadership by Ugnayan

Leadership by UGNAYAN		WM	DE	Rank
1	Think first on matters affecting the organization.	4.77	Always Practiced	1
2	Follow systematic and analytic processes to determine what should be done and how to do it.	4.66	Always Practiced	4
3	See the need to correct appropriate behavior when it is first recognized before it becomes a habit and is harder to correct.	4.47	Always Practiced	9
4	Interested in what, how and why to do things.	4.63	Always Practiced	6.5
5	Allow teachers to make decisions and work them in advance to work out the type of decisions each is responsible.	4.64	Always Practiced	5
6	Deal with staff when things go wrong and need to create a strategy to keep the project running on schedule.	4.53	Always Practiced	8
7	Make some unconventional ways to carrying out goals.	3.79	Often Practiced	10
8	Get information through listening to the staff advice and suggestions.	4.63	Always Practiced	6.5
9	Achieve positive results by discussing the matters with the staff.	4.67	Always Practiced	3
10	Believe that participation and coordination make the group cohesive in performing their duties and responsibilities.	4.72	Always Practiced	2
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.55</b>	<b>Always Practiced</b>	

This further implies that the school administrators practiced hybrid leadership styles and are a gifted reconciler of all philosophies and beliefs held by various types of leaders. They integrate various styles of management depending on

the need and condition of their organization. They are participatory and cooperative. Borough (2011) argued that leaders should think first on matters affecting their organization which will have a lasting effect on its existence.

**Table 13:** Summary on Filipino Leadership Styles of School Administrators

Filipino Leadership Styles		OWM	DE	Rank
1	Leadership Style by Kayod	4.30	Always Practiced	3
2	Leadership Style by Lusot	3.43	Often Practiced	5
3	Leadership Style by Libro	4.54	Always Practiced	2
4	Leadership Style by Oido	4.28	Always Practiced	4
5	Leadership Style by Ugnayan	4.55	Always Practiced	1
<b>Grand Mean</b>		<b>4.22</b>	<b>Always Practiced</b>	

Out of the five (5) Filipino leadership styles, Leadership Style by Ugnayan was perceived to be Always Practiced (4.55, rank 1), followed by Leadership Style by Libro (4.54, rank 2), Leadership Style by Kayod (4.30, rank 3), Leadership Style by Oido (4.28, rank 4), and Leadership Style by Lusot (3.43, rank 5). Overall, the Filipino leadership styles were perceived to be Always Practiced by School Administrators with mean

rating of 4.22. Thus, the Grand Mean on level of practiced among the five (5) Filipino leadership styles were perceived to be Always Practiced and among the five Filipino leadership styles, notice the inferiority of Leadership style by Lusot as the lone leadership style being perceived by school administrator-respondents as Often Practiced. This supports the fact that administrators practiced equally the leadership



styles by Ugnayan, Libro, Kayod and Oido; however, they motivating staff to perform well without so much excuses  
Often practiced leadership style by Lusot which mirrored on that further reflects on their adversity quotient.

**Table 14:** Test of Difference on the Dimensions of Adversity Quotient of School Administrators

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Control	103	376.6	3.656311	0.4717
Ownership	103	404.8	3.930097	0.322909
Reach	103	369.4	3.586408	0.453539
Endurance	103	381.6	3.704854	0.435957

Source of Variation	SS	Df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	6.826	3	2.275	5.4042	0.0011	2.6267
Within Groups	171.77	408	0.4210			
Total	178.60	411				
<b>Decision: Reject Null Hypothesis (Significant)</b>						

The computed F value of 5.40 which is greater than (>) F-critical value of 2.62, using 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is Rejected, hence there is significant difference on the adversity quotient of school administrator-respondents towards dimensions as to control, ownership, reach and endurance. This further

implies that the adversity quotient of respondents on the four (4) dimensions is equal.

Howell (2016) further explains that leaders respond to different dimensions of adversity quotient in constant, subconscious patterns that affects their overall adversity in dealing with situations.

**Table 14:** Test of Difference on the Dimensions of Leadership Styles of School Administrators

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Leadership Style by Kayod	103	443.3	4.3038	0.1962
Leadership Style by Lusot	103	467.9	4.5427	0.1626
Leadership Style by Libro	103	353.3	3.4300	0.3440
Leadership Style by Oido	103	440.9	4.2805	0.2119
Leadership Style by Ugnayan	103	468.7	4.5504	0.1597

Source of Variation	SS	Df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	87.344	4	21.836	101.58	1.45E-63	2.3894
Within Groups	109.62	510	0.2149			
Total	196.9708	514				
<b>Decision: Reject Null Hypothesis (Significant)</b>						

The computed F value of 101.58 which is greater than (>) F-critical value of 2.38, using 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is Rejected, hence there is significant difference on dimensions of leadership styles of school administrators as to Leadership

Style by Kayod, Leadership Style by Lusot, Leadership Style by Libro, Leadership Style by Oido, and Leadership Style by Ugnayan. The findings signify that there is a difference on the extent of practice of school administrators towards the various Filipino leadership styles.

**Table 16:** Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation to determine Relationship between Adversity Quotient and Leadership Styles of School Administrators

Sources of Correlations		Adversity Quotient	Leadership Style	Decision
Adversity Quotient	Pearson Correlation	1	0.405**	<b>Low Positive Relationship Reject Ho</b>
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	
	N	103	103	
Leadership Style	Pearson Correlation	0.405**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		
	N	103	103	

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The computed Pearson r value of 0.405 denotes low positive correlation between adversity quotient and leadership styles of school administrators. The computed P-value 0.000 is less than (<) 0.01 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. The result signifies that there is significant relationship between adversity quotient and

leadership styles of school administrators. This further implies that as the adversity quotient of school administrators increases, their leadership style also becomes better.

