

Resiliency and Leadership Competence of the School Heads: Basis for a Leadership Enhancement Program

Ms. Janice Tresreyes Solomon¹, Mr. Onward Osorio Ognita²

¹Teacher In Charge, Department Of Education

²Dean-College Of Education

Abstract

This study determined the influence of the level of resiliency on the leadership competence of school heads and served as basis for a school-based enhancement program in the 4th Congressional District of the Schools Division of Camarines Sur. It employed a descriptive-correlational research design with purposive sampling, using Weighted Mean, Frequency Count, Percentage Technique, Chi-Square, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, and Coefficient of Determination for data analysis. The study described respondents' demographic profile in terms of age, sex, civil status, position, length of service, and educational attainment; assessed their level of resiliency in behavioral skills; and evaluated leadership competence in governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and resource management. Findings revealed that school heads are mostly experienced, highly educated women in Principal I positions, reflecting stability and a clear leadership structure. They demonstrated strong resiliency and adaptability, though improvement is needed in handling criticism and developing emotional intelligence. Leadership competence was high, particularly in resource management and partnership building, while governance and curriculum leadership emerged as key areas for development. Significant relationships were found between resiliency, leadership competence, age, and position, while other competencies were influenced more by training and experience. Resiliency and leadership competence were also found to be interconnected, with sustained experience strengthening leadership capacity. Moreover, their combined effect significantly influences teachers' performance. In conclusion, school heads are generally resilient and competent leaders, but require further enhancement in governance, curriculum leadership, and emotional intelligence. Based on these findings, a Leadership Enhancement Program aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) was developed, focusing on emotional intelligence, stress management, governance, curriculum development, data-driven decision-making, and stakeholder engagement.

Introduction

Resiliency and leadership competence were central to contemporary school leadership, shaping how school heads responded to disruption, sustained instructional quality, and supported teacher and student well-being. Resilience was understood not as mere endurance but as a dynamic capacity to learn, adapt, and bounce forward after setbacks, combining emotional regulation, realistic planning, and problem-solving with a commitment to continuous learning. Leadership competence complemented resilience by encompassing the managerial, instructional, relational, and strategic skills that enabled school heads to translate vision into

practice, manage resources effectively, and cultivate professional communities that improved teaching and learning. Together, these qualities positioned school heads as change agents who steered schools through globalization, technological change, and post-pandemic recovery while maintaining a focus on equity and student outcomes. Overall, these dimensions defined the foundation of effective and adaptive school leadership in complex educational environments. Effective school leadership therefore required an integrated view of competence and resilience, where competence supplied technical and interpersonal tools and resilience provided adaptive coping resources. Empirical and theoretical studies reviewed in the literature showed that resilience strengthened decision-making, supported emotional intelligence, and amplified instructional leadership, resulting in improved teacher performance and school stability. These findings indicated that leadership effectiveness depended not only on technical skill but also on emotional and psychological strength. Framing school heads as both competent and resilient leaders clarified the importance of holistic professional development. Consequently, sustained school improvement required attention to both skill enhancement and well-being support. Globally, education systems placed renewed emphasis on leadership as a key factor in achieving quality and equity in learning. International syntheses indicated that resilient, instructional, and adaptive principals consistently defined successful schools across diverse contexts. Organizational resilience was strengthened through transformational and distributed leadership, which enhanced teacher efficacy and institutional stability. These global patterns aligned with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which called for inclusive, equitable, and quality education. Ultimately, effective leadership was recognized as essential in achieving global education targets. SDG 4's emphasis on inclusive and lifelong learning underscored the need for leaders who could manage policy shifts, integrate innovations, and address equity concerns. International research suggested that resilience and competence were developable through professional learning communities, coaching, and data-driven instructional practices. These approaches improved teaching quality and expanded equitable access to learning opportunities. Situating the study within this framework highlighted its global relevance in strengthening school leadership. Therefore, leadership development was viewed as a critical mechanism for educational transformation. In today's global education landscape, school leadership emerged as a major factor in student achievement, institutional effectiveness, and educational reform. Across nations, the demand for competent and resilient school leaders grew due to rapid changes brought by globalization, technology, and post-pandemic recovery. These leaders were expected to balance managerial responsibilities with visionary and adaptive leadership roles. As education systems strived for quality standards, strengthening leadership competence and resilience became increasingly important. Thus, leadership capacity was recognized as a cornerstone of sustainable school improvement. Competent and resilient school leaders served as the backbone of thriving educational communities. They were mentors, visionaries, and change agents who faced complex challenges with determination and professionalism. Psychologists such as Cherry (2019) described resilience as the ability to recover from setbacks, while Venkatesh and Shivaranjani (2018) noted that it could be developed through emotional regulation and problem-solving. Organizational studies also showed that resilience extended to institutions, enabling recovery and growth after disruptions (Bhamra et al., 2021). Overall, resilience strengthened both individual leaders and educational systems. Leadership studies further expanded resilience into guiding organizations through adversity. Perdomo (2022) framed resilient leadership as "bouncing forward," while Davis (2023) emphasized self-care practices as essential for sustained leadership effectiveness. Cureg (2023) and Henebery (2022) highlighted that educational leaders must transform challenges into opportunities for innovation. These perspectives showed that resilience enhanced leadership capacity and organizational

