

# Collaborative Leadership Ability, Futuristic Thinking Capability, And Emergency Preparedness on Strategic Leadership of School Administrators

Hero Jun B. Valendez<sup>1</sup>, James L. Paglinawan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School Principal I, Department of Education, Division of Valencia City, Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor IV, College of Education, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Maramag, Bukidnon, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400509>

Received: 22 April 2026; Accepted: 28 April 2026; Published: 15 May 2026

## ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of collaborative leadership capacity, futuristic thinking capability, and emergency educational preparedness on the strategic leadership of school administrators in Region 10 during the 2025–2026 school year. It assessed collaborative leadership in terms of assessing the environment, visioning and mobilizing, building trust, shared power and influence, developing people, and self-reflection; futuristic thinking capability through future scanning, future visioning, future-oriented planning, and future-focused decision-making; and emergency educational preparedness across emergency planning and delegation, implementation, communication and monitoring, motivation and democratic leadership, professional development, and accountability and transparency. The study also measured strategic leadership in terms of strategic orientation, translation, alignment, intervention, and competence.

Findings revealed that school administrators demonstrated high levels of collaborative leadership, futuristic thinking, and emergency preparedness, with assessing the environment and emergency motivation receiving the highest ratings. Strategic leadership was interpreted as highly strategic, though strategic orientation and translation emerged as the dimensions requiring the most refinement. Correlation analysis indicated significant positive relationships between all independent variables and strategic leadership, with emergency preparedness identified as the strongest correlate. Regression analysis identified six significant predictors led by emergency accountability and transparency which accounted for 72.3% of the variance in strategic leadership.

**Keywords:** Collaborative Leadership Capacity, Futuristic Thinking Capability, Emergency Preparedness, Strategic Leadership

## INTRODUCTION

In the Philippine basic education system, strategic leadership is a mandated standard under the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), which identifies "Leading Strategically" as the primary domain for ensuring school plans remain anchored on learner achievement (Department of Education, 2020).

According to Davies and Davies (2004), as cited in Carvalho et al. (2021), this requires administrators to move beyond routine management to align people, structures, and resources with a long-term perspective.

However, a significant gap exists between vision and practice, as many leaders lack the strategic processes needed to embed their mission into daily school culture (Carvalho et al., 2021).

In the Philippine context, administrators frequently struggle with long-term planning, innovation, and the strategic use of data (Mendoza, 2024; Rivera et al., 2025; Tom-en Jr., 2025). This challenge is particularly acute

in Region X, where "Leading Strategically" emerged as the least-mastered domain in the 2023 National Qualifying Examination for School Heads (Aganon, 2025).

To address these gaps, research suggests that strategic leadership flourishes when supported by three critical pillars: collaborative leadership, futuristic thinking, and emergency preparedness. Collaborative leadership, characterized by shared power and trust, enables school heads to more effectively translate strategic plans into collective practices (Guarana, 2022; Rivera et al., 2025). Simultaneously, futuristic thinking allows leaders to navigate volatile environments by using horizon scanning and foresight to shape long-term directions (Carvalho et al., 2021; Rivera et al., 2025). Emergency educational preparedness has emerged as a vital anchor for strategic coherence, as leaders who integrate disaster-risk reduction and learning continuity into their planning are better positioned to coordinate resources during crises (Mendoza, 2024; Rivera et al., 2025; UNESCO, 2021)

Systematically mapping these determinants provides a robust framework for building administrative excellence among school administrators in Region X for the school year 2025–2026.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Examine the extent of collaborative leadership ability of school administrators in terms of:

- a. Assessing the environment;
- b. visioning and mobilizing;
- c. Building trust;
- d. Shared power and influence;
- e. Developing people; and
- f. Self-reflection.

2. Examine the level of futuristic thinking capability of school administrators in terms of:

- a. Future scanning;
- b. Future visioning;
- c. Future-oriented planning; and
- d. Future-focused decision-making.

3. Ascertain the level of emergency preparedness practices of school administrators in terms of:

- a. Emergency planning and delegation;
- b. Emergency implementation;
- c. Emergency communication and monitoring;
- d. Emergency motivation and democratic leadership;
- e. Emergency professional development; and
- f. Emergency accountability and transparency.

4. Assess is the level of strategic leadership of school administrators in the areas of:

- a. Strategic orientation;
  - b. Strategic translation;
  - c. Strategic alignment;
  - d. Strategic intervention; and
  - e. Strategic competence.
5. Correlate a significant relationship between the school administrators' strategic leadership and:
- a. Collaborative leadership ability;
  - b. Futuristic thinking capability; and
  - c. Emergency preparedness.
6. Identify the variables, singly or in combination, best predict the school administrators' strategic leadership.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

This study utilized a descriptive, correlational, and causal-comparative research design to develop and apply mathematical models, theories, and hypotheses related to the strategic leadership of school administrators. It also utilized a descriptive correlational method to describe the levels of collaborative leadership capacity, futuristic thinking capability, and emergency preparedness among school administrators. While correlation was used to examine and measure the connection between collaborative leadership capacity, futuristic thinking capability, and emergency educational preparedness, and the strategic leadership of school administrators. The study also used regression to identify variables that may predict strategic leadership among school administrators.

