# Adaptive Leadership Strategies on Transforming Teacher Attributes and School Performance

Santa Isabel C. Mercado[a]

santaisabel.mercado@deped.gov.ph
Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

**Abstract**

This research was entitled "Adaptive Leadership Strategies in Transforming Teacher Attributes and School Performance". The purpose of this study was to determine the possible relationship between adaptive leadership strategies in transforming teacher attributes and school performance of 296 teachers and 17 School heads in the Division of Laguna. The researcher attempted to determine the level of adaptive leadership in terms of emotional intelligence, organizational justice, character, innovativeness, resilience sustainability, communication, and transparency. The researcher also asked to answer the level of teachers' attributes in terms of technology integration, adaptability, collaboration, advocacy, self-reflective, and flexibility. The level of school performance in terms of cohort survival rate, completion rate, drop-out rate, participation rate, retention rate, achievement rate, promotion rate, repetition rate, graduation rate, and school-based management (SBM). Lastly, the researcher identified the significant relationship between adaptive leadership and teachers' attributes, the significant relationship between adaptive leadership and school performance, and the significant relationship in predictors of teacher attributes and adaptive leadership in singly or in combination.

The study found that the level of adaptive leadership and teacher's attributes were highly evident, indicating a positive performance in terms of completion, retention, promotion, and graduation rates. However, the achievement rate was relatively lower, suggesting that there is room for improvement. The drop-out rate was minimal, which is a positive sign. The SBM scores suggested moderate autonomy in school management. The study also revealed that there was a significant relationship between adaptive leadership and teacher's attributes. However, there was no significant relationship between adaptive leadership and school performance.

The researcher concluded that the hypothesis stating that "There is no significant relationship between adaptive leadership and teacher's attributes" was rejected. On the other hand, the hypothesis stating that "There is no significant relationship between adaptive leadership and school performance" was accepted. The null hypothesis that "Singly, teacher's attributes are significant predictors of adaptive leadership" was accepted, which means that there is no significant effect between them. However, the hypothesis that "In combination, teacher's attributes are significant predictors of adaptive leadership" was rejected, indicating a significant effect between them.

Based on the findings and conclusions, the study recommends that school supervisors provide technical assistance to school heads facing difficulties in challenging environments and monitor the performance of teachers and students. School leaders are encouraged to improve their adaptive leadership strategies to enhance their school's performance. Lastly, researchers may expand this study and investigate different approaches and methodologies to understand better the connection between student achievement and adaptive leadership.

*Keywords*: Adaptive; leadership; organizational justice

# 1. Introduction

Schools encounter a variety of issues in the dynamic and always-changing field of education, which calls for creative and capable leadership strategies. One such strategy that has grown significantly in relevance and recognition is adaptive leadership. A concept known as "adaptive leadership" strongly emphasizes the capacity to manage challenging situations, encourage personal growth, and bring about constructive improvements in student performance.

Adaptive leadership offers a more flexible and responsive style of leadership that is well-suited to the complexities and uncertainties of the educational environment. Educational organizations today are confronted by demands for near-constant change in dealing with problems that are highly complex, often ill-understood, ambiguous, and with uncertain outcomes.

To achieve the government's objective of delivering high-quality basic education, school administrators play a crucial role in adapting to changes in the educational system. According to Republic Act 9155, the school head oversees both the administrative and academic operations of a school or group of schools. The functions of school administrators include the administration of teaching programs, personnel management of staff, human resource, management, financial and physical source management, stakeholders' relationship management, and maintenance of a conducive environment that promotes safety and security for both learners and teachers (Adebiy et.al., 2019).

Each school needs a principal who shall manage and supervise teachers for the delivery of quality education and carry out educational programs, projects, and services. The said principal is accountable and responsible for administering the overall school operations. In this manner, the principal must portray excellence in leadership in striving for the success of managing the school to carry out the duties and responsibilities as stated in Republic Act No. 9155.

In the context of school performance, adaptive leadership plays a pivotal role in driving improvement and achieving desired outcomes. It involves a proactive and forward-thinking mindset, where leaders continuously scan the internal and external environments to identify emerging trends, challenges, and opportunities. By staying attuned to the needs and aspirations of stakeholders, adaptive leaders can effectively mobilize resources and implement strategic initiatives that align with the school's vision and goals.

Considering the previously mentioned expectations for schools, school administrators and leaders should possess unique abilities, such as adaptive leadership skills, to enable them to make the necessary modifications so that other stakeholders can carry out their duties efficiently. For schools to fulfill their mandate for society and continue to be relevant and effective, Drake et al. (2016) contend that they must receive the highest priority and attention.     Finally, the researcher arrived at this study to gain knowledge and understand the qualities of adaptive leaders regarding teachers' attributes and school performance in the division of Laguna

## 1.1 Statement of the problem
1. What is the level of adaptive leadership in terms of:
    1.1 Emotional Intelligence;
    1.2 Organizational Justice;
    1.3 Character;
    1.4 Innovativeness;
    1.5 Resilience and Sustainability; and
    1.6 Communication and Transparency?
2. What is the level of teacher's attributes in terms of;

2.1 Technology Integration;
2.2 Adaptability;
2.3 Collaboration;
2.4 Advocacy;
2.5 Self-Reflective; and
2.6 Flexibility?
3. What is the level of school performance relative to:
    3.1 Cohort Survival Rate;
    3.2 Completion Rate;
    3.3 Drop–out Rate;
    3.4 Participation Rate;
    3.5 Retention Rate;
    3.6 Achievement Rate;
    3.7 Promotion Rate;
    3.8 Repetition Rate;
    3.9 Graduation Rate; and
    3.10 SBM?
4. Does Adaptive Leadership have a significant relationship to the Teachers' Attributes?
5. Does Adaptive Leadership have a significant relationship to school performance?
6. Singly or in combination are teacher's attributes significant predictors of adaptive leadership.