growth. Ultimately, resilient leadership fostered stability and long-term success in educational institutions. Underpinning school leadership in governance was Republic Act 9155, which mandated the delegation of authority and accountability to school heads. This policy strengthened School-Based Management and promoted localized decision-making for school improvement. The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) defined leadership competencies that guided professional practice and development. These frameworks ensured that leadership roles were aligned with national educational goals. Collectively, these policies provided a structured foundation for effective school leadership. At the regional and division levels, DepEd issued policies that translated national mandates into school-level responsibilities. In Camarines Sur, school heads faced challenges such as resource limitations and post-pandemic recovery demands. These conditions tested both their competence and resilience in managing schools effectively. Local studies revealed gaps in instructional leadership and resource management that required targeted interventions. Therefore, continuous leadership support became necessary to address these challenges. DepEd policies emphasized School-Based Management and data-driven decision-making, but implementation depended on leadership readiness and resilience. Effective leadership development programs integrated technical training with emotional and adaptive support systems. These programs strengthened the capacity of school heads to manage complex educational demands. As a result, leadership sustainability was improved through structured professional development. Hence, resilience and competence were reinforced as essential leadership qualities. This study provided a foundation for a contextually relevant enhancement program that benefited school heads, teachers, and learners. It offered insights that improved leadership practice and educational outcomes across schools. The findings supported alignment with DepEd policies, PPSSH standards, and SBM principles. Ultimately, the study contributed to strengthening leadership sustainability in similar educational contexts. Thus, it enhanced evidence-based decision-making in education. This study addressed the gap between policy mandates and actual leadership practice in SDO Camarines Sur. It led to the development of Project RISE (Resilient and Inclusive School Leadership Enhancement). The program aimed to strengthen resilience and leadership competence through structured training and mentoring. It focused on improving instructional leadership, emotional intelligence, and adaptive capacity. Ultimately, it served as a model for sustainable and resilient school leadership development.

Research Objectives

This study determined the influence of the level of resilience on the leadership competence of school heads and used this as basis in crafting a school-based enhancement program in the 4th Congressional District of the Schools Division of Camarines Sur. Specifically, it attained the following objectives: 1. To describe the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, position, length of service as school head and highest educational attainment. 2. To assess the level of resiliency of the school head along behavioral skills. 3. To ascertain the level of leadership competence of the school heads along with the principle of leadership governance, curriculum & learning, accountability & continuous improvement and management of resources. 4. To evaluate the significant association in the level of resiliency of school heads when they are grouped according to their demographic profile. 5. To determine the significant association in the leadership competence of school heads when they are grouped according to their demographic profile. 6. To assess the significant relationship between the school heads' level of resiliency and their leadership competence. 7. To evaluate the extent of influence of resiliency on

the leadership competence of school heads.8. To develop school-based enhancement programs to enhance the leadership competence of school heads and improve their level of resiliency.