### **Research Setting**

The study was carried out across the 10 school divisions of the Department of Education (DepEd) Region 10 during the school year 2025–2026. DepEd Region X, also known as Northern Mindanao, spans a total land area of 17,855 square kilometers and includes 85 municipalities and 2,020 barangays. The region comprises five provinces: Bukidnon in the south, Misamis Oriental in the north, the island province of Camiguin in the northeast, and Lanao del Norte and Misamis Occidental in the west. These provinces are further subdivided into nine city divisions: Cagayan de Oro, El Salvador, Gingoog, Iligan, Malaybalay, Ozamiz, Oroquieta, Tangub, and Valencia.

### **Participants of the Study**

The study involved 564 school administrators from the 10 divisions of Region X. These school administrators self-assessed their collaborative leadership capacity, futuristic thinking capability, and emergency educational preparedness in relation to strategic leadership. Respondents were selected using stratified random sampling with proportional allocation, ensuring that each division was represented in proportion to its size in the sample. This method guarantees that the sample accurately reflects the population by selecting a representative number of respondents from each division and giving every selected individual an equal chance of inclusion in the study.

### **Sampling Procedure**

The study used a combination of stratified and simple random sampling to ensure an accurate representation of school leaders across region 10. Initially, the population of school administrators was divided into distinct strata by division, ensuring proportional representation of each group. This approach ensured that all divisions were

adequately represented within the sample. Individual respondents were then randomly selected from each division using the fishbowl method, thereby ensuring equal chances of inclusion and minimizing selection bias

### **Data Gathering Procedure**

Prior to conducting the study, a recommendation for approval signed by the dissertation adviser and the college dean was obtained. An intent letter was submitted to the DepEd Region X Director to request permission to conduct the research. Once approval was granted, the intent letters and approved documents were forwarded to the respective school division, public school district, and school offices. Pilot testing of the research instrument was conducted in Region XI – Division of Davao City, with the necessary approvals secured from the schools to ensure compliance with research protocols.

After securing all required permissions, consent forms were distributed to all respondents, clearly explaining their rights and the voluntary nature of participation. Respondents had three weeks to complete the questionnaires, which were distributed in both printed and Google Forms formats to accommodate the large number of participants. Collected data was tallied, tabulated, scored, and classified according to the research questions, with appropriate statistical techniques applied for analysis. Throughout the process, all respondents' answers remained anonymous to ensure confidentiality and uphold ethical standards.

### **Data Analysis**

To determine the levels of collaborative leadership capacity, futuristic thinking capability, and emergency preparedness among school administrators, descriptive statistics, such as the mean and rank, were employed. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to examine whether significant relationships existed among these variables and their influence on the school administrators' overall strategic leadership. To identify the variable or combination of variables that best predicted strategic leadership, a stepwise multiple-linear regression analysis was conducted.

### **Ethical Considerations**

Prior to conducting the study, the researcher ensured compliance with established ethical research protocols. Approval was sought from the university's Research Evaluation Committee (REC) before any fieldwork began. Once approval was granted, the researcher proceeded with data collection.

All study participants received an ethics statement outlining the ethical principles guiding the research. This statement detailed informed consent, emphasizing that participation was voluntary and that individuals could withdraw at any time without consequences. Confidentiality was assured, with participants' identities and personal information protected and securely managed throughout the study. The ethics statement was submitted together with the permission letter and approval notice to ensure transparency and build trust in the research process.

Additionally, the ethics statement was addressed to the DepEd Region 10 Director, Schools Division Superintendents, Public Schools District Supervisors, Districts In-Charge, and School Administrators. A formal approval note signed by the relevant authorities accompanied the letter before it reached the respondents. To uphold confidentiality, participants' names remained anonymous throughout the study.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Collaborative Leadership**

Table 1 provides a comprehensive summary of the mean scores across the six dimensions of collaborative leadership practiced by school administrators. The overall mean for Collaborative Leadership is 4.37, corresponding to an "Often" descriptive rating and interpreted as a "High Level". The highest-rated dimensions are Assessing the Environment ( $M = 4.42$ ) and Developing People ( $M = 4.41$ ), while the lowest-rated dimension is Visioning and Mobilizing ( $M = 4.28$ ).

