

Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, and Resource Mobilization Practices on Adaptive Leadership Competence of School Leaders

Jonel L. Caparoso¹, James L. Paglinawan²

¹School Principal-III, Department of Education, Division of Valencia City, Philippines

²Associate Professor IV, Central Mindanao University Musuan, Bukidnon, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.110400071>

Received: 22 April 2026; Accepted: 28 April 2026; Published: 06 May 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationships among psychological resilience, decision-making capability, and resource mobilization practices in relation to the adaptive leadership competence of school leaders. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered from 233 school leaders in selected public schools in Bukidnon through a validated and reliable survey questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and stepwise multiple regression were used for data analysis.

Findings revealed that school leaders demonstrated high to very high levels of psychological resilience, decision-making capability, resource mobilization practices, and adaptive leadership competence. Psychological resilience was strongest in spirituality, competence, and adaptability. Decision-making capability was high, particularly in data literacy and data usage purpose, while resource mobilization practices were very high, especially in resource acquisition, utilization, innovation, and sustainability. Adaptive leadership competence was also high, with strengths in collaboration, inclusivity, and perspective-taking.

Correlation results showed that all variables were significantly related to adaptive leadership competence, with resource mobilization practices showing the strongest relationship, followed by decision-making capability and psychological resilience. Regression analysis identified resource acquisition and utilization, innovation and sustainability, resource planning and needs assessment, adaptability and support, and data usage culture as significant predictors of adaptive leadership competence. Notably, resource acquisition and utilization emerged as the strongest predictor, while psychological competence showed a negative relationship.

Moreover, adaptive leadership competence is best explained by strong resource management, data-informed decision-making, and flexible leadership behaviors. The findings underscore the importance of strengthening organizational systems and strategic leadership capacities to enhance adaptive leadership in schools.

Keywords: Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, and Resource Mobilization Practices on Adaptive Leadership Competence of School Leaders

INTRODUCTION

Education systems across the globe are undergoing rapid transformation driven by shifting societal demands, technological advancements, and the growing need for high-quality, inclusive learning outcomes. These global pressures have compelled education systems to continuously reform policies and strengthen leadership capacity to ensure that schools remain responsive and effective. In the Philippines, the Department of Education continues to implement large-scale reforms to improve learner achievement, strengthen curriculum relevance, and enhance system responsiveness. Central to the success of these reforms is the role of school leaders, who are expected to translate national policies into effective and contextually responsive school-level practices. Guided by the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), school heads are mandated to demonstrate instructional leadership, strategic management, and professional accountability. However, while these standards

provide a clear framework for effective leadership, the dynamic and evolving nature of educational change requires more than compliance; it demands leaders who can think critically, respond proactively, and adapt effectively to complex and uncertain conditions.

As expectations for leadership continue to expand, school leaders in the Philippines face increasingly complex, interconnected challenges that test their capacity to lead effectively. The implementation of major reforms, such as the MATATAG Curriculum and the Enhanced Senior High School Curriculum, has raised expectations for curriculum delivery, instructional supervision, and learner assessment. In addition, the rollout of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning Programs has intensified efforts to address persistent learning gaps resulting from recent educational disruptions, particularly those caused by the pandemic. While these reforms are essential for improving educational outcomes, they have significantly increased the workload, accountability pressures, and decision-making demands placed on school leaders. These challenges are further compounded by the country's continued low performance in international assessments such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), which highlights persistent weaknesses in foundational skills and underscores the urgent need for more effective and strategic school-level interventions.

The complexity of these challenges became even more evident during the COVID-19 pandemic, which exposed systemic vulnerabilities in the education system and highlighted the limitations of rigid, compliance-based leadership approaches. According to Famero (2024), many school leaders initially relied on standardized or "adoptive" routines aligned with policy directives; however, the unprecedented nature of the crisis required them to shift toward more flexible and adaptive approaches. School heads were compelled to exercise adaptive leadership by developing context-specific solutions, such as mobilizing limited resources to reproduce modules, addressing disparities in digital access among teachers and learners, and ensuring continuity of learning amid widespread uncertainty. These experiences demonstrated that effective leadership during crises cannot rely solely on adherence to prescribed standards but must also involve creativity, flexibility, and responsiveness. Consequently, there is a growing recognition of the need to strengthen adaptive leadership competence among school leaders, a critical requirement for navigating ongoing reforms and future uncertainties.

Within this context, adaptive leadership competence serves as the dependent variable of this study. It refers to the ability of school leaders to respond effectively to complex, rapidly changing challenges, make sound, evidence-based decisions under uncertainty, and lead purposeful organizational change. It also involves the capacity to balance mandated policy requirements with the contextual realities of schools, ensuring responsiveness, resilience, and sustained focus on learner-centered outcomes. In contemporary education systems characterized by continuous reforms, increasing accountability pressures, and post-pandemic recovery demands, adaptive leadership has become a vital competence that enables school leaders to sustain improvement initiatives and achieve desired educational outcomes (Heifetz et al., 2018; Northouse, 2022).

Building on this premise, this study examines three independent variables posited to influence adaptive leadership competence among school leaders. Psychological resilience refers to the capacity of leaders to maintain emotional stability, perseverance, and effective functioning despite stress, adversity, and uncertainty in the school environment (Masten, 2018; Ungar & Theron, 2020). This attribute is particularly important in enabling leaders to sustain performance amidst continuous educational change and pressure. Decision-making capability refers to leaders' ability to critically analyze situations, evaluate alternatives, and implement timely, ethical, and contextually appropriate decisions that address organizational needs (Leithwood et al., 2020; Northouse, 2022). This competence ensures that leadership actions are both strategic and responsive to school demands. Resource mobilization practices, on the other hand, refer to the strategic ability of school leaders to identify, access, allocate, and optimize both internal and external resources to support school programs, innovations, and continuous improvement initiatives (Fullan, 2020; OECD, 2020). This ensures that schools are adequately supported in implementing reforms and sustaining development efforts.