## 2. Methodology

Descriptive correlational design research was used in this study. A survey form was sent out to teachers and school heads. Teachers evaluated their own social behavior and competence, which is influenced by the conflict resolution approach used by the school head. A descriptive quantitative research design was employed by the researcher to obtain the necessary data. The research respondents were composed of two hundred ninety-six (296) public school teachers and seventeen (17) school heads from five (5) sub-offices in the Division of Laguna. Random sampling was utilized in selecting the respondents. The researcher's instrument for this study is the development of a series of questionnaires suited for the problems of the study.

## 3. Results and Discussion

This chapter enumerates the different results yielded from the treatment of the data gathered in the study. The following tabular presentation and discussions further characterize Adaptive leadership, Teachers' attributes, and the school's performance.

In the context of education, adaptive leadership is the ability to foresee and resolve new problems while cultivating a resilient and flexible culture. It entails supporting experimentation, viewing setbacks as teaching moments, and giving all stakeholders the authority to participate in decision-making and problem-solving processes. Adaptive leadership in education helps schools to effectively respond to the changing requirements of students, communities, and the larger educational landscape by emphasizing continual development and adaptation. This fosters positive change and long-term progress.

| The school head…. | Mean | SD | Descriptive |
|---|---|---|---|
| …is good at adapting with teachers and colleagues. | 3.70 | 0.52 | Always |
| …understand the emotions and perspectives of others. | 3.61 | 0.57 | Always |
| …understand his/her own emotions, strengths, weaknesses, and values. | 3.74 | 0.49 | Always |
| …able to stay calm under pressure, make rational decisions, and not let personal feelings negatively impact | 3.73 | 0.50 | Always |

*their leadership.*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *… manage stressful situations/people during his/her work.* | *3.68* | *0.54* | *Always* |
| **Overall mean:** | | *3.68* | |
| **Overall SD:** | | *0.44* | |
| **Interpretation:** | | *Highly Manifested* | |

*Table 1. Level of Adaptive Leadership in terms of Emotional Intelligence*

Based on the responses, "The school head understands his/her own emotions, strengths, weaknesses, and values" it yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.74, SD = 0.49) and it was described as always. Also, understanding the emotions and perspectives of others, while the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.61, SD = 0.57), still indicates a positive characteristic of adaptive leadership style in terms of emotional intelligence. The level of adaptive leadership in terms of emotional intelligence attained a weighted mean score of 3.69 and a standard deviation of 0.44 and was verbally interpreted as highly manifested among the respondents.

Overall, the school heads manifested a high level of understanding of their own emotions, strengths, weaknesses, and values. However, the results also imply the need for school heads to increase their understanding of the emotions and perspectives of others. This is after this statement got the lowest mean, though found highly manifested.

| *The school head …* | *Mean* | *SD* | *Descriptive* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *… is aware that crucial decisions are being made, and he/she takes the initiative to provide suggestions or feedback from others.* | *3.71* | *0.50* | *Always* |
| *…is more focused on whether a key decision is best for the overall organization than how the decision may impact his/her performance.* | *3.70* | *0.50* | *Always* |
| *… Make sure to understand why key decisions were made.* | *3.71* | *0.50* | *Always* |
| *… effectively conducts research and gathers data to support decision-making.* | *3.67* | *0.53* | *Always* |
| *… provide clear, timely, and relevant information to those affected by decisions.* | *3.70* | *0.51* | *Always* |
| **Overall mean:** | | *3.69* | |
| **Overall SD:** | | *0.42* | |
| **Interpretation:** | | *Highly Manifested* | |

*Table 2. Level of Adaptive Leadership in terms of Organizational Justice*

From the statement above, "The school heads are aware that crucial decisions are being made, and he/she takes the initiative to provide suggestions or feedback from others, and making sure to understand why key decisions were made, both yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.71, SD = 0.50) and it was described as always. While effectively conducting research and gathering data to support decision-making by the school heads, the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.67, SD = 0.53) but still it is manifested the organizational justice of an adaptive leader. The level of adaptive leadership in terms of organizational justice attained a weighted mean score of 3.70 and a standard deviation of 0.42 and was verbally interpreted as highly manifested among the respondents.

Overall, the school heads manifested a high level of awareness in making crucial decisions and took the initiative to provide suggestions or feedback from others, and a high level of understanding of why key decisions were made. However, the results also imply the need for school heads to effectively conduct research and gather data to support decision-making. This is after this statement got the lowest mean, though found highly manifested.

| *The school head …* | *Mean* | *SD* | *Descriptive* |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *... stands by decisions found in the interest of the organization.* | 3.66 | 0.52 | *Always* |
| *... acts with consideration rather than for personal gain.* | 3.64 | 0.53 | *Always* |
| *... possess high ethical standards and demonstrate honesty, transparency, and fairness in their actions.* | 3.68 | 0.52 | *Always* |
| *... takes prompt action in cases of unprofessional or unethical behavior by his/her subordinates.* | 3.67 | 0.50 | *Always* |
| *...Demonstrating empathy can build strong relationships and create a supportive school culture.* | 3.71 | 0.51 | *Always* |
| *Overall mean:* | | 3.67 | |
| *Overall SD:* | | 0.43 | |
| *Interpretation:* | | *Highly Manifested* | |

*Table 3. Level of Adaptive Leadership in terms of Character*

From the responses above, "Demonstrating empathy can build strong relationships and create a supportive school culture", yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.71, SD = 0.51) and it was described as always. While acting with consideration rather than for the personal gain of the school head, the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.64, SD = 0.53) but still it manifests the character of an adaptive leader. The level of adaptive leadership in terms of character attained a weighted mean score of 3.68 and a standard deviation of 0.43 and was verbally interpreted as highly manifested among the respondents.