Table 1. School administrators' level of collaborative leadership

INDICATORS	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Assessing the Environment	4.42	Often	High Level
Developing People	4.41	Often	High Level
Building Trust	4.38	Often	High Level
Self-Reflection	4.37	Often	High Level
Sharing Power and Influence	4.31	Often	High Level
Visioning and Mobilizing	4.28	Often	High Level
OVERALL MEAN	4.37	Often	High Level

LEGEND:

SCALE/RANGE	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
4.51-5.00	Always	Very high level
3.51-4.50	Often	High level
2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderate level
1.51-2.50	Seldom	Low level
1.00-1.50	Never	Very low level

The data indicate that school administrators demonstrate a well-rounded and consistent application of collaborative behaviors rather than relying on a single leadership trait. There is a particularly strong emphasis on diagnostic activities (environmental scanning) and human capital investment (developing people), which suggests a balanced focus on both organizational context and individual growth. The fact that Visioning and Mobilizing received the lowest mean suggests that while administrators are strong at the technical aspects of planning and mentoring, the act of broadly mobilizing diverse stakeholders remains their most challenging task.

These results imply that administrators in the region have successfully transitioned from traditional hierarchical models toward a distributed leadership paradigm. By prioritizing environmental assessment and the development of their staff, they create a foundational culture of stability and continuous improvement. The overall "High Level" interpretation suggests that collaborative practices are not just occasional events but are deeply embedded in the institutional culture, likely serving as a primary driver for school performance and teacher retention.

The study's findings are strongly supported by Legaspi (2025), who identified the ReTranS framework as essential for navigating post-pandemic transitions through critical and systematic thinking, directly validating the high level of collaborative leadership observed in this data. This is further corroborated by Dalagan (2018), who established a significant positive correlation ( $r=0.808$ ) between collaborative leadership and the Quality of Work Life in Philippine schools, suggesting that administrators who excel in trust-building and environmental assessment create a congenial workplace where staff potential is maximized.

Theoretical support is also provided by Nurlina et al. (2025), whose research indicates that collaborative leadership is rooted in participation and shared responsibility, with the principal serving as a facilitator of stakeholder involvement. These results are reinforced by Yulo and Dioso (2020), who demonstrated that distributed leadership and collective roles empower staff to achieve organizational goals, effectively framing teaching as a fundamental leadership role.

The results are consistent with Zolina and Eulatic (2026), who noted that while shared governance may not immediately impact standardized performance ratings, it remains vital for fostering institutional resilience and empowerment. This underscores the "High Level" of practice identified in the current study as a critical enabling condition for maintaining a positive and collaborative school culture

**Futuristic Thinking**

Table 2 presents the summary of mean scores for school administrators’ overall level of futuristic thinking capability. The composite mean is 4.35, which corresponds to an "Often" descriptive rating and is qualitatively interpreted as a "High Level". The dimension with the highest mean score is future-focused decision-making (MEAN=4.38), while the lowest sub-mean is for future scanning (MEAN=4.29).

The data reveal a consistent "High Level" proficiency across all four strategic pillars of futuristic thinking. Administrators show their strongest performance in the operational aspects of foresight—specifically in making decisions that account for long-term consequences. While still high, the relatively lower scores in future scanning (MEAN=4.29) and future visioning (MEAN=4.33) suggest that administrators are slightly more proficient at reacting to and planning for the future than they are at the continuous, systematic monitoring of emergent global trends.

Table 2: School administrators’ level of futuristic thinking

INDICATORS	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Future Scanning	4.29	Often	High Level
Future Visioning	4.33	Often	High Level
Future-Oriented Planning	4.34	Often	High Level
Future-Focused Decision-Making	4.38	Often	High Level
OVERALL MEAN	4.35	Often	High Level

LEGEND:

SCALE/RANGE	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
4.51-5.00	Always	Very high level
3.51-4.50	Often	High level
2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderate level
1.51-2.50	Seldom	Low level
1.00-1.50	Never	Very low level

These results suggest that school administrators in the region possess a "foresight-ready" leadership mindset, characterized by strategic agility and a willingness to adapt based on new evidence. Their capability is not merely theoretical but is reflected in their daily commitment to aligning immediate actions with a long-term school destiny. The interpretation of this summary indicates that while administrators have mastered the technical and planning aspects of futuristic thinking, there remains a small opportunity to further institutionalize systematic horizon-scanning to stay ahead of rapid global shifts

The study’s findings are reinforced by Magdato et al. (2025), who validated that data-driven decision-making and socio-emotional competence are primary predictors of strategic foresight, supporting the high scores observed in the decision-making dimension. This is further corroborated by Pisapia et al. (2025), who established that proficiency in systems thinking and reframing serves as a direct predictor of administrative success within increasingly non-linear educational environments.