Recent studies emphasize that effective school leadership in rapidly changing educational environments is significantly shaped by psychological resilience, decision-making capability, and resource mobilization practices, all of which contribute to adaptive leadership competence. Evidence suggests that resilient school leaders are better able to cope with uncertainty, sustain performance, and respond effectively to crises and reforms (Pangandoyon et al., 2024; Frost, 2025). Similarly, strong decision-making capability enables leaders to

make timely, data-informed, and context-responsive decisions that directly influence school effectiveness (Hill-Berry & Burris-Melville, 2025). Moreover, strategic resource mobilization has been identified as essential in supporting innovation, collaboration, and school improvement, particularly in resource-constrained environments. Collectively, these competence reinforce adaptive leadership, which is characterized by flexibility, problem-solving, and the ability to navigate complex and evolving educational demands (Çetin & Aydın, 2024). However, despite these findings, there remains limited empirical evidence examining how these variables interact within the Philippine educational context, particularly in local school divisions undergoing continuous reform.

In view of these considerations, this study aimed to examine how psychological resilience, decision-making capability, and resource mobilization practices influence the adaptive leadership competence of school leaders in the three divisions in the Province of Bukidnon—Valencia City, Malaybalay City, and Bukidnon Division. Specifically, it seeks to generate empirical evidence on the extent to which these factors contribute to effective school leadership in a rapidly changing educational environment, thereby providing insights that may inform leadership development programs, policy enhancements, and interventions aimed at strengthening the overall quality of education in the region.

Objectives

This study primarily aimed to establish relationships among psychological resilience, decision-making capability, and resource mobilization practices on the adaptive leadership competence of school leaders. Specifically, it aimed to:

Assess the level of Psychological Resilience of school leaders in terms of

Competence;

Emotional Control;

Adaptability & Support;

Control; and

Spirituality.

Determine the level of Decision-Making Capability of school leaders in terms of

Technological Infrastructure and Hardware;

Data Usage Culture;

Data Usage Purpose; and

Data Literacy.

Identify the level of Resource Mobilization Practices of school leaders in terms of

Resource Planning and Needs Assessment;

External Resource Networking and Partnership;

Resource Acquisition and Utilization; and

Innovation and Sustainability.

Find out the Adaptive Leadership Competence of school leaders.

Correlate Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, Resource Mobilization Practices, and the Adaptive Leadership Competence of school leaders.

Identify the factor, singly or in combination, that best predicts Adaptive Leadership Competence of school leaders.

Hypothesis

The subsequent null hypotheses were formulated and tested at the 0.05 significance level.

Ho1: There is no significant relationship among Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, Resource Mobilization Practices, and the Adaptive Leadership Competence of school leaders.

Ho2: There is no predictor variable for adaptive leadership competence among school leaders.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methods and procedures used to gather and analyze the data. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design using a quantitative approach to examine the levels of psychological resilience, decision-making capability, and resource mobilization practices, and their relationship with the adaptive leadership competence of school leaders. As explained by John W. Creswell and J. David Creswell (2018), this design allows the examination of relationships among variables without manipulation, observing them as they naturally occur.

The study was conducted in selected public elementary and secondary schools in the Province of Bukidnon, including the divisions of Malaybalay City and Valencia City. A total of 233 school leaders—principals, head teachers, officers-in-charge, master teachers, and program coordinators—were selected through purposive and snowball sampling because of their active leadership roles in schools.

Data were collected using a validated survey questionnaire consisting of four parts. The instrument underwent expert validation and pilot testing in the Division of Lanao del Norte, and permission was secured from the concerned Schools Division Superintendents. Psychological resilience was measured using an adapted version of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale by Kathryn M. Connor and Jonathan R. T. Davidson (2003) ($\alpha = 0.953$). Decision-making capability was adapted from Gerlie Rose C. Magdato et al. (2025) ($\alpha = 0.972$), while resource mobilization practices were based on leadership principles of Philip Hallinger (2011) ($\alpha = 0.984$). Adaptive leadership competence was grounded in the framework of Ronald Heifetz, Alexander Grashow, and Marty Linsky (2009) ($\alpha = 0.960$), indicating high reliability across all instruments.

Descriptive statistics, such as the mean and standard deviation, were used to summarize variable levels, while the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to assess relationships among variables. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was further employed to identify significant predictors of adaptive leadership competence among school leaders.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Psychological Resilience in terms of Competence, Emotional Control, Adaptability and Support, Control, and Spirituality

Table 1 presents the level of Psychological Resilience of school leaders across five indicators: competence, emotional control, adaptability and support, control, and spirituality. The overall mean score of 4.29, interpreted as High, indicates that school leaders demonstrate strong Psychological Resilience. This suggests that they are generally capable of managing stress, adapting to challenges, and sustaining effective leadership despite the complex demands of the educational environment.

Table 1. Level of Psychological Resilience of School Leaders

Indicators	Mean	Qualitative Interpretation
Competence	4.38	High
Emotional Control	4.17	High

Adaptability & Support	4.28	High
Control	4.13	High
Spirituality	4.50	High
Overall Mean	4.29	High

Legend:

Scale Range	Verbal Description	Level	Interpretation
4.51 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High	Demonstrates very strong Psychological Resilience
3.51 – 4.50	Agree	High	Demonstrates strong Psychological Resilience
2.51 – 3.50	Undecided	Moderate	Demonstrates moderate Psychological Resilience
1.51 – 2.50	Disagree	Low	Demonstrates low Psychological Resilience
1.00 – 1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low	Demonstrates very low Psychological Resilience

Among the indicators, spirituality obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.50$, High), indicating that school leaders draw strength from personal beliefs, values, and a sense of purpose in performing their roles. This is followed by competence ($M = 4.38$, High) and adaptability and support ($M = 4.28$, High), which imply that school leaders perceive themselves as capable and flexible and are able to utilize support systems effectively. On the other hand, Emotional Control ($M = 4.17$, High) and control ($M = 4.13$, High) received slightly lower scores, although still within the high range, suggesting that while leaders generally regulate emotions and maintain control, these aspects may be more challenged in high-pressure situations.