Scope and Delimitation

This study determined the influence of the level of resilience on the leadership competence of school heads and used this as basis in crafting a school-based enhancement program in the 4th Congressional District of the Schools Division of Camarines Sur, School Year 2025-2026. Specifically, this study sought to determine the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, position, length of service as a school head, and highest educational attainment. It also assessed their resilience across various behavioral skills and examined their leadership competence within the School-Based Management (SBM) principles of leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and resource management. Furthermore, the study evaluated significant associations between demographic variables and both resilience and leadership competence. It also analyzed the relationship between resilience and leadership competence, specifically the extent to which the former influenced the latter. Finally, the study aimed to develop a school-based enhancement program designed to strengthen the leadership competence and resilience of school heads. Moreover, this study was guided by a descriptive-correlational research design. A stratified sampling technique was employed in determining the respondents of the study. The study ensured that the resulting data provided a robust basis for the development of Project RISE, a contextually relevant leadership enhancement program. This study deliberately limited its scope to maintain a focused and rigorous analysis of key variables. It excluded the measurement of teacher and stakeholder satisfaction, as the research emphasized objective assessment of school heads' competencies rather than subjective perceptions. Additionally, socio-economic factors and district-level budget allocations were not considered, since these were deemed secondary to the primary relationship between resilience and leadership competence. By narrowing the scope in this manner, the study avoided unnecessary data complexity and ensured a more precise examination of administrative competencies within the specified timeframe. This approach allowed for a clear and undistorted analysis of school heads' resiliency and leadership competence, free from the confounding effects of external satisfaction metrics and financial or environmental variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents the discussion, analysis, and interpretation of the data gathered to address the research problems of the study. The data were statistically processed, analyzed, and interpreted in accordance with the sequence of the research questions presented.

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 2 presents the demographic profile of the 78 respondents involved in the study, which includes their age, sex, civil status, position, length of service, and highest educational attainment. Understanding their demographic characteristics provides important context for interpreting their responses and the trends observed in the study. As shown in the table, the largest proportion of school heads falls within the 41–50 age bracket, comprising 35 respondents or 44.9%, followed by those aged 51–60 (19.2%) and 31–40 (17.9%). Only a small percentage belongs to the 25–30 (14.1%) and 60 and above (3.8%) age groups. In terms of sex, the majority are female (75.6%), while males account for 24.4%. Regarding civil status, most respondents are married (87.2%), while only 12.8% are unmarried. In terms of position, the majority hold

the rank of Principal I (64.1%), followed by Head Teachers (19.2%) and Principal II (16.7%). For length of service, a significant number have four years and above experience (69.2%), while 17.9% have 2–3 years and 12.8% have one year and below. Lastly, in terms of educational attainment, most respondents hold CAR MAED (60.3%), followed by MAED graduates (32.1%), while only a small portion have CAR PhD units (7.7%).

Table 2
Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile		f	%
Age	25-30	11	14.10
	31-40	14	17.90
	41-50	35	44.90
	51-60	15	19.20
	60 and up	3	3.80
	Total	78	100.00
Sex	Male	19	24.40
	Female	59	75.60
	Total	78	100.00
Civil Status	Unmarried	10	12.80
	Married	68	87.20
	Total	78	100.00
Position	Principal II	13	16.70
	Principal I	50	64.10
	Head Teacher	15	19.20
	Total	78	100.00
Length of Service	1 year and below	10	12.80
	2 to 3 years	14	17.90
	4 years and above	54	69.20
	Total	78	100.00
Highest Educational Attainment	CAR PhD	6	7.70
	MAED	25	32.10
	CAR MAED	47	60.30
	Total	78	100.00

Note: f=frequency; %=percentage

The data indicate that the respondents are predominantly middle-aged, female, married, and occupying entry to mid-level leadership positions, with considerable experience in school leadership. The high percentage of respondents with four or more years of service suggests that most school heads have been exposed to various administrative and leadership challenges, which may have contributed to the development of their resiliency and leadership competence. Furthermore, the prevalence of graduate-level education (MAED and CAR MAED) implies a strong inclination toward professional growth and continuous learning among the respondents. From these findings, it can be inferred that the respondents