Beyond surface-level trends, these capabilities allow leaders to create "transformative spaces" for alternative futures and deeper systemic change (Inayatullah, 2009, as cited in Couture & Murgatroyd, 2024). For example, Peñaranda (2025) demonstrated how Philippine education executives utilize Causal Layered Analysis (CLA) to derive strategic implications from high-impact drivers such as artificial intelligence and climate hazards

Inclusive and collaborative planning is considered essential for the sustainability of learning recovery programs and for preparing schools for Education 4.0 imperatives (Samosa et al., 2026; Viador, 2024). However, while local administrators exhibit high foresight practice, there remains a persistent gap between theoretical knowledge and institutionalized horizon monitoring (Inductivo, 2024). This can be addressed by the BTS (2025) "future-back thinking" framework, which encourages leaders to design for future success rather than merely reacting to present challenges

**Emergency Preparedness**

Table 3 summarizes the overall mean scores, with a grand mean of 4.40, interpreted as "High Preparedness". The scores across all sub-variables—Motivation (4.43), Implementation (4.42), Communication (4.40), Professional Development (4.38), Planning (4.37), and accountability (4.37)—reflect a consistent level of readiness.

Table 3: School administrators’ level of emergency preparedness

INDICATORS	EAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Emergency Motivation and Democratic Leadership	4.43	Often	High Preparedness
Emergency Implementation	4.42	Often	High Preparedness
Emergency Communication and Monitoring	4.40	Often	High Preparedness
Emergency Professional Development	4.38	Often	High Preparedness
Emergency Planning and Delegation	4.37	Often	High Preparedness
Emergency Accountability and Transparency	4.37	Often	High Preparedness
OVERALL MEAN	4.40	Often	High Preparedness

LEGEND:

SCALE/RANGE	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
4.51-5.00	Always	Very High Preparedness
3.51-4.50	Often	High Preparedness
2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderate Preparedness
1.51-2.50	Seldom	Low Preparedness
1.00-1.50	Never	Very Low Preparedness

The data indicate a mature disaster management culture where no single area of preparedness is significantly lagging. The consistency across indicators suggests that emergency preparedness is "second nature" to these administrators.

These results suggest that administrators have developed a holistic framework for resilience, shifting from principal-centric to co-responsible models. This level of readiness aligns with the "all-hazards" framework necessary for surviving the Pacific Ring of Fire.

This holistic readiness is anchored in legal mandates, specifically Republic Act No. 10121 (2010), which provides the statutory backbone for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction across all levels of the education sector.

Research by Daminar and Cabonce (2026) substantiates this mandate, confirming a strong positive relationship ( $r=0.88$ ) between administrative capacity and the effective execution of disaster protocols, which proves that leadership competence serves as the primary engine of institutional resilience.

Further evidence from Garcia and Espiritu (2025) establishes a significant positive correlation between school head preparedness and the overall effectiveness of disaster risk implementation. This tactical focus is complemented by Angwas (2025), who identified instructional delivery as the strongest predictor of learning continuity, reflecting the high competency regional leaders demonstrate in maintaining schooling even under extreme duress. Albuero (2025) asserts that institutional agility and faculty engagement are the essential drivers for transforming crisis-driven disruptions into opportunities for educational innovation.

**Strategic Leadership**

Table 4 presents the summary of mean scores for school administrators’ level of strategic leadership, encompassing the dimensions of orientation, translation, alignment, intervention, and competence. The overall mean score is 4.40, which corresponds to the "Often" descriptive rating and is qualitatively interpreted as "Highly Strategic". Among the five dimensions, Strategic Alignment and Strategic Competence received the highest sub-means of 4.40, followed by Strategic Intervention at 4.39. The dimensions of Strategic Orientation and Strategic Translation both obtained the lowest sub-mean of 4.38, though they remain firmly within the "Highly Strategic" level.

Table 4: School administrators’ level of strategic leadership

INDICATORS	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Strategic Orientation	4.38	Often	Highly Strategic
Strategic Translation	4.38	Often	Highly Strategic

Strategic Alignment	4.40	Often	Highly Strategic
Strategic Intervention	4.39	Often	Highly Strategic
Strategic Competence	4.40	Often	Highly Strategic
OVERALL MEAN	4.40	Often	Highly Strategic

Legend:

SCALE/RANGE	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
4.51-5.00	Always	Very Highly Strategic
3.51-4.50	Often	Highly Strategic
2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderately Strategic
1.51-2.50	Seldom	Less strategic
1.00-1.50	Never	Not strategic at all

The data reveal a high degree of consistency across the strategic leadership repertoire, with only a 0.02 difference between the highest and lowest-rated dimensions. The parity between Strategic Alignment and Strategic Competence indicates that administrators are equally focused on ensuring organizational structures support the school's vision and applying professional judgment to drive long-term improvement. Conversely, the shared lowest score for Orientation and Translation suggests that while administrators are proficient in vision-setting, the granular tasks of translating that vision into detailed multi-year milestones (such as three-to-five-year roadmaps) are the relative areas for procedural refinement.