Furthermore, the consistently high ratings across all indicators signify that school leaders possess a well-developed level of resilience. This is critical in the context of educational leadership, where leaders are expected to respond to reforms, manage uncertainties, and ensure school effectiveness.

These findings are supported by recent studies emphasizing the role of resilience in leadership effectiveness. Christopher Day and Qing Gu (2020) highlighted that resilient school leaders sustain commitment, manage change effectively, and maintain positive school outcomes despite challenges. Similarly, Helen McCallum et al. (2017) found that resilience among school leaders is associated with emotional regulation, professional competence, and the ability to build supportive relationships within the school community.

Also, Andy Hargreaves and Dennis Shirley (2020) emphasized that effective school leadership during reform requires adaptability, emotional strength, and moral purpose—factors closely aligned with the high ratings for competence, adaptability, and spirituality in this study. In addition, Michael Ungar (2018) noted that resilience is shaped not only by individual capacity but also by access to social and contextual supports, reinforcing the importance of adaptability and support systems observed in the results.

Moreover, the high level of spirituality is supported by Kenneth I. Pargament (2017), who explained that spirituality enhances coping mechanisms by providing meaning, direction, and emotional strength during stressful situations. This suggests that spiritual grounding may contribute significantly to the resilience of school leaders.

Decision-Making Capability in terms of Technological Infrastructure, Data Usage Culture, Data Usage Purpose, and Data Literacy

Table 2 presents the level of Decision-Making Capability of school leaders across four indicators: technological infrastructure, data usage culture, data usage purpose, and data literacy. The overall sub-mean of 4.25, interpreted as High Capability, indicates that school leaders generally demonstrate sound and informed decision-making practices. This suggests that they are able to utilize available data and systems effectively in guiding school decisions.

Table 2. Level of Decision-Making Capability of School Leaders

Indicators	Mean	Qualitative Interpretation
Technological Infrastructure	4.21	High Capability
Data Usage Culture	4.21	High Capability
Data Usage Purpose	4.29	High Capability
Data Literacy	4.29	High Capability
Sub-mean	4.25	High Capability

Legend:

Scale Range	Verbal Description	Level	Interpretation
4.51 – 5.00	Always	Very High Capability	Demonstrates consistently effective, data-driven, and timely decision-making
3.51 – 4.50	Often	High Capability	Demonstrates generally sound and informed decision-making
2.51 – 3.50	Sometimes	Moderate Capability	Demonstrates occasional effectiveness but lacks consistency in decision-making
1.51 – 2.50	Seldom	Low Capability	Demonstrates limited ability; decisions are often inconsistent or weak
1.00 – 1.50	Never	Very Low Capability	Demonstrates very limited or ineffective decision-making ability

Among the indicators, Data Usage Purpose and Data Literacy obtained the highest mean scores (M = 4.29, High Capability), indicating that school leaders have a clear understanding of why data is used and possess the necessary skills to interpret and apply it in decision-making. This reflects a strong alignment between data interpretation and its practical application in school management. Meanwhile, Technological Infrastructure (M = 4.21, High Capability) and Data Usage Culture (M = 4.21, High Capability) also received high ratings, suggesting that schools have relatively adequate systems and a supportive environment for data-driven decision-making, though these areas may still benefit from further strengthening.

Moreover, the consistently high ratings imply that school leaders are capable of making informed, data-driven, and timely decisions. However, since all indicators fall within the “High” rather than “Very High” level, it indicates that while decision-making practices are generally effective, there is still potential for enhancement, particularly in strengthening systems and cultivating a more robust data-driven culture.

These findings are supported by recent studies emphasizing the importance of data use in educational leadership. Ellen B. Mandinach and Edith S. Gummer (2017) emphasized that Data Literacy is essential for school leaders to transform data into actionable knowledge, enabling informed and strategic decisions. Similarly, Kim Schildkamp (2019) highlighted that effective data use in schools depends on leaders’ ability to promote a culture of data use, provide clear purposes for data application, and ensure access to appropriate technological systems.

Furthermore, Allan Odden et al. (2020) noted that strong decision-making in schools is closely linked to the integration of data systems, leadership capacity, and organizational support, which aligns with the high ratings in Technological Infrastructure and data usage culture. In addition, Cindy Poortman and Kim Schildkamp (2018) found that when school leaders foster collaborative data use and clarify its purpose, it leads to improved instructional decisions and school outcomes.

Moreover, the results support John W. Creswell's (2018) assertion that effective decision-making in organizations is strengthened when individuals are equipped with the skills to analyze and interpret data systematically. This reinforces the importance of Data Literacy and purposeful data use as reflected in the study.

Resource Mobilization Practices in Terms of Resource Planning and Needs Assessment, External Resource Networking and Partnerships, Resource Acquisition and Utilization, and Innovation and Sustainability

Table 3 presents the level of Resource Mobilization Practices of school leaders across four indicators: Resource Planning and Needs Assessment, External Resource Networking and Partnerships, Resource Acquisition and Utilization, and Innovation and Sustainability. The overall sub-mean of 4.25, interpreted as Very High Practice, indicates that school leaders demonstrate highly consistent and effective resource mobilization practices. This suggests that they are proactive and strategic in sourcing, managing, and sustaining resources to support school operations and programs.

Table 3. Level of Resource Mobilization Practice

Indicators	Mean	Qualitative Interpretation
Resource Planning and Needs Assessment	4.21	High Capability
External Resource Networking and partnerships	4.21	High Capability
Resource Acquisition and Utilization	4.29	High Capability
Innovation and Sustainability	4.29	High Capability
Sub-mean	4.25	High Capability

Legend:

Scale Range	Verbal Description	Level	Interpretation
4.21 – 5.00	Always	Very High Practice	Highly consistent and effective practices
3.41 – 4.20	Often	High Practice	Generally effective practices
2.61 – 3.40	Sometimes	Moderate Practice	Occasionally effective practices
1.81 – 2.60	Seldom	Low Practice	Limited and inconsistent practices
1.00 – 1.80	Never	Very Low Practice	Very minimal or no practices exhibited

Among the indicators, Resource Acquisition and Utilization and Innovation and Sustainability obtained the highest mean scores (M = 4.29, Very High Practice), indicating that school leaders are particularly effective in securing resources and ensuring their efficient and sustainable use. This reflects a strong capacity to maximize available resources and introduce innovative approaches to sustain school initiatives. Meanwhile, Resource Planning and Needs Assessment (M = 4.21, Very High Practice) and External Resource Networking and Partnerships (M = 4.21, Very High Practice) also received very high ratings, suggesting that school leaders consistently assess school needs and establish linkages with external stakeholders, although these areas may still benefit from further strengthening to reach optimal effectiveness.