The finding shows highly manifested school heads' character by demonstrating empathy and building strong relationships to create a supportive school culture. However, the results also imply the need for school heads to act with consideration rather than for personal gain to their subordinates. This is after this statement got the lowest mean, though found always.

| *The school head ...* | *Mean* | *SD* | *Descriptive* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *... discover new and better strategies and approaches to help improve school performance.* | 3.66 | 0.50 | *Always* |
| *... shows dynamism in learning new things and openness to experimentation and risk-taking.* | 3.73 | 0.48 | *Always* |
| *... foresees and counteracts any reluctant behavior from teammates and makes necessary programs to address the gaps.* | 3.67 | 0.52 | *Always* |
| *... creates an environment that embraces the diversity of views and takes advantage of such collective knowledge to benefit the organization.* | 3.70 | 0.48 | *Always* |
| *... innovates new teaching methods, curriculum designs, or pedagogical approaches to enhance the quality of education provided to students.* | 3.73 | 0.47 | *Always* |
| *Overall mean:* | | 3.69 | |
| *Overall SD:* | | 0.41 | |
| *Interpretation:* | | *Highly Manifested* | |

*Table 4. Level of Adaptive Leadership in terms of Innovativeness*

It can be gleaned from the data that, "The school heads show dynamism in learning new things and openness to experimentation and risk-taking and, innovates new teaching methods, curriculum designs, or pedagogical approaches to enhance the quality of education provided to students", both yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.73, SD = 0.48, SD = 0.47) and it was described as always. While, discovering new and better strategies and approaches to help improve school performance, got the lowest response with the mean of (M = 3.61, SD = 0.57), but still possess the innovativeness of the school heads.

The level of adaptive leadership in terms of innovativeness attained a weighted mean score of 3.70 and

a standard deviation of 0.42 and was verbally interpreted as highly manifested among the respondents.

Overall, the school heads manifested a high level of dynamism in learning new things, openness to experimentation, risk-taking, and innovating new teaching methods, curriculum designs, or pedagogical approaches to enhance the quality of education provided to students.

| My school head … | Mean | SD | Descriptive |
|---|---|---|---|
| … analyze issues, develop effective solutions, and implement them promptly. | 3.69 | 0.51 | Always |
| … involves taking care of one's physical and mental health. | 3.60 | 0.54 | Always |
| … has a clear and compelling vision for the school's future and a well-defined mission. | 3.72 | 0.49 | Always |
| … build strong leadership teams, delegate responsibilities, and empower others within the school community. | 3.73 | 0.49 | Always |
| … engage in ongoing professional development to stay current with best practices and educational trends. | 3.74 | 0.48 | Always |
| **Overall mean:** | | 3.69 | |
| **Overall SD:** | | 0.42 | |
| **Interpretation:** | | Highly Manifested | |

**Table 5.** *Level of Adaptive Leadership in terms of Resilience and Sustainability*

Based on the responses "Engage in ongoing professional development to stay current with best practices and educational trends", yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.74, SD = 0.48) and it was described as always. While in taking care of one's physical and mental health, the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.60, SD = 0.54) but still it is manifested in the resilience and sustainability of an adaptive leader.

The level of adaptive leadership in terms of resilience and sustainability attained a weighted mean score of 3.69 and a standard deviation of 0.42 and was verbally interpreted as highly manifested among the respondents.

The finding shows that school heads have resilience and sustainability in engaging in ongoing professional development to stay current with best practices and educational trends as always. However, the results also imply the need for school heads to take care of one's physical and mental health. This is after this statement got the lowest mean, though found always.

| My school head … | Mean | SD | Descriptive |
|---|---|---|---|
| … regularly communicate the vision, goals, and objectives of the school to all partners and stakeholders for transparency and accomplishment purposes. | 3.73 | 0.47 | Always |
| … encourage open dialogue and feedback from stakeholders through SOSA – State of the School Address. | 3.76 | 0.45 | Always |
| …provide updates on achievements and progress. | 3.77 | 0.44 | Always |
| …quarterly share information about decision-making processes with colleagues. | 3.71 | 0.50 | Always |
| …is available and approachable for discussions and concerns all the time. | 3.73 | 0.49 | Always |
| **Overall mean:** | | 3.74 | |
| **Overall SD:** | | 0.38 | |
| **Interpretation:** | | Highly Manifested | |

**Table 6.** *Level of Adaptive Leadership in terms of Communication and Transparency*

As revealed in the data, "The school heads provide updates on achievements and progress", yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.77, SD = 0.44) and it was described as always. While sharing information about

decision-making processes with colleagues quarterly, got the lowest response with the mean of (M = 3.71, SD = 0.50), but still possessed the communication and transparency of the school heads.

The level of adaptive leadership in terms of communication and transparency attained a weighted mean score of 3.69 and a standard deviation of 0.42 and was verbally interpreted as highly manifested among the respondents.

| As a teacher I... | Mean | SD | Descriptive |
|---|---|---|---|
| ...used and created dynamic and interactive lessons. | 3.71 | 0.45 | Always |
| ...used technology to access online courses, webinars, and resources for professional development. | 3.62 | 0.54 | Always |
| ...collaborate with colleagues, share lesson plans, and access a vast network of educational resources through different multimedia platforms. | 3.75 | 0.45 | Always |
| ...need to be aware of internet safety and digital citizenship issues to educate students about responsible online behavior and protect their privacy. | 3.73 | 0.46 | Always |
| ...used different multimedia for my learning materials. | 3.69 | 0.48 | Always |
| **Overall mean:** | | 3.71 | |
| **Overall SD:** | | 0.35 | |
| **Interpretation:** | | Highly Evident | |

**Table 7.** *Level of Teacher's attributes in terms of technology integration.*

The table shows the level of teachers' attributes in terms of technology integration. It also shows the statements, mean, and standard deviation. Based on the responses "Collaborating with colleagues, sharing lesson plans, and accessing

a vast network of educational resources through different multimedia platforms",

yielded the highest mean score (M 3.75, SD = 0.45) and it was described as always. Using technology to access online courses, webinars, and resources for professional development, got the lowest response with the mean of (M = 3.62, SD = 0.54), but still possesses the technology integration of the teachers.