These results suggest that school administrators possess a robust and balanced capacity for leading school improvement. The "Highly Strategic" interpretation across all domains implies that administrators have moved beyond purely reactive management to a proactive style that integrates personal traits with organizational processes. Their proficiency in Alignment suggests they are successful at reducing contradictions between stated goals and daily routines, while their high Competence rating reflects a commitment to building long-term institutional capacity and leadership succession.

Research by Apillanes (2025) and Pana (2024) confirms a "very high" level of strategic standard adoption among Philippine school heads, particularly in aligning goals with national policies like the PPSSH. This proficiency is critical, as Santos et al. (2025) demonstrate that integrated strategic leadership predicts reliable educational outcomes and change anticipation, while Kirigi (2025) identifies strategic performance as the dominant predictor of stakeholder engagement and improved academic results.

In the context of institutional renewal, Knight (2023) posits that strategic leadership transcends linear planning by using orientation and translation to foster cultural transformation and ongoing dialogue. This is reinforced by Carvalho et al. (2021), who define strategic leadership as the "core element" of school action that systematically leverages collective resources to enhance learning. The EDCOM II (2026) report further emphasizes that the Philippine education sector is at a "turning point," requiring evidence-based leadership to translate initial gains into sustained, system-wide reform.

Kunalan et al. (2025) validate that acquiring strategic factors is essential for managing complex educational environments and navigating both physical and psychological risks. High-performing strategic leaders are further distinguished by personal traits such as stress tolerance and wisdom (Al-Maskari et al., 2025). Collectively, these findings affirm that strategic leadership is an integrated, multidimensional capability that serves as the anchor for institutional success in the modern era

**Correlation of Strategic Leadership and the Independent Variables**

Table 5 presents the correlation coefficients between school administrators’ emergency preparedness practices, futuristic thinking capability, collaborative leadership capacity, and their overall strategic leadership. The Pearson correlation coefficients (r-values) range from 0.506 to 0.806, all statistically significant at the 0.01 level ( $p < 0.01$ ), indicating strong positive relationships among these variables. The highest correlation is observed between overall emergency preparedness and strategic leadership ( $r = 0.806$ ), followed by specific sub-variables such as emergency accountability and transparency ( $r = 0.776$ ), future-focused decision-making ( $r = 0.740$ ), emergency professional development ( $r = 0.723$ ), and emergency motivation ( $r = 0.722$ ). Futuristic thinking also shows a robust correlation with strategic leadership ( $r = 0.698$ ), with its components future-oriented planning ( $r = 0.641$ ) and future scanning ( $r = 0.557$ ) being significantly related. Collaborative leadership dimensions correlate moderately, with developing people ( $r = 0.572$ ), building trust ( $r = 0.543$ ), and visioning and mobilizing ( $r = 0.506$ ) contributing to the strategic leadership.

Table 5: Correlation between the dependent and independent variables

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFICIENT (r)	P-VALUE
Emergency Preparedness	.806	.000**
Emergency Accountability and Transparency	.776	.000**
Emergency Professional Development	.723	.000**
Emergency Motivation and Democratic Leadership	.722	.000**
Emergency Communication and Monitoring;	.716	.000**
Emergency Planning and Delegation	.705	.000**
Emergency Implementation	.702	.000**
Futuristic Thinking	.698	.000**
Future-Focused Decision-Making	.740	.000**
Future-Oriented Planning	.641	.000**
Future Scanning	.557	.000**
Future Visioning	.543	.000**
Collaborative Leadership	1.89	.000**
Developing People	.572	.000**
Building Trust	.543	.000**
Shared Power and Influence	.513	.000**
Self-Reflection	.508	.000**
Visioning and Mobilizing	.506	.000**

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

### Listwise N=564

The study's findings align with the framework of Davies and Davies (2006), as cited in Kirigi (2025), which posits that strategic leadership integrates organizational abilities—such as orientation, alignment, and translation—with personal wisdom to create sustainable educational environments. This alignment is evidenced by the strong correlation between strategic dimensions and overall leadership, emphasizing the necessity of mental mapping and architectural analysis. Furthermore, Kirigi (2025) validates that leaders who utilize clear strategic visioning and proportional positioning among diverse communities are better equipped to enhance stakeholder engagement and academic performance.