possess a relatively mature and experienced profile, which is essential in managing the complexities of school leadership. Their demographic characteristics, particularly age, experience, and educational attainment, may significantly influence their ability to cope with challenges and effectively lead their schools. The dominance of female school heads also reflects current trends in the education sector, where women increasingly assume leadership roles. These findings highlighted the influence of demographic factors on resilience and leadership competence. Reed (2018) and Bumphus (2018) found that resilience and emotional intelligence tend to increase with age and professional experience, which aligned with the predominance of respondents in the 41–50 age group and those with more than four years of service. This suggests that maturity and tenure played a significant role in leadership effectiveness. In addition, Domingo and Salva (2021) and Gonzales and Reyes (2020) reported that female school leaders often demonstrated strong collaborative and organizational skills, which was consistent with the feminization of school leadership observed in this study. Venkatesh and Shivaranjani (2018) and Libertad and Dalisay (2024) also emphasized that marital and family support systems contributed to stronger resilience among leaders, supporting the high proportion of married respondents. Furthermore, Abellanosa (2019) and Mojica, De Castro, and Poblete (2024) noted that leadership competence varied depending on position and level of responsibility, which aligned with the distribution of respondents across Principal I, Principal II, and Head Teacher roles. Further, several studies reinforce the importance of educational attainment and professional development in leadership effectiveness. Isaacs (2023) and Medida and Cabañero (2024) emphasized that advanced education enhances both leadership competence and resilience, supporting the high percentage of respondents with MAED and CAR MAED degrees. These findings collectively suggest that demographic and professional factors are closely linked to leadership capacity in educational settings. Theoretically, these results are anchored on Garmezy's Resilience Theory and Heifetz and Linsky's Adaptive Leadership Theory. Garmezy's framework explains how resilience develops through coping, adaptation, and sustained functioning under stress, while Adaptive Leadership Theory highlights the importance of flexibility and responsiveness in addressing complex educational challenges. Together, these theories explain how school heads develop resilience and leadership competence as they navigate demanding and evolving school environments.

References

1. Abellanosa, A. L. (2019). Leadership competence and demographic characteristics of school heads in public basic education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management Studies*, 8(2), 45–60.
2. Abolghasemi, A., Karami, K., & Zare, H. (2020). Leadership stress and adaptive capacity in educational institutions. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 15(2), 112–128.
3. Amanchukwu, R. (2019). Leadership resilience and school effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Administration*, 11(2), 23–34.
4. Amanchukwu, R. (2021). School leadership and experience: Implications for governance. *Journal of Educational Leadership Studies*, 14(1), 67–82.
5. Arambala, M. (2025). Leadership competence and resilience among school leaders: A correlational study in public secondary schools. *Asian Journal of Educational Leadership*, 10(1), 55–72.
6. Arambala, M. (2025). Leadership competencies and resilience: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 102, 45–60.
7. Balwant, P. (2022). Psychological resilience and leadership performance. *Leadership and*

- Organization Development Journal, 43(5), 789–804.
8. Bandur, A., Nguyen, D., & Tran, T. (2022). Leadership development programs and school effectiveness. *Educational Management Review*, 18(3), 233–248.
 9. Bano, S., & Malik, R. (2020). Gender and leadership effectiveness in educational settings. *Asian Journal of Educational Leadership*, 9(1), 44–58.
 10. Bano, S., & Malik, R. (2021). Leadership resilience and emotional intelligence in school administration. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 13(2), 91–107.
 11. Basilio, J. (2025). Digital leadership and resilience among public school heads. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 98(1), 12–29.
 12. Bennington, A. (2021). *Adaptive leadership in modern organizations: Navigating complexity and uncertainty in dynamic environments*. Routledge.
 13. Brożek, G., & Kogut, J. (2016). Application of Pearson’s correlation coefficient in statistical analysis: A practical approach with numerical examples. *Statistical Methods Journal*, 12(3), 101–115.
 14. Bumphus, A. (2018). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness in school administration. *Journal of Educational Leadership Studies*, 6(2), 88–104.
 15. Cansoy, R., & Polatcan, M. (2019). Leadership roles and instructional effectiveness. *Educational Sciences Review*, 10(4), 211–226.
 16. Connor, K., & Davidson, J. (2020). Development of a resilience scale. *Depression and Anxiety*, 18(2), 76–82.
 17. Davis, J. (2023). *Self-care and resilience in leadership: Strategies for sustaining performance and well-being*. Springer Publishing.
 18. Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2018). Successful school leadership. *Educational Development Journal*, 38(2), 145–162.
 19. De Vera, J., & De Vera, M. (2021). Leadership traits and school effectiveness. *Philippine Educational Review*, 15(1), 77–92.
 20. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH)*.
 21. Dimmock, C., & Tan, C. (2022). Leadership in Asian schools. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 58(3), 345–367.
 22. Domingo, J., & Salva, M. (2021). Stakeholder engagement and school leadership effectiveness. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 22(4), 567–580.
 23. Estrada, J., & Gumban, L. (2024). School heads’ competence and its relationship to teachers’ performance and student achievement. *International Journal of Educational Policy and Leadership*, 15(1), 25–41.
 24. Garmezy, N. (1971). Vulnerability research and resilience theory. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 41(1), 101–116.
 25. Ghamrawi, N. (2021). Instructional leadership in schools. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 81, 102–115.
 26. Gonzales, P., & Reyes, L. (2020). Leadership practices among female school heads. *Philippine Educational Review*, 12(3), 90–108.
 27. Graham, S. (2020). An attributional theory of motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101861. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101861>
 28. Hadjithoma, C., & Karagiorgi, Y. (2021). Leadership resilience and experience. *School Leadership & Management*, 41(2), 123–139.