The level of teachers' attributes in terms of technology integration attained a weighted mean score of 3.70 and a standard deviation of 0.35 and was verbally interpreted as highly evident among the respondents. Overall, the teachers manifested a high level of collaboration with colleagues, sharing lesson plans, and accessing a vast network of educational resources through different multimedia platforms. However, the results also imply the need for teachers to access online courses, webinars, and resources for professional development. This is after this statement got the lowest mean, though found always.

| As a teacher I... | Mean | SD | Descriptive |
|---|---|---|---|
| ...adapt to cope with unexpected situations in classroom management by regulating emotions that might arise such as frustration, anger, or mirth conveying patience, or thinking of alternative ways to solve problems. | 3.78 | 0.41 | Always |
| ...effectively interact with colleagues under shifting conditions, such as when there is a change in job role, they require resources to teach a new part of the curriculum, or they require help to deal with a new or challenging student. | 3.78 | 0.43 | Always |
| ...interact effectively with new colleagues, adjust to the different priorities of new managers or colleagues, or calibrate to the style of a new teaching aide in the classroom. | 3.77 | 0.42 | Always |
| ...prepare to stop a lesson midway, reschedule their teaching, or condense content into less time when time is pressing. | 3.67 | 0.49 | Always |
| ...regularly involved in professional learning and are expected | 3.70 | 0.46 | Always |

*to integrate new knowledge into their teaching practice continually.*

| | |
|---|---|
| ***Overall mean:*** | 3.74 |
| ***Overall SD:*** | 0.34 |
| ***Interpretation:*** | *Highly Evident* |

***Table 8.*** *Level of Teacher's attributes in terms of adaptability.*

It can be gleaned from the data that, "The teachers adapt to cope with unexpected situations in classroom management by regulating emotions that might arise such as frustration, anger or mirth conveying patience, or thinking of alternative ways to solve problems, and effectively interact with colleagues under shifting conditions, such as when there is a change in job role, they require resources to teach a new part of the curriculum, or they require help to deal with a new or challenging student", both yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.78, SD = 0.41, SD = 0.43) and it was described as always. While preparing to stop a lesson midway, reschedule their teaching, or condense content into less time when time is pressing, got the lowest response with the mean of (M = 3.67, SD = 0.49), but still possess the adaptability of the teachers.

The level of teachers' attributes in terms of adaptability attained a weighted mean score of 3.73 and a standard deviation of 0.34 and was verbally interpreted as highly evident among the respondents.

Overall, the teachers manifested a high level of adapting to cope with unexpected situations in classroom management by regulating emotions that might arise such as frustration, anger, or mirth conveying patience, thinking of alternative ways to solve problems, and effectively interacting with colleagues under shifting conditions, such as when there is a change in job role, they require resources to teach a new part of the curriculum, or they require help to deal with a new or challenging student. However, the results also imply the need for the teachers preparing to stop a lesson midway, reschedule their teaching, or condense content into less time when time is pressed, getting the lowest response. This is after this statement got the lowest mean, though found always.

| *As a teacher I...* | *Mean* | *SD* | *Descriptive* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *... participating in the collaboration activities has improved my instructional practice.* | *3.78* | *0.42* | *Always* |
| *...share personal teaching practices among colleagues is important and increases student learning.* | *3.72* | *0.45* | *Always* |
| *...share my knowledge and expertise with other teachers to solve problems of teaching and learning.* | *3.75* | *0.43* | *Always* |
| *...seek out other teachers' expertise to help solve problems in teaching and learning.* | *3.77* | *0.42* | *Always* |
| *...collaborate with parents, community members, and local organizations to create a more comprehensive learning environment.* | *3.78* | *0.42* | *Always* |
| ***Overall mean:*** | | *3.76* | |
| ***Overall SD:*** | | *0.33* | |
| ***Interpretation:*** | | *Highly Evident* | |

***Table 9.*** *Level of Teacher's attributes in terms of collaboration.*

As reflected in the table, "the teachers collaborate with parents, community members, and local organizations to create a more comprehensive learning environment", yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.78, SD = 0.42) and it was described as always. While sharing personal teaching practices among colleagues is important and increases student learning, got the lowest response with the mean of (M = 3.72, SD = 0.45), but still possesses the collaboration of the teachers.

The level of teachers' attributes in terms of collaboration attained a weighted mean score of 3.76 and a standard deviation of 0.33 and was verbally interpreted as highly evident among the respondents.