Emergency preparedness emerged as the strongest correlate of strategic leadership, supporting Salibo's (2025) assertion that planning, implementation, and accountability are the foundational dimensions of crisis management for school heads. This is further reinforced by Ogunyemi et al. (2025) and Edmondson et al. (2022), who argue that proactive governance and transparency are essential for validating strategic execution during disruptions. Additionally, the cultivation of emotional intelligence and adaptive team approaches is critical for sustaining staff morale and institutional operations under extreme duress (Guno, 2022; Harris et al., 2025)

The significance of futuristic thinking is affirmed by Pisapia et al. (2025), who demonstrated that metacognitive processes like systems thinking and reframing are directly linked to strategic success. By utilizing future scanning to expand decision options and prevent "strategic myopia," leaders can navigate the limitations of short-term management (Freestone, 2012, as cited in Macaspac, 2024)

The positive correlations within collaborative leadership validate the view of leadership as a practice stretched across a collective framework (Spillane, 2006; Wood & Fields, 2007, as cited in Dalagan, 2023). High collaborative leadership among Philippine school heads significantly impacts teacher teamwork and work-life quality, while collective ownership and feedback loops remain vital for sustainable school improvement plans (Abalorio, 2022; Dalagan, 2023; Phebani, 2025). Additionally, joint capacity-building and mentoring serve as potent predictors of enhanced instructional performance, confirming that proficient strategic leadership in the local context is fundamentally driven by vision alignment and resource stewardship (Bautista & Baniqued, 2025; Laguna et al., 2025; Pana, 2024; Santos et al., 2025).

Statistical results establish that Pearson correlation coefficients (r-values) range from 0.506 to 0.806, all of which are significant at the 0.01 level ( $p < 0.01$ ). Because the p-values for all independent variables and their sub-variables are .000, the null hypothesis—stating that there is no significant relationship between the independent variables and strategic leadership—is rejected. These findings underscore a robust mathematical link between the investigated determinants and the strategic proficiency of school administrators in the region.

### Variables That Best Predict the Resource Generation Capability of School Leaders in Region 10

Table 6 presents the regression analysis results identifying key predictors of resource generation capabilities among school leaders, focusing on work engagement, human resource management, and organizational politics. The analysis indicates that highly engaged leaders, characterized by professional growth engagement, dedication, and absorption, are more effective in mobilizing resources due to their strong stakeholder relationships. Effective human resource management practices, especially in performance appraisal and feedback, foster a supportive environment that encourages staff participation in resource identification. Additionally, navigating organizational politics enhances leaders' ability to advocate for necessary resources and align efforts with school goals. Overall, these findings underscore the need for strategies that enhance these predictors to improve resource mobilization and support school improvement.

Table 6: Regression Analysis between the independent and dependent variables

Model	UNSTANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS		STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS	T	SIG.
	B	STD. ERROR	BETA		
(Constant)	.499	0.114		4.386	0.000
Emergency Preparedness					
Emergency Accountability and Transparency	.328	.029	.396	11.455	0.000
Emergency Planning and Delegation	.116	.035	.134	3.274	0.001
Emergency Professional Development	.082	.037	.090	2.211	0.027
Futuristic Thinking					
Future-Focused Decision- Making	.223	.035	.239	6.311	0.000
Collaborative Leadership					
Developing People	.077	.034	.077	2.291	0.022
Self-Reflection	.063	.029	.067	2.167	0.031
R= 0.850	R <sup>2</sup> = 0.723	F= 242.102	p-value= 0.000		

Regression Equation Model

$$Y = .499 + .328X_1 + .223X_2 + .116X_3 + .082X_4 + .077X_5 + .063X_6$$

Where, Y = Strategic Leadership of School Administrators

X1 = Emergency Accountability and Transparency (Emergency Preparedness)

X2 = Future-Focused Decision-Making (Futuristic thinking)

X3 = Emergency Planning and Delegation (Emergency Preparedness)

X4 = Emergency Professional Development (Emergency Preparedness)

X5 = Developing People (Collaborative Leadership)

X6 = Self-Reflection (Collaborative Leadership)

Regression analysis revealed that six variables significantly predict strategic leadership, accounting for 72.3% of the variance (R=0.850, R<sup>2</sup> =0.723). Emergency accountability and transparency emerged as the most potent predictor (β=.396), suggesting that the ability to maintain institutional integrity and clear standards during disruptions is the primary driver of administrative effectiveness (Edmondson et al., 2022; Salibo, 2025). This is complemented by emergency planning and delegation (β=.134), which validates Salibo’s (2025) assertion that systematic task distribution is foundational to preventing "crisis paralysis" in the Philippine educational context.

The predictive power of future-focused decision-making (β=.239) confirms that cognitive foresight and systems reflection are critical for generating adaptive school futures (Butler University, 2025; Pisapia et al., 2025). Furthermore, the inclusion of emergency professional development (β=.090) in the model aligns with the NEAP Framework and DepEd mandates (2024), which emphasize that continuous, simulation-based capacity building is essential for transforming administrative resilience. These findings demonstrate that strategic leadership is not a singular trait but relies heavily on an administrator's ability to balance immediate operational readiness with long-term visionary planning.