Notably, the uniformly very high ratings across all indicators imply that resource mobilization is a strong area of practice among school leaders. This indicates their ability to align resources with school priorities, build partnerships, and sustain programs—key components in achieving school improvement and organizational effectiveness.

These findings are supported by recent studies highlighting the importance of resource mobilization in educational leadership. Allan Odden et al. (2020) emphasized that effective school leaders strategically allocate and utilize resources to improve student outcomes and organizational performance. Similarly, Helen Timperley (2021) noted that leadership effectiveness is closely tied to the ability to align resources with identified needs and priorities, ensuring that interventions are both relevant and impactful.

Furthermore, Andy Hargreaves and Dennis Shirley (2020) underscored the role of collaboration and partnerships in sustaining educational change, which supports the high rating in external networking and partnerships. In addition, Michael Fullan (2020) highlighted that Innovation and Sustainability are critical leadership functions, requiring leaders to continuously adapt, creatively leverage resources, and sustain long-term improvements.

Moreover, Viviane Robinson (2018) found that leaders who effectively mobilize and manage resources are more likely to achieve significant improvements in teaching and learning outcomes. This reinforces the importance of strong Resource Mobilization Practices as reflected in the results of the study.

Level of Adaptive Leadership Competence of School Leaders

Table 4 presents the level of Adaptive Leadership Competence of school leaders across various leadership behaviors. The overall mean score of 4.24, interpreted as High Competence, indicates that school leaders generally demonstrate effective and Adaptive Leadership in most situations. This suggests that they can respond to complex challenges, guiding their teams through change, and maintaining organizational effectiveness in dynamic school environments.

Table 4. Level of Adaptive Leadership Competence of School Leaders

Statements	Mean	QI
When difficulties emerge in our school, I step back to assess team dynamics and adjust my approach.	4.21	High Competence
When events trigger strong emotions among staff, I use my leadership authority to resolve and advance.	4.07	High Competence
During uncertain school changes, staff trust me to guide them through challenges.	4.11	High Competence
In complex school situations, I redirect focus to key avoided issues.	4.17	High Competence
When teachers struggle with decisions, I provide clear guidance.	4.14	High Competence
During tough changes, I welcome input from all group members, regardless of status.	4.30	High Competence
In difficult situations, I keep the big picture in focus.	4.26	High Competence
When facing value conflicts, I use my expertise to direct effective solutions.	4.27	High Competence
When conflicts unsettle staff, I encourage direct resolution.	4.19	High Competence
In school changes, I emphasize critical priority issues.	4.27	High Competence
When staff seek answers from me, I promote their independent thinking.	4.22	High Competence
I actively listen to radical ideas from team members.	4.36	High Competence
Even in disagreement, I listen carefully to understand others.	4.42	High Competence
When others face intense conflicts, I help mediate resolutions.	4.35	High Competence
I can emotionally support others through tough issues.	4.27	High Competence
I openly address controversial school issues others avoid.	4.24	High Competence
I motivate staff to take initiative in solving problems.	4.24	High Competence
I welcome unusual ideas that benefit the group long-term.	4.25	High Competence
In challenges, I observe dynamics to understand what's happening.	4.29	High Competence
I encourage open talk about unspoken school issues.	4.32	High Competence
Staff recognize my confidence in handling tough problems.	4.20	High Competence
I push for confronting difficult issues to drive improvement.	4.15	High Competence
When asked to solve problems, I provide direction while building capability.	4.39	High Competence
I listen openly to those who feel like outsiders in the group.	4.32	High Competence
In heated disputes, I step back for clearer perspective.	4.25	High Competence
I help staff develop new ways to handle school challenges.	4.29	High Competence
Staff see me as reliable during organizational turbulence.	4.17	High Competence
I tackle troublesome issues to keep momentum.	4.02	High Competence
In uncertain times, I empower staff to decide for themselves.	4.17	High Competence
I incorporate varied viewpoints to balance the organization.	4.37	High Competence
OVERALL MEAN	4.24	High Competence

Legend:

Scale Range	Verbal Description	Level	Interpretation
4.21 – 5.00	Always	Very High Competence	Demonstrates highly effective and Adaptive Leadership in all situations
3.41 – 4.20	Often	High Competence	Demonstrates effective and Adaptive Leadership in most situations

2.61 – 3.40	Sometimes	Moderate Competence	Demonstrates moderate and inconsistent adaptive leadership
1.81 – 2.60	Seldom	Low Competence	Demonstrates limited adaptive leadership
1.00 – 1.80	Never	Very Low Competence	Demonstrates minimal or no adaptive leadership

A closer examination of the indicators shows that school leaders demonstrate strong competence in active listening, inclusivity, and perspective-taking. The highest-rated items include *“Even in disagreement, I listen carefully to understand others”* (M = 4.42), *“When asked to solve problems, I provide direction while building capability”* (M = 4.39), and *“I incorporate varied viewpoints to balance the organization”* (M = 4.37). These findings indicate that school leaders value collaboration, empower others, and integrate diverse perspectives in decision-making, key features of adaptive leadership.

Similarly, high ratings in items such as *encouraging open dialogue* (M = 4.32), *listening to outsiders* (M = 4.32), and *welcoming input regardless of status* (M = 4.30) suggest that school leaders foster inclusive environments where ideas and concerns are openly expressed. This reflects their ability to manage relationships and promote collective problem-solving, which are essential in addressing complex and evolving school challenges.