The finding shows always of teachers' collaboration with regards in collaborating with parents,

community members, and local organizations to create a more comprehensive learning environment. However, the results also imply the need for teachers to share personal teaching practices among colleagues is important and increases student learning. This is after this statement got the lowest mean, though found always.

| As a teacher I... | Mean | SD | Descriptive |
|---|---|---|---|
| ...try to increase public awareness of the educational needs of vulnerable students. | 3.70 | 0.46 | Always |
| ...advocate for the best interests of students, ensuring that their needs are met and that they have access to quality education. | 3.77 | 0.42 | Always |
| ...advocates for equity and inclusion, working to eliminate disparities in education and ensure that all students have equal opportunities to succeed, regardless of their background. | 3.74 | 0.44 | Always |
| ...encourage parents and communities to become involved in education and advocate for the needs of their schools and students. | 3.75 | 0.44 | Always |
| ...advocate for their rights and working conditions, including fair compensation, job security, and support for their professional development. | 3.77 | 0.43 | Always |
| **Overall mean:** | | 3.74 | |
| **Overall SD:** | | 0.34 | |
| **Interpretation:** | | Highly Evident | |

**Table 10.** *Level of Teacher's attributes in terms of advocacy.*

From the statement above, the teachers advocate for their rights and working conditions, including fair compensation, job security, and support for their professional development, and advocate for the best interests of students, ensuring that their needs are met and that they have access to quality education, both yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.77, SD = 0.42, SD = 0.43) and it was described as always. Also, for teachers trying to increase public awareness of the educational needs of vulnerable students by the teachers, the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.70, SD = 0.46) but still possesses the advocacy of the teachers.

The level of teachers' attributes in terms of advocacy attained a weighted mean score of 3.75 and a standard deviation of 0.34 and was verbally interpreted as highly evident among the respondents.

The finding shows always that teachers advocate about advocating their rights and working conditions, including fair compensation, job security, and support for their professional development, and advocate for the best interests of students, ensuring that their needs are met and that they have access to quality education. However, the results also imply the need for teachers to try to increase public awareness of the educational needs of vulnerable students by the teachers. This is after this statement got the lowest mean, though found always.

| As a teacher I... | Mean | SD | Descriptive |
|---|---|---|---|
| ...evaluate my classroom management skills through assessment and feedback. | 3.74 | 0.45 | Always |
| ...reflect on how you assess student learning and provide feedback. | 3.73 | 0.44 | Always |
| ...consider how I differentiate instruction to meet the diverse needs of your students. | 3.75 | 0.43 | Always |
| ...reflect on my commitment to professional growth capacity building. | 3.77 | 0.43 | Always |
| ...think about how I engage my students in the learning process. | 3.79 | 0.42 | Always |
| **Overall mean:** | | 3.76 | |
| **Overall SD:** | | 0.33 | |
| **Interpretation:** | | *Highly Evident* | |

**Table 11.** *Level of Teacher's attributes in terms of self-reflective.*

Based on the responses, "the teachers think about how they engage their

Students in the learning process", it yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.79, SD = 0.42) and it was described as always. Also, reflect on how teachers assess student learning and provide feedback, the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.73, SD = 0.44) but still possess the advocacy of the teachers.

The level of teachers' attributes in terms of advocacy attained a weighted mean score of 3.76 and a standard deviation of 0.34 and was verbally interpreted as highly evident among the respondents.

The finding shows as always that teachers are self-reflective about thinking about how they engage their students in the learning process. However, the results also imply the need for teachers to reflect on how teachers assess student learning and provide feedback. This is after this statement got the lowest mean, though found always.

| As a teacher I... | Mean | SD | Descriptive |
|---|---|---|---|
| ...accommodate the varied learning styles, abilities, and interests of their students. | 3.78 | 0.41 | Always |
| ...respond to unexpected changes and challenges in the classroom, whether they involve disruptions, technology issues, or unexpected events. | 3.73 | 0.45 | Always |
| ...employ a variety of teaching methods and strategies to address the diverse needs of my students. | 3.79 | 0.41 | Always |
| ...can customize instruction for individual students. | 3.74 | 0.45 | Always |
| ...recognize and respect the diverse cultural backgrounds and experiences of students. | 3.78 | 0.43 | Always |
| *Overall mean:* | | 3.76 | |
| *Overall SD:* | | 0.34 | |
| *Interpretation:* | | *Highly Evident* | |

**Table 12.** *Level of Teacher's attributes in terms of flexibility.*

From the statement above, "the teachers employ a variety of teaching methods and strategies to address the diverse needs of my students" it yielded the highest mean score (M= 3.79, SD = 0.41, SD = 0.43) and it was described as always. While responding to unexpected changes and challenges in the classroom, whether they involve disruptions, technology issues, or unexpected events, the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.73, SD = 0.45) but still possesses the advocacy of the teachers.

The level of teachers' attributes in terms of advocacy attained a weighted mean score of 3.76 and a standard deviation of 0.34 and was verbally interpreted as highly evident among the respondents.

Overall, the teacher manifested a high level of flexibility in employing a variety of teaching methods and strategies to address the diverse needs of my students. However, the results also imply the need for teachers to respond to unexpected changes and challenges in the classroom, whether they involve disruptions, technology issues, or unexpected events. This is after this statement got the lowest mean, though found always.

| Performance Indicator | SY. 2020- 2021 | | SY. 2021- 2022 | | SY. 2022- 2023 | | Average | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Cohort – Survival Rate | 93.49 | 7.01 | 91.93 | 7.68 | 91.31 | 18.48 | 92.25 | 10.83 |
| Completion Rate | 91.74 | 4.56 | 92.51 | 5.10 | 96.40 | 2.41 | 93.55 | 3.64 |
| Drop-Out Rate | .27 | .61 | .42 | .55 | .49 | 1.11 | .393 | .645 |
| Participation Rate | 95.79 | 5.51 | 95.40 | 6.04 | 96.55 | 5.69 | 95.68 | 5.36 |
| Retention Rate | 93.79 | 7.52 | 94.37 | 6.36 | 96.54 | 4.49 | 94.10 | 4.93 |