The study of Bautista (2016) concluded that higher AQ strengthens the effectiveness of leadership styles among

respondents and further enhance effectiveness of those subordinates.

## 7. Conclusions and Implications

Based on the summary of the findings, the researcher concluded that:

1. Majority of the school administrators are female, married, in their middle adulthood stage, with position title of a Principal, M.A degree holders, with adequate number of service as teacher, newly promoted school administrator, with minimal number of faculty being supervised, with small student population and above average earners;

2. The mean adversity quotient test score of school administrators was 149.08, indicating above average adversity quotient;

3. The adversity quotient of the school administrators along the four dimensions was above average;

4. The school administrators always practiced the different Filipino leadership styles;

5. There is no significant difference on the adversity quotient of school administrator-respondents towards Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance;

6. There is significant difference on the leadership styles of school administrators as to Leadership by ;

7. There is significant relationship between adversity quotient and leadership styles of school administrators; and

8. The proposed technical assistance mechanisms for school administrators were identified towards Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance.

## 8. Recommendations

Based on the summary of findings and the conclusions arrived at, the researcher offered the following recommendations:

1. DepEd may conduct training to school administrators on awareness of adversity quotient and related to financial literacy; practice rewards, recognition, and incentives system for thru just and healthy working relations; and mentoring/coaching on decision making and file management.

2. DepEd is encouraged to provide coaching to school administrators on task management and implement strategies towards attaining their goals as school heads.

3. School Administrators are encouraged to respond to different dimensions of adversity quotient in conscious and constant patterns which further affects their overall adversity in dealing with situations.

4. School Administrators are encouraged to examine their leadership style and consider giving equal practice to leadership style by Lusot.

6. Since the overall adversity quotient was affected by age, school administrators are encouraged to continue whatever challenge they experience in their leadership and take into account to move forward and be brave since aging, years coupled with experience will further help them grow and overcome life challenges.

7. Since the overall leadership style was affected by educational attainment and civil status, school administrators are encouraged to consider to acquire professional growth such as training and enrolling to advanced education and set priorities and home and work balance which further affect their decision making.

8. School administrators are encouraged to strive on ways of increasing their adversity quotient to help them utilize various leadership styles to establish productive organization.

## References

- [1] Amparo, M. (2015). The level of Adversity Quotient and Social Skills of Student Leaders at Dela Salle Lipa. College of Education Arts and Sciences
- [2] Bautista, R. (2016). Adversity Quotient and Leadership Styles. Retrieved: [https://www.peaklearning.com/wpcontent/uploads/2019/05/PEAK\\_GRI\\_Bautista\\_Pascua\\_Tiu\\_Vela.pdf](https://www.peaklearning.com/wpcontent/uploads/2019/05/PEAK_GRI_Bautista_Pascua_Tiu_Vela.pdf)
- [3] Canivel, L. (2010). "AQ and leadership style, performance and best practices" Retrieved in June 19, 2020, from [http://www.peaklearning.com/documents/PEAK\\_GRI\\_canivel.pdf](http://www.peaklearning.com/documents/PEAK_GRI_canivel.pdf)
- [4] DepEd Order No. 19 s. 2016. Retrieved: [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2016/04/DO\\_s2016\\_19\\_0.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2016/04/DO_s2016_19_0.pdf)
- [5] Howell, J.P. (2001). Understanding Behaviors for Effective Leadership. New Jersey: Prentice- Hall. Howell, R. (2016). The Role of Adversity Quotient in Dealing with Everyday Challenges. Retrieved: <https://www.psychreg.org/adversity-quotient/>
- [6] Lazaro-Capone A. R. (2004), 'Adversity Quotient & the Performance Level of Selected Middle Managers of the Different Departments of the City of Manila as Revealed by the 360 Degree Feedback System; Paper presented at the 5th Regional Asian Conference of the International Industrial Relations Association at Seoul, Korea.
- [7] Peterson, C., Maier, S., & Seligman, M. (1993). Learned helplessness: Theory for the age of personal control, New York: Oxford University Press.
- [8] Robbins, S.P. (2001) Organisational behaviour. 9th edition. Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- [9] Sanchez, L. (2018). Relationship between Adversity Quotient and Psychological Well-being. Retrieved:

[https://www.peaklearning.com/wpcontent/uploads/2019/05/PEAK\\_GRI\\_Sanchez\\_October-2018.pdf](https://www.peaklearning.com/wpcontent/uploads/2019/05/PEAK_GRI_Sanchez_October-2018.pdf)

- [10] 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
- [11] Stoltz, P.G. (2000). Creating Sustainable Optimism. Based on a Presentation by Executive Forum Series Speaker p.5. Retrieved from [www.executiveforum.net](http://www.executiveforum.net) (accessed June 26, 2020).
- [12] Stoltz, P. G. (1997). Adversity quotient, turning obstacles into opportunities. New York: Wiley
- [13] Stoltz, P. G & Weihenmayer E. (2010). The Adversity Advantage: Turning Everyday Struggles into Everyday Greatness!: updated with new stories from the seven summits and expedition photographs. New York: Simon & Schuster.