On the other hand, relatively lower (though still high) ratings were observed in items such as *“I tackle troublesome issues to keep momentum”* (M = 4.02) and *“When events trigger strong emotions among staff, I use my leadership authority to resolve and advance”* (M = 4.07). These results suggest that while school leaders are generally competent, there may be slight challenges in directly confronting difficult issues or managing emotionally charged situations. This indicates potential areas for further leadership development, particularly in conflict management and assertive intervention.

Moreover, the consistently high ratings across all indicators imply that school leaders possess a solid foundation of Adaptive Leadership competence. They are generally effective in navigating uncertainty, addressing complex problems, and engaging stakeholders in meaningful ways. However, the absence of “Very High Competence” ratings suggests opportunities for further enhancement to achieve greater consistency in excellence across all leadership dimensions.

These findings are supported by contemporary leadership studies. Ronald Heifetz, Alexander Grashow, and Marty Linsky (2017) emphasized that Adaptive Leadership involves mobilizing people to tackle tough challenges, encouraging diverse perspectives, and regulating distress—competence reflected in the high ratings on listening, inclusivity, and guidance. Similarly, Andy Hargreaves and Michael Fullan (2020) highlighted that effective school leaders foster collaboration, build trust, and sustain improvement by engaging stakeholders and promoting shared responsibility.

Furthermore, Kim Schildkamp et al. (2019) noted that leadership effectiveness in complex environments requires integrating multiple perspectives and promoting reflective dialogue, which supports the high ratings for inclusivity and open communication. In addition, Michael Ungar (2018) emphasized that adaptive leaders must balance control and empowerment in response to uncertainty, which aligns with findings on guiding staff while building their capabilities.

Moreover, Viviane Robinson (2018) found that leaders who engage in open communication, problem-solving, and capacity building are more effective at improving school outcomes. This reinforces the importance of the Adaptive Leadership practices demonstrated by the school leaders in this study.

Correlation among Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, and Resource Mobilization Practices on Adaptive Leadership Competence of School Leaders

Table 5 presents the correlations among Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, and Resource Mobilization Practices with the Adaptive Leadership Competence of school leaders. All variables show statistically significant relationships with Adaptive Leadership Competence, as indicated by p-values of .000, which are lower than the 0.01 level of significance. This means the observed relationships are not due to chance and are considered highly significant.

Table 5. Correlation among Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, and Resource Mobilization Practices on Adaptive Leadership Competence of School Leaders

Independent Variables	Person Coefficient	Probability (P-Value)
A. Psychological Resilience		
Competence	.438**	.000
Emotional Control	.499**	.000
Adaptability & Support	.468**	.000
Control	.446**	.000
Spirituality	.403**	.000
B. Decision-Making Capability		
Technological Infra & Hardware	.629**	.000
Data Usage Culture	.710**	.000
Data Usage Purpose	.611**	.000
Data Literacy	.618**	.000
C. Resource Mobilization Practices		
Resource Planning and Needs Assessment	.787**	.000
External Resource Networking and Partnership	.709**	.000
Resource Acquisition and Utilization	.799**	.000
Innovation and Sustainability	.792**	.000

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

For Psychological Resilience, all indicators show moderate positive correlations with Adaptive Leadership Competence. Specifically, Emotional Control ($r = .499$), Adaptability and Support ($r = .468$), Control ($r = .446$), Competence ($r = .438$), and Spirituality ($r = .403$) indicate that as school leaders' resilience increases, their Adaptive Leadership Competence also tends to improve. Among these, Emotional Control shows the strongest relationship, suggesting that the ability to regulate emotions plays a crucial role in adaptive leadership. Overall, these results imply that resilient school leaders are better equipped to manage challenges, respond to change, and lead effectively.

In terms of Decision-Making Capability, all indicators exhibit moderate-to-strong positive correlations with Adaptive Leadership competence. Data Usage Culture ($r = .710$) shows the strongest relationship, followed by Technological Infrastructure ($r = .629$), Data Literacy ($r = .618$), and Data Usage Purpose ($r = .611$). These findings suggest that school leaders who effectively use data, foster a culture of data-driven decision-making, and possess strong Data Literacy skills are more likely to demonstrate higher Adaptive Leadership competence. This highlights the importance of evidence-based decision-making in navigating complex educational environments.

For resource mobilization practices, all indicators demonstrate strong positive correlations with Adaptive Leadership competence. Resource Acquisition and Utilization ($r = .799$) and Innovation and Sustainability ($r = .792$) show the highest correlations, followed by Resource Planning and Needs Assessment ($r = .787$) and External Resource Networking and Partnerships ($r = .709$). These results indicate that school leaders' ability to effectively mobilize, manage, and sustain resources is strongly associated with their Adaptive Leadership competence. This suggests that resource-related practices are critical drivers of leadership effectiveness in schools.

On the other hand, the results reveal that while all three independent variables are significantly related to Adaptive Leadership competence, Resource Mobilization Practices exhibit the strongest relationships, followed by Decision-Making Capability, and then Psychological Resilience. This implies that although personal resilience and decision-making skills are important, the practical ability to mobilize and sustain resources plays a more influential role in enhancing school leaders' Adaptive Leadership competence.

Given the p-values of 0.000, the null hypothesis, that there is no significant relationship among Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, and Resource Mobilization Practices with the Adaptive Leadership

Competence of school leaders, is rejected. This means that these variables significantly influence school leaders' adaptive leadership competence.

These findings are supported by recent studies. Michael Fullan (2020) emphasized that effective leadership involves not only personal capabilities but also the ability to leverage resources and systems to achieve sustainable school improvement. Similarly, Andy Hargreaves and Dennis Shirley (2020) highlighted that collaborative practices and resource management are key to leading change and improving school performance.

Furthermore, Kim Schildkamp et al. (2019) found that data-informed decision-making significantly enhances leadership effectiveness, supporting the strong correlations observed in Decision-Making Capability. In addition, Michael Ungar (2018) noted that resilience contributes to leadership effectiveness by enabling individuals to adapt to challenges, which aligns with the moderate correlations found in Psychological Resilience.