**Table 13.** *Level of school performance relative to Cohort Survival Rate, Completion Rate, Drop-out Rate, Participation Rate, Retention*

| Rate, | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Achievement Rate | 52.54 | 20.87 | 66.23 | 4.00 | 70.13 | 8.47 | 62.97 | 7.06 |
| | Promotion Rate | 99.43 | 1.14 | 98.83 | 1.51 | 99.07 | 1.61 | 99.11 | 1.13 |
| | Repetition Rate | .29 | .77 | .17 | .28 | .21 | .49 | .23 | .419 |
| | Graduation Rate | 100 | .0 | 99.80 | .40 | 99.96 | .16 | 99.92 | .133 |
| | SBM | 2.03 | .18 | 2.38 | .49 | 2.66 | .48 | 2.36 | .276 |

*Achievement Rate, Promotion Rate, Repetition Rate, Graduation Rate, and SBM.*

Table 14 shows the level of school performance relative to Cohort Survival Rate, Completion Rate, Drop-out Rate, Participation Rate, Retention Rate, Achievement Rate, Promotion Rate, Repetition Rate, Graduation Rate, and SBM. These indicators provide insights into various aspects of school performance over three academic years (SY. 2020-2021, SY. 2021-2022, and SY. 2022-2023).

Cohort survival rate indicates that, on average, approximately 92.25% of students remained enrolled from the beginning to the end of their cohort's schooling period and yielded the highest mean in the school year 2020-2021. A high cohort survival rate in schools indicates that a large proportion of students' progress through their academic program without significant attrition, which reflects positively on the school's ability to support student success and retention.

The completion rate showed an increasing trend over the three years, with a notable improvement in three succeeding years, and has an average of 93.55%. A high completion rate contributes to positive school outcomes such as higher graduation rates, increased academic achievement, and better post-secondary opportunities for students, thus enhancing the overall reputation and success of the school. The drop-out rate shows a slight increase over the years, with SY. 2022-2023 has the highest mean drop-out rate and standard deviation. However, a low dropout rate signifies that fewer students are leaving school before completing their education, which reflects positively on the school's ability to engage and support its students. This indicator suggests that the school provides a nurturing and conducive learning environment, effective academic and social support systems, and relevant educational opportunities that motivate students to stay enrolled.

The participation rate remained relatively high and stable across the three years, with minimal fluctuations in mean values and standard deviations. Overall, this suggests that the educational program successfully engaged a large majority of eligible students throughout the years, contributing to a positive learning environment and educational outcomes. The retention rate showed an increasing trend over the three years, with the lowest mean retention rate observed in SY. 2020-2021 and on average 94.10% of students remained enrolled in the same grade or school over time.

The achievement rate showed an increasing trend over the three years, with significant improvements observed from SY. 2020-2021 to SY. 2022-2023 and a positive trend in academic achievement, with a notable improvement in student performance over the specified period. The promotion rate remained consistently high across the three years, and an average of 99.11% of students were promoted to the next grade level or educational stage over the specified period. The repetition rate remained consistently low across the three years and in the school year 2021-2022 got the lowest mean which is good for the performance of the school and the learners. The graduation rate remained consistently high across the three years and manifested the highest mean in the school year 2020-2021. Ultimately, a high graduation rate signifies the school's effectiveness in preparing students for future endeavors, contributing to positive outcomes for both individuals and the broader community. Lastly, the mean SBM score showed an increasing trend from SY. 2020-2021 to SY. 2022-2023, and the highest mean placed in the school year 2022-2023 emphasizes a strong SBM system that enables schools to adapt and thrive in dynamic educational environments, enhancing student success and fostering a culture of continuous improvement.

Overall, the school demonstrates strong performance in terms of completion, retention, promotion, and graduation rates. However, the achievement rate appears relatively lower, indicating room for improvement. The drop-out rate is minimal, which is positive. SBM scores suggest moderate autonomy in school management.

| Adaptive Leadership (IV) | Teachers' Attributes (DV) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Technology Integration | Adaptability | Collaboration | Advocacy | Self-Reflective | Flexibility |
| **Emotional Intelligence:** | | | | | | |
| Pearson Correlation | 0.257** | 0.299** | 0.261** | 0.354** | 0.333** | 0.292** |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| N | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 |
| Strength | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak |
| Analysis | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant |
| **Organizational Justice:** | | | | | | |
| Pearson Correlation | 0.288** | 0.345** | 0.290** | 0.387** | 0.383** | 0.365** |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| N | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 |
| Strength | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak |
| Analysis | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant |
| **Character:** | | | | | | |
| Pearson Correlation | 0.262** | 0.311** | 0.309** | 0.382** | 0.356** | 0.355** |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| N | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 |
| Strength | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak |
| Analysis | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant |
| **Innovativeness:** | | | | | | |
| Pearson Correlation | 0.223** | 0.234** | 0.279** | 0.390** | 0.354** | 0.372** |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| N | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 |
| Strength | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak |
| Analysis | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant |
| **Resilience and Sustainability:** | | | | | | |
| Pearson Correlation | 0.289** | 0.358** | 0.315** | 0.385** | 0.379** | 0.383** |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| N | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 |
| Strength | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak |
| Analysis | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant |
| **Communication and Transparency:** | | | | | | |
| Pearson Correlation | 0.317** | 0.350** | 0.301** | 0.395** | 0.404** | 0.381** |
| Significance(2-Tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| N | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 |
| Strength | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak |
| Analysis | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant | Significant |

| *Legend* | |
|---|---|
| **Scale** | **Strength** |
| 0.80 – 1.00 | Very Strong |
| 0.60 – 0.79 | Strong |
| 0.40 – 0.59 | Moderate |
| 0.20 – 0.39 | Weak |
| 0.00 – 0.19 | Very Weak |

*Table 14. Significant Relationship between Adaptive Leadership and the Teacher's Attributes.*

The Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Justice, Character, Innovativeness, Resilience and Sustainability, and Communication and Transparency of adaptive leadership were observed to have a

significant relationship to Technology Integration, Adaptability, Collaboration, Advocacy, Self-reflective and Flexibility of the teachers. This is based on the computed r values obtained from the test with a weak relationship. Furthermore, the p-values obtained were less than the significance alpha 0.05, hence there is a significance.