The model incorporates collaborative dimensions, specifically developing people (β=.077) and self-reflection (β=.067), identifying them as essential multipliers of strategic performance and ethical leadership (Dalagan, 2023; Griffin, 2025; Laguna et al., 2025). This multidimensional result supports the comprehensive framework established by Davies and Davies (2004), which posits that sustainable school improvement is driven by the integration of organizational processes with personal wisdom.

The second null hypothesis was rejected as statistical analysis confirmed that the identified predictors are highly significant indicators of leadership capacity.

In alignment with the Emergency Educational Leadership Scale (EELS) theory developed by Salibo (2025), emergency accountability and transparency emerged as the most potent predictor, a finding supported by Edmondson et al. (2022) and Ogunyemi et al. (2025), who argue that transparency and proactive governance validate strategic execution during disruptions. Additionally, the predictive value of emergency planning and delegation reinforces that systematic task distribution is foundational to preventing crisis-driven paralysis (Salibo, 2025), a principle mandated by DepEd Order No. 21 (2015).

The significance of future-focused decision-making as a key predictor validates the Strategic Thinking Questionnaire (STQ) framework by Pisapia et al. (2025), which posits that reframing and systems reflection are critical for generating adaptive school futures. This is further reinforced by the Butler (2025) framework, which links foresight-driven decisions to optimized long-term educational outcomes through intuitive reflection. Furthermore, the predictive role of emergency professional development aligns with the NEAP Framework and DepEd mandates (2024), which prioritize continuous capacity building to transform administrative resilience.

The inclusion of developing people in the model supports Dalagan's (2023) findings that joint capacity-building acts as a strategic multiplier, while the contribution of self-reflection remains consistent with Griffin's (2025) work on reflexive practice for ethical leadership. These predictors, alongside the role of reflection in systems intelligence (Pisapia, 2009), collectively support the comprehensive model of Davies and Davies (2004).

## CONCLUSION

After carefully examining different factors affecting the school administrators' strategic leadership, the researcher draws several conclusions.

School administrators in Region X possess a high level of collaborative leadership capacity, particularly excelling in assessing the environment and developing people. However, while technical planning and mentorship are strong, the conclusion is that visioning and mobilizing diverse stakeholders remain the most challenging collaborative tasks.

Administrators demonstrate a high level of futuristic thinking, with a notable strength in future-focused decision-making. It is concluded that, while they have a "foresight-ready" mindset for operations, they lack systematic scanning practices to continuously monitor emergent global and educational trends.

There is a high level of preparedness across the region, with emergency motivation and democratic leadership being the strongest areas. The study concludes that while administrators are effective crisis managers, they have yet to fully integrate disaster protocols into the long-term School Improvement Plan (SIP) framework.

Administrators are highly strategic, especially in strategic alignment and competence. A key conclusion is that a "translation gap" exists: administrators are proficient in vision-setting but struggle with the granular tasks of translating those visions into detailed three- to five-year roadmaps.

There are significant positive relationships between strategic leadership and all independent variables. It is concluded that emergency preparedness is the strongest driver of strategic performance in the current educational landscape ( $r = .806$ ).

Six variables significantly predict strategic leadership, with emergency accountability and transparency emerging as the most potent predictors. This leads to the conclusion that the ability to maintain clear standards and responsibility during crises is the primary indicator of leadership effectiveness.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based on the conclusions drawn from the study, the following recommendations are offered.

School administrators may implement more inclusive stakeholder engagement programs specifically designed to move beyond information sharing toward active co-creation. This initiative may address the need for stronger "visioning and mobilizing" by fostering a deeper culture of collective responsibility and ensuring that the community fully adopts the school vision.

Administrators may institutionalize systematic horizon scanning by adopting formal tools, such as the PESTLE framework, during annual strategic workshops. Utilizing these foresight tools may help leaders move beyond reactive planning and better monitor the emergent global and local trends that influence long-term school growth.

The Department of Education and school heads may ensure that emergency preparedness is not treated as a separate activity but is fully integrated into the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Such a move may provide a more robust framework for "emergency planning and delegation," ensuring that disaster protocols are a core component of school governance.

Professional development programs may prioritize "strategic translation" by providing administrators with concrete templates and mental maps for execution. These resources help leaders break down abstract, long-term strategic orientations into clear, scheduled, and measurable tactical milestones.

Given the strong correlation between crisis readiness and leadership performance, the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP) may prioritize simulation-based capacity building in its leadership tracks. Strengthening these areas may leverage the high impact that emergency preparedness has on an administrator's overall strategic effectiveness.