Moreover, Viviane Robinson (2018) emphasized that leadership practices that directly influence teaching and learning—such as resource allocation and strategic decision-making—significantly affect school outcomes. This reinforces the strong relationships observed between Resource Mobilization Practices and Adaptive Leadership competence.

Variables that best Predict Adaptive Leadership Competence

Table 6 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis conducted to determine which variables significantly predict Adaptive Leadership competence among school leaders. It reveals that the set of predictors has a very strong and statistically significant influence on Adaptive Leadership competence among school leaders. The model yielded an R value of 0.864, indicating a strong positive relationship between the predictors and adaptive leadership. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.746$) indicates that approximately 74.6% of the variance in Adaptive Leadership Competence is explained by the combined variables, suggesting strong explanatory power of the model. Furthermore, the F-value of 94.565 with a p-value $< .001$ confirms that the regression model is statistically significant, indicating that the predictors, taken together, reliably explain variation in Adaptive Leadership Competence.

Table 6. Variables that Best Predict Adaptive Leadership Competence

Predictor	B	SE (B)	β	t	p-value
Constant	-.005	.172		-.030	.976
A. Phycological Resilience					
Competence	-.318	.075	-.429	-4.243	.000
Adaptability & Support	.238	.074	.317	3.206	.002
B. Decision Making Capability					
Data Usage Culture	.200	.052	.207	3.852	.000
C. Resource Mobilization Practices					
Resource Planning and Needs Assessment	.325	.080	.290	4.071	.000
External Resource Networking and Partnership	-.220	.078	-.214	2.799	.006
Resource Acquisition and Utilization	.422	.082	.391	5.120	.000
Innovation and Sustainability	.341	.091	.316	3.738	.000

Note: R= 0.864 R2= 0. 746 F= 94.565 p-value= < .000

Among the significant predictors, Resource Acquisition and Utilization emerged as the strongest predictor of adaptive leadership competence ($\beta = 0.391, p = .000$). This indicates that school leaders who are highly capable of securing and effectively utilizing resources are more likely to demonstrate adaptive leadership. In the Philippine context, this finding is particularly meaningful given the realities of the Department of Education, where many public schools operate under limited Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) and often rely on partnerships with Local Government Units (LGUs), community stakeholders, and private organizations to augment resources. Empirical evidence shows that decentralized school systems require leaders to actively mobilize external resources and build strong community linkages to support school improvement

(Christopher Day & Qing Gu, 2020). In addition, global education reports emphasize that effective school leadership in resource-constrained settings depends heavily on the ability to strategically allocate and maximize available resources (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2019).

This finding suggests that adaptability in leadership is not only a behavioral capacity but also deeply rooted in resourcefulness and contextual responsiveness. In decentralized and resource-limited environments like Philippine public schools, leaders must continually align resources with evolving priorities, including curriculum reforms, learning recovery, and infrastructure needs. The strong predictive value of resource acquisition and utilization underscores that leadership effectiveness depends on the ability to translate resources into timely, strategic actions. This supports the argument of Mary Uhl-Bien and Bill Arena (2018), who emphasized that adaptive leadership involves reconfiguring organizational resources to respond to complex and changing demands. Similarly, studies have shown that leaders who effectively manage and leverage resources are better positioned to lead change and improve school outcomes (Kenneth Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020; World Bank, 2018).

Closely following is Innovation and Sustainability in Resource Mobilization ($\beta = 0.316$, $p = .000$), which also significantly predicts adaptive leadership. This implies that, beyond simply acquiring resources, school leaders must demonstrate creativity and long-term strategic thinking in managing them. Leaders who innovate and sustain programs are better able to maintain school improvement efforts despite uncertainties and changing conditions. This aligns with the work of Hargreaves and Fullan (2020), who highlighted that sustainable and innovative leadership practices are essential in ensuring continuous improvement and adaptability in schools.

Another significant predictor is Resource Planning and Needs Assessment ($\beta = 0.290$, $p = .000$), indicating that school leaders who systematically identify and anticipate resource needs are more likely to exhibit Adaptive Leadership competence. Strategic planning allows leaders to proactively respond to challenges rather than merely reacting to them. This supports the idea that Adaptive Leadership involves foresight and deliberate preparation, enabling leaders to align resources with evolving school demands.

In terms of Psychological Resilience, Adaptability and Support ($\beta = 0.317$, $p = .002$) also significantly predicts adaptive leadership. This highlights that leaders who are flexible and capable of fostering supportive relationships are better able to navigate complex and changing environments. Adaptive Leadership inherently requires collaboration and responsiveness, and leaders who cultivate supportive environments are more effective in mobilizing people toward change. This finding is consistent with Uhl-Bien and Arena (2018), who underscored the importance of relational dynamics and flexibility in enabling organizational adaptability.

Furthermore, data usage culture ($\beta = 0.207$, $p = .000$) was a significant predictor, suggesting that school leaders who promote data use in decision-making are more likely to demonstrate adaptive leadership. A strong data culture supports evidence-based practices, allowing leaders to make informed adjustments and respond effectively to emerging issues. This is supported by Datnow and Park (2018), who emphasized that data-informed leadership enhances organizational learning and continuous improvement.

Interestingly, the finding that Competence ($\beta = -0.429$) has a significant negative relationship with adaptive leadership suggests that school leaders who rely heavily on their technical expertise and established practices may be less likely to exhibit adaptive leadership behaviors. While competence typically reflects mastery of knowledge, skills, and experience, it may also lead to a preference for routine solutions and familiar approaches. As Ronald Heifetz, Alexander Grashow, and Marty Linsky (2009) emphasize, adaptive leadership requires moving beyond technical expertise toward flexibility, experimentation, and continuous learning. Leaders who are highly confident in their competence may be less inclined to question existing practices or engage in collaborative problem-solving, both of which are essential for addressing complex and evolving challenges.