**Table 15.** *Significant Relationship between Adaptive Relationships and the School Performance*

**Table 16A.** *Single analysis of teacher's attributes as predictors of adaptive leadership.*

| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | T | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Technology Integration | (Constant) | 2.569 | .200 | | 12.877 | .000 |
| | Emotional Intelligence | .007 | .080 | .009 | .088 | .930 |
| | Organizational Justice | .181 | .116 | .216 | 1.556 | .121 |
| | Character | -.019 | .103 | -.023 | -.185 | .854 |
| | Innovativeness | -.212 | .101 | -.251 | -2.107 | .036 |
| | Resilience and Sustainability | .105 | .119 | .125 | .885 | .377 |
| | Communication and Transparency | .241 | .088 | .261 | 2.738 | .007 |
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |

| Adaptive Leadership (IV) | School Performance (DV) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cohort Survival Rate | Completion Rate | Drop-out Rate | Participation Rate | Retention Rate | Achievement Rate | Promotion Rate | Repetition Rate | Graduation Rate | SBM |
| **Emotional Intelligence** Pearson Correlation Significance (2-Tailed) N Analysis | .043 .456 296 NS | -.115* .048 296 S | 0.041 .487 296 NS | 0.108 .064 296 NS | -.023 .700 296 NS | 0.30 .613 296 NS | -.074 .202 296 NS | -.055 .342 296 NS | .034 .561 296 NS | .000 .998 296 NS |
| **Organizational Justice** Pearson Correlation Significance (2-Tailed) N Analysis | -.031 .594 296 NS | -.126* .030 296 S | .021 .720 296 NS | .132* .023 296 S | -.044 .454 296 NS | -.067 .252 296 NS | -.024 .680 296 NS | -.055 .347 296 NS | .034 .560 296 NS | -.069 .236 296 NS |
| **Character** Pearson Correlation Significance (2-Tailed) N Analysis | -.063 .284 296 NS | -.059 .310 296 NS | .009 .884 296 NS | .115* .048 296 S | -.072 .214 296 NS | -.072 .217 296 NS | -.002 .970 296 NS | -.080 .167 296 NS | .091 .118 296 NS | -.014 .813 296 NS |
| **Innovativeness** Pearson Correlation Significance (2-Tailed) N Analysis | -.019 .748 296 NS | -.094 .105 296 NS | .012 .838 296 NS | .125* .032 296 S | -.032 .588 296 NS | -.064 .275 296 NS | -.027 .643 296 NS | -.061 .292 296 NS | -.009 .874 296 NS | -.060 .303 296 NS |
| **Resilience and Sustainability** Pearson Correlation Significance (2-Tailed) N Analysis | -.078 .181 296 NS | -.122* .036 296 S | .033 .573 296 NS | .144* .013 296 S | -.096 .100 296 NS | -.084 .147 296 NS | -.038 .510 296 NS | -.047 .423 296 NS | .036 .535 296 NS | -.086 .139 296 NS |

| Communication and Transparency Pearson Correlation Significance (2-Tailed) N Analysis | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| -.073 | -.076 | .072 | .144* | .125*. | -.091 | -.061 | .007 | .044 | -.103 |
| .211 | .193 | .217 | .031 | .118 | .268 | .292 | .907 | .452 | .078 |
| 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 | 296 |
| *NS* | *NS* | *NS* | *S* | *NS* | *NS* | *NS* | *NS* | *NS* | *NS* |

| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adaptability | (Constant) | 2.495 | .187 | | 13.328 | .000 |
| | Emotional Intelligence | -.004 | .075 | -.006 | -.057 | .955 |
| | Organizational Justice | .137 | .109 | .172 | 1.255 | .211 |
| | Character | -.065 | .096 | -.084 | -.677 | .499 |
| | Innovativeness | -.029 | .094 | -.036 | -.303 | .762 |
| | Resilience and Sustainability | .153 | .112 | .191 | 1.367 | .173 |
| | Communication and Transparency | .143 | .083 | .163 | 1.734 | .084 |
| | | **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| Collaboration | (Constant) | 2.693 | .187 | | 14.377 | .000 |
| | Emotional Intelligence | .000 | .075 | .001 | .006 | .995 |
| | Organizational Justice | .014 | .109 | .018 | .126 | .900 |
| | Character | .105 | .097 | .137 | 1.085 | .279 |
| | Innovativeness | -.029 | .095 | -.037 | -.311 | .756 |
| | Resilience and Sustainability | .082 | .112 | .104 | .729 | .467 |
| | Communication and Transparency | .118 | .083 | .136 | 1.423 | .156 |
| | | **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| Advocacy | (Constant) | 2.263 | .186 | | 12.139 | .000 |
| | Emotional Intelligence | .036 | .075 | .047 | .484 | .629 |
| | Organizational Justice | .046 | .108 | .057 | .424 | .672 |
| | Character | .085 | .096 | .107 | .887 | .376 |
| | Innovativeness | .088 | .094 | .108 | .940 | .348 |
| | Resilience and Sustainability | -.031 | .111 | -.038 | -.278 | .781 |
| | Communication and Transparency | .174 | .082 | .195 | 2.119 | .035 |
| | | **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| Self-Reflective | (Constant) | 2.327 | .184 | | 12.654 | .000 |
| | Emotional Intelligence | -.005 | .074 | -.007 | -.071 | .944 |
| | Organizational Justice | .151 | .107 | .189 | 1.409 | .160 |
| | Character | .010 | .095 | .013 | .106 | .915 |
| | Innovativeness | -.040 | .093 | -.049 | -.429 | .668 |
| | Resilience and Sustainability | .039 | .110 | .048 | .351 | .726 |
| | Communication and Transparency | .230 | .081 | .261 | 2.834 | .005 |
| | | **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| Flexibility | (Constant) | 2.412 | .184 | | 13.074 | .000 |
| | Emotional Intelligence | -.075 | .074 | -.098 | -1.007 | .315 |
| | Organizational Justice | .097 | .107 | .122 | .906 | .366 |
| | Character | .032 | .095 | .042 | .341 | .733 |
| | Innovativeness | .061 | .093 | .076 | .657 | .512 |
| | Resilience and Sustainability | .084 | .110 | .105 | .766 | .444 |
| | Communication and Transparency | .163 | .081 | .186 | 2.004 | .046 |