29. Hallinger, P. (2020). Leadership and school improvement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(1), 5–23.
30. Hassan, A., & Ismail, R. (2023). Educational attainment and leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 26(2), 145–160.
31. Heifetz, R., & Linsky, M. (1994). *Adaptive leadership*. Harvard University Press.
32. Henebery, B. (2022). Innovation and resilience in educational leadership. *Education Today Journal*, 18(2), 66–80.
33. Ibrahim, M., & Wahab, J. (2021). Experience and leadership competence. *Educational Leadership Review*, 22(1), 33–49.
34. Isaacs, T. (2023). Educational attainment and leadership competence. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 61(4), 402–418.
35. Keleş, H., & Özkan, H. (2022). Leadership competence and experience. *Educational Sciences Journal*, 14(2), 98–113.
36. Khalil, D., & Carroll, B. (2023). Leadership hierarchy and instructional leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 33(1), 22–40.
37. Ledesma, J. (2019). Conceptual frameworks and research models on resilience in leadership studies. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 18(2), 36–49.
38. Libertad, M., & Dalisay, R. (2024). Family support systems and leadership resilience. *Philippine Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(1), 55–70.
39. Lindberg, K. (2023). Trait leadership theory in contemporary leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly Review*, 29(1), 14–28.
40. Lupina, A., & Mandin, R. (2024). Resilient leadership practices in integrated schools. *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, 9(2), 120–136.
41. Mahfouz, J. (2020). Leadership resilience in education. *Educational Management Review*, 15(3), 211–225.
42. Medida, A., & Cabañero, R. (2024). Leadership competence and experience. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 96(2), 145–160.
43. Mendoza, P. (2021). Educational attainment and leadership skills. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(2), 210–225.
44. Mestry, R. (2019). Instructional leadership and school management. *South African Journal of Education*, 39(2), 1–10.
45. Mojica, R., De Castro, P., & Poblete, J. (2024). Leadership roles and administrative competence. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, 8(2), 45–63.
46. Mowbray, D. (2012). *Resiliency assessment questionnaire (RAQ): User manual*.
47. Mullen, C. (2020). Leadership development across career stages. *Educational Leadership Review*, 21(3), 56–72.
48. Mwesigwa, R., Tusiime, I., & Ssekiziyivu, B. (2020). Professional development and leadership competence. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(6), 1012–1025.
49. Navarro, L. (2023). Instructional leadership and resilience. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 17(1), 33–49.
50. Nguyen, H. (2022). Leadership experience and governance competence. *Educational Policy Analysis*, 30(2), 89–105.
51. O'Connor, P., & Scott, S. (2021). Leadership competence and training. *Educational Leadership*

Quarterly, 57(2), 250–270.

52. Perdomo, J. (2022). Resilient leadership: Bouncing forward in times of adversity. *Leadership Insights Journal*, 7(1), 15–28.
53. Philippine Statistics Authority. (2025). Civil status classification and demographic indicators.
54. Reed, S. (2018). Leadership resilience and professional experience. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 12(3), 45–59.
55. Reyes, J., & Bautista, M. (2024). Professional development and leadership resilience. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 18(2), 90–105.
56. Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2019). Leadership and student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(5), 635–674.
57. Vatankhah, S. (2026). Leadership resilience and institutional support. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 21(1), 77–93.
58. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 13(1), 55–70.