Training initiatives may specifically target the development of emergency accountability and future-focused decision-making, as these were identified as the most potent predictors of success. Enhancing these competencies may sustain public trust and institutional legitimacy during periods of significant educational disruption.

## REFERENCES

1. Abalorio, B. E. (2022). Assessment of the school improvement plan implementation in the Muslim areas of Lanao Del Norte Division: A mixed methods study [Doctoral dissertation, La Salle University].
2. Aganon, A. (2025). School heads' competencies and NQESH performance. *Journal of Instructional and Pedagogical Research*.
3. Al-Maskari, N., et al. (2025). Core competencies for school leaders: Insights from Omani experts. *Frontiers in Education*.
4. Al Sawafi, A., et al. (2025). Bridging the leadership gap: Developing a culturally adapted leadership program for healthcare professionals in Oman. *Journal of Healthcare Leadership*, 17, 365–381.
5. Albuero, E. A. (2025). Emergency preparedness in higher education: A literature review on institutional readiness and disaster response. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies in Higher Education*, 2(3), 87–99.
6. Angwas, R. O. (2025). School heads' emergency management competencies: Its influence on continuity of teaching and learning during emergency situations in the Division of Agusan Del Sur, Philippines. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP)*, 15(6).
7. Apillanes, R. C. (2025). Strengths and challenges in the adoption of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) among public elementary school heads in Bislig City Division, Philippines: A mixed-method study. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 15(8), 142–213.
8. Bautista, R., & Baniqued, M. (2025). Teacher leadership behaviors and collaborative practices for instructional improvement. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*.
9. Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2024). Importance of trust and collaboration in educational administration. *American Educational Research Journal*, 61(1), 89–112.
10. BTS. (2025). How future-back thinking turns uncertainty into strategy. *BTS Blog*.
11. Butler University. (2025). Servant leadership's foresight principle: Anticipating decision consequences through intuitive reflection. *FutureVision Educators*.

12. Carvalho, M., Cabral, I., Verdasca, J. L., & Alves, J. M. (2021). Strategy and strategic leadership in education: A scoping review. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, Article 706608.
13. Cohen, H., & Field, A. (2023). The importance of robust financial management practices in sustaining educational initiatives. *Journal of Educational Administration*.
14. Couture, J. C., & Murgatroyd, S. (2024). Agile school leadership: Navigating disruptions in AI and equity.
15. Dalagan, S. E., Jr. (2023). Collaborative leadership and quality of work life. *Davao Research Journal*.
16. Daminar, N. L., & Cabonce, C. B. (2026). Extent of implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act (RA 10121) in the schools of Cabadbaran City, Philippines. *Jambá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, 18(1), Article a1991.
17. Davies, B., & Davies, B. J. (2004). The nature and dimensions of strategic leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 24(1), 29–38.
18. Davies, B., & Davies, B. J. (2006). Contextual wisdom and the integration of external scanning in school leadership.
19. Department of Education. (2020). Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH).
20. Department of Education. (2024). Capability enhancement training on innovative leadership and management for school leaders (PD2024-0004-0605).
21. Edmondson, A. C., et al. (2022). Implementation leadership scales in educational contexts. *PMC*.
22. Freestone, R. (2012). Futures thinking in planning education and research. *Journal for Education in the Built Environment*, 7(1), 8–22.
23. Garcia, J. C., & Espiritu, D. L. (2025). Crisis management preparedness of school heads in the implementation of DRRM in basic education in Second Congressional Districts Division of Camarines Sur. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 49(3), 266–296.
24. Griffin, J. (2025). Reflections on embracing collaborative educational leadership. *TeacherMagazine*.
25. Guarana, G. (2022). The impact of collaborative leadership on school improvement.
26. Guno, C. S. M. (2022). Educational leadership practices of Philippine school principals during COVID-19. ERIC.
27. Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2024). Recognizing teacher contributions to enhance motivation and effectiveness. *School Leadership & Management*, 44(1), 45–62.
28. Harris, A., et al. (2025). Educational leadership and resilience in times of crises. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*.
29. Inayatullah, S. (2009). Causal layered analysis: Poststructuralism as method.
30. Inductivo, I. B. L. (2024). Leading education for the future: Foresight knowledge and foresight practice in education development planning. *International Journal of Open-Access, Interdisciplinary & New Educational Discoveries (iJOINED ETCOR)*, 3(2), 478–491.
31. Kirigi, J. (2025). Strategic leadership performance and its influence on stakeholder engagement and academic outcomes. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 5(5), 9175–9181.
32. Knight, D. (2023). Leadership strategies and strategic planning for times of crisis: Strategic thinking beyond linear planning. *The Journal of Adventist