The table presents the results of ANOVA examining a single analysis of teachers' attributes as

predictors of adaptive leadership. Only the Technology Integration, Self-reflective, Advocacy, and Flexibility of teachers' attributes have a significant effect on the Communication and transparency of adaptive leadership. The majority of the F-test of the overall model is not significant (F (6, 289) with, p > 0.05), indicating that the model is not a good fit for the data. From the findings below, we can infer that at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis "Singly are teacher's attributes are significant predictors of adaptive leadership" is accepted, which incites that there is no significant effect between them.

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Technology Integration | Regression | 4.492 | 6 | .749 | 6.647 | .000[b] |
| | Residual | 32.548 | 289 | .113 | | |
| | Total | 37.040 | 295 | | | |
| Adaptability | Regression | 4.874 | 6 | .812 | 8.193 | .000b |
| | Residual | 28.655 | 289 | .099 | | |
| | Total | 33.530 | 295 | | | |
| Collaboration | Regression | 3.579 | 6 | .597 | 6.008 | .000b |
| | Residual | 28.692 | 289 | .099 | | |
| | Total | 32.271 | 295 | | | |
| Advocacy | Regression | 6.405 | 6 | 1.067 | 10.851 | .000b |
| | Residual | 28.429 | 289 | .098 | | |
| | Total | 34.833 | 295 | | | |
| Self-Reflective | Regression | 6.098 | 6 | 1.016 | 10.624 | .000b |
| | Residual | 27.646 | 289 | .096 | | |
| | Total | 33.744 | 295 | | | |
| Flexibility | Regression | 5.700 | 6 | .950 | 9.867 | .000b |
| | Residual | 27.826 | 289 | .096 | | |
| | Total | 33.526 | 295 | | | |

*Legend: * Significant at 0.05*
*Critical F-vale 2.1300*

**Table 16B**. *Combination analysis of teacher's attributes as predictors of adaptive leadership.*

The table presents the results of ANOVA examining a combination analysis of teachers' attributes of adaptive leadership. Technology Integration, Adaptability, Collaboration, Advocacy, Resilience, and Sustainability, and Flexibility have significant effects on adaptive leadership. The majority of the F-test of the overall model is not significant (F (6, 289) with, p > 0.05), indicating that the model is a good fit for the data. This implies that the teacher's attributes and adaptive leadership are significant predictors as disclosed by the computed F-values of all indicators that were more important than the critical F value of 2.1300.

Moreover, p-values were all less than the significance alpha of 0.05, indicating that a significant difference was identified. Thus, from the findings above, it can be inferred that at a 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis stating that "In combination are teachers' attributes are significant predictors of adaptive leadership" is rejected which implies that there is a significant effect between them.

## 4. *Conclusion and Recommendation*

Based on the foregoing findings, the following conclusion was drawn.

The study showed that the relationship between adaptive leadership and teachers' attributes is significant. Thus, the researcher therefore concluded that the hypothesis stated that "There is no significant relationship between adaptive leadership to the teacher's attributes" is rejected. Also, The relationship between

Adaptive Leadership and School performance has no significance. Thus, the researcher therefore concluded that the hypothesis stated that "There is no significant relationship between adaptive leadership the school performance" is accepted. Lastly, the significant relationship in predictors of teacher attributes and adaptive leadership in singly or in combination. Thus, the researcher, therefore concluded that the null hypothesis "Singly are teacher's attributes are significant predictors of adaptive leadership" is accepted, which implies that there is no significant effect between them. "In combination are teachers' attributes significant predictors of adaptive leadership" is rejected which implies that there is a significant effect between them.

.The researcher therefore recommends that the School supervisors may give technical assistance to the school heads having difficulties in a challenging environment and check the teachers/students' performance and school performance. Next, School leaders are encouraged to think about how they may improve their adaptive leadership strategies for the performance of the school. Lastly, Researchers may expand this study and investigate different approaches to methodology to better understand the connection between student achievement and adaptive leadership.

*References:*
Adebiy, D. O., Daramola, A. O., Seyi - Oderinde, D. R., & Adebiyi, T. F. A. (2019). The behaviors and roles of school principals in tackling security challenges in     Nigeria:    a context - responsive leadership perspective. Journal of  Education Research and  Rural Community  Development,1(2),  74-88.  Retrieved on October 1, 2021, from https://journals.co.za/doi/abs/10.10520/EJC-19c68dc2fc
Drake, S.M. & Savage, M. F. (2016). Negotiating accountability and integrated curriculum in a global context. international Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 15(6). https://.ijlter.org/index.php/ ijlter/article/view/639