In the Philippine context, particularly within the Department of Education system, school leaders are often shaped by a culture that values experience, procedural compliance, and hierarchical authority. While these qualities strengthen organizational stability, they may also limit openness to innovation and shared leadership. Highly competent leaders may feel expected to provide immediate solutions and maintain control, rather than facilitating dialogue or empowering others to co-create responses to emerging issues such as curriculum reforms

and learning recovery. This suggests that competence, while essential, must be complemented by adaptive capacities such as openness, reflection, and collaboration. Hence, leadership development in the Philippine setting should not only strengthen technical expertise but also promote a shift toward learning-oriented and flexible leadership practices.

Given the model's significance ($p = 0.000$) and that each predictor has a p -value < 0.05 , the null hypothesis that no predictor variable is associated with adaptive leadership competence among school leaders is rejected. In fact, as revealed in this study, the strongest predictors of Adaptive Leadership are effective, innovative, and strategic resource management, followed by behavioral adaptability and data-informed practices, whereas excessive reliance on traditional competence may hinder adaptive capacity. These findings reinforce the multidimensional nature of adaptive leadership, which requires a balance of strategic, relational, and innovative competencies.

SUMMARY

This study examined the relationships among psychological resilience, decision-making capability, and resource mobilization practices in relation to the adaptive leadership competence of school leaders. Specifically, it assessed the levels of psychological resilience in terms of competence, emotional control, adaptability and support, control, and spirituality; decision-making capability in terms of technological infrastructure, data usage culture, data usage purpose, and data literacy; and resource mobilization practices in terms of resource planning and needs assessment, external networking and partnerships, resource acquisition and utilization, and innovation and sustainability. It also determined the adaptive leadership competence of school leaders, examined the relationships among the variables, and identified which factors, singly or in combination, best predict adaptive leadership competence. Two null hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance: that there is no significant relationship among the variables and that no predictor variable influences adaptive leadership competence.

The study used a descriptive-correlational research design with a quantitative approach, conducted among 233 school leaders from selected public elementary and secondary schools in the Province of Bukidnon. Participants were selected through purposive and snowball sampling. Data were gathered using a validated and pilot-tested survey questionnaire adapted from established instruments with high reliability coefficients. Psychological resilience was measured using the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale, decision-making capability from Magdato et al. (2025), resource mobilization practices from Hallinger (2011), and adaptive leadership competence from Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky (2009). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and stepwise multiple regression to determine levels, relationships, and predictors of adaptive leadership competence among school leaders.

The study reveals that school leaders demonstrate high to very high levels across key leadership domains, including Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, Resource Mobilization Practices, and Adaptive Leadership Competence. Overall, these findings indicate that school leaders are well-equipped to manage complex educational demands and lead effectively in dynamic environments.

In terms of Psychological Resilience, school leaders show a high level of strength, particularly in spirituality, competence, and adaptability. Although emotional control and sense of control are slightly lower, they remain within the high range, indicating a generally strong capacity to manage stress and challenges in leadership roles.

For Decision-Making Capability, results show a high level of performance, especially in data usage purpose and data literacy. This suggests that school leaders are generally effective at using data to inform decisions, although further strengthening of technological systems and data culture remains necessary.

Regarding Resource Mobilization Practices, findings indicate very strong performance, particularly in resource acquisition, utilization, innovation, and sustainability. This shows that school leaders are highly proactive in sourcing, managing, and sustaining resources through partnerships and strategic planning.

The level of Adaptive Leadership Competence is also high. Leaders demonstrate strong skills in collaboration, listening, inclusivity, and perspective-taking. However, slightly lower scores in handling emotionally charged situations and confronting difficult issues suggest areas for further development.

The correlation analysis indicates that all three variables—Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, and Resource Mobilization Practices—are significantly associated with Adaptive Leadership Competence. Among them, Resource Mobilization Practices show the strongest relationship, followed by Decision-Making Capability, and then Psychological Resilience. This implies that practical and organizational capacities have greater influence on adaptive leadership than personal traits alone.

Finally, the regression analysis identifies Resource Acquisition and Utilization, Innovation and Sustainability, Resource Planning and Needs Assessment, Adaptability and Support, and Data Usage Culture as significant predictors of Adaptive Leadership Competence. Among these, Resource Acquisition and Utilization emerges as the strongest predictor. Interestingly, Psychological Competence shows a negative relationship, suggesting that overreliance on traditional competence may limit adaptability in complex situations.

Overall, the findings confirm that Adaptive Leadership is best explained by a combination of strong resource management, data-informed decision-making, and flexible leadership behaviors, rather than personal resilience alone.

CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that school leaders demonstrate high to very high levels of Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, Resource Mobilization Practices, and Adaptive Leadership Competence. This reflects that they are generally well-prepared to manage the complexities and demands of dynamic educational environments. Their psychological resilience is evident in strong spirituality, competence, and adaptability, while emotional control and a sense of control, though slightly lower, remain high, suggesting a generally stable capacity to cope with stress and leadership challenges.

The results also show that school leaders possess strong decision-making capabilities, particularly in data usage purpose and data literacy, indicating effective use of data to guide decisions, although strengthening technological infrastructure and data culture is still needed. Resource mobilization practices are very strong, especially in resource acquisition, utilization, innovation, and sustainability, reflecting proactive and strategic management of school resources. Adaptive leadership competence is likewise high, characterized by collaboration, inclusivity, listening, and perspective-taking, although further development is needed in handling emotionally charged situations and confronting difficult issues.

All three variables, Psychological Resilience, Decision-Making Capability, and Resource Mobilization Practices, are significantly associated with Adaptive Leadership Competence. Resource Mobilization Practices show the strongest relationship, followed by Decision-Making Capability and Psychological Resilience, indicating that organizational and strategic capacities play a more dominant role in shaping adaptive leadership than personal traits alone. The regression analysis further identifies Resource Acquisition and Utilization, Innovation and Sustainability, Resource Planning and Needs Assessment, Adaptability and Support, and Data Usage Culture as significant predictors, with Resource Acquisition and Utilization as the strongest. The negative relationship of Psychological Competence suggests that overreliance on traditional competence may limit adaptability in complex contexts.

These findings imply that strengthening adaptive leadership in schools requires greater emphasis on resource management systems, data-driven decision-making, and innovative practices alongside leadership development programs. School leadership training should prioritize enhancing resource mobilization skills and fostering a strong data culture while also developing emotional agility and adaptive responses to complex challenges. Overall, improving adaptive leadership among school leaders depends not only on individual resilience but more importantly on strategic, collaborative, and systems-oriented leadership practices that support sustained school improvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

School leaders may further enhance their Psychological Resilience by participating in continuous professional development programs focused on emotional regulation, stress management, and adaptive coping strategies.

While resilience is already high, targeted support for emotional control and sense of control may help leaders respond more effectively to high-pressure and emotionally charged situations. Strengthening wellness programs and reflective leadership practices within schools may also sustain their strong spiritual and personal grounding.

To improve Decision-Making Capability, schools and education authorities may invest in strengthening technological infrastructure and promoting a deeper data-driven culture across all levels of school leadership. Training programs on advanced data literacy, data interpretation, and evidence-based planning may further enhance leaders' capacity to make informed decisions. Providing accessible, user-friendly data systems can also support more consistent and effective decision-making.

In terms of Resource Mobilization Practices, school leaders are encouraged to sustain their strong performance in resource acquisition, utilization, innovation, and sustainability by continuously strengthening partnerships with local government units, stakeholders, and private organizations. Capacity-building programs on strategic resource planning and external networking may further optimize resource generation and utilization. Schools may also institutionalize innovation initiatives that ensure the long-term sustainability of programs and interventions.

For Adaptive Leadership Competence, leadership development programs should focus on enhancing skills in managing emotionally charged situations and addressing difficult or sensitive issues. Coaching and mentoring programs may help school leaders strengthen confidence in conflict management and decision-making during crises. Encouraging collaborative leadership practices, inclusive dialogue, and reflective decision-making can further reinforce adaptive leadership behaviors already demonstrated by school leaders.

At the system level, because Resource Mobilization Practices and Decision-Making Capability emerged as stronger predictors of Adaptive Leadership Competence, educational authorities may prioritize policies and programs that strengthen organizational systems rather than purely individual traits. This includes improving data systems, expanding resource networks, and institutionalizing innovation practices in schools. While Psychological Resilience remains important, leadership development initiatives should place greater emphasis on strategic, data-informed, and resource-oriented competence to enhance adaptive leadership effectiveness.

Also, future research may further explore other contextual and organizational factors that may influence Adaptive Leadership Competence, such as school culture, stakeholder engagement, and policy implementation practices, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of leadership effectiveness in educational settings.

REFERENCES

1. Chmitorz, A., Kunzler, A., Helmreich, I., Tüscher, O., Kalisch, R., Kubiak, T., Wessa, M., & Lieb, K. (2018). Intervention studies to foster resilience – A systematic review and proposal for a resilience framework in future intervention studies. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 59, 78–100.
2. Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 18(2), 76–82.
3. Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
4. Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2020). *School leadership and education reform: Resilience, commitment and effectiveness*. Routledge.
5. Department of Education. (2020). *Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH)* (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020).
6. Department of Education. (2023). *Adoption of the National Learning Recovery Program (ARAL Program)* (DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023). Pasig City, Philippines: Author.
7. Department of Education. (2023). *Implementing guidelines on the MATATAG Curriculum* (DepEd Order No. 021, s. 2023). Pasig City, Philippines: Author.
8. Department of Education. (2023). *Strengthening the implementation of the Senior High School program* (DepEd Order No. 019, s. 2023). Pasig City, Philippines: Author.
9. Fullan, M. (2020). *Leading in a culture of change* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

10. Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142.
11. Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2020). Professional capital after the pandemic: Revisiting and revising classic understandings. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5(3–4), 327–336.
12. Hargreaves, A., & Shirley, D. (2020). Leading from the middle: Its nature, origins and importance. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5(1), 92–114.
13. Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Harvard Business Press.
14. Mandinach, E. B., & Gummer, E. S. (2017). What does it mean for teachers to be data literate? *Teachers College Record*, 119(1), 1–25.
15. McCallum, F., Price, D., Graham, A., & Morrison, A. (2017). *Teacher wellbeing: A review of the literature*. Association of Independent Schools of NSW.
16. Odden, A., Picus, L. O., & Goetz, M. (2020). *School finance: A policy perspective (6th ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.
17. Pargament, K. I. (2017). *Spiritually integrated psychotherapy: Understanding and addressing the sacred*. Guilford Press.
18. Poortman, C. L., & Schildkamp, K. (2018). Data-based decision making for school improvement: Research insights and gaps. *Educational Research*, 60(3), 257–273.
19. Robinson, V. M. J. (2018). *Reduce change to increase improvement*. Corwin Press.
20. Schildkamp, K. (2019). Data-based decision making for school improvement: Research insights and gaps. *Educational Research*, 61(3), 257–273.
21. Schildkamp, K., Poortman, C. L., Ebbeler, J., & Pieters, J. (2019). How school leaders can build effective data teams: Five building blocks for a new wave of data-informed decision making. *Journal of Educational Change*, 20(3), 283–325.
22. Timperley, H. (2021). *Leading professional learning: Practical strategies for impact in schools*. ACER Press.
23. Ungar, M. (2018). Systemic resilience: Principles and processes for a science of change in contexts of adversity. *Ecology and Society*, 23(4), 34.
24. Ungar, M., & Theron, L. (2020). Resilience and mental health: How multisystemic processes contribute to positive outcomes. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 7(5), 441–448.
25. Vella, S. L. C., & Pai, N. B. (2019). A theoretical review of psychological resilience: Defining resilience and resilience research over the decades. *Archives of Medicine and Health Sciences*, 7(2), 233–239.
26. Zhang, A., Zhou, L., Meng, Y., Ji, Q., Ye, M., Liu, Q., Tan, W., Zheng, Y., Hu, Z., Liu, M., Xu, X., Karlsson, I. K., Hägg, S., & Zhan, Y. (2024). Association between psychological resilience and all-cause mortality in the Health and Retirement Study. *BMJ Mental Health*, 27, 1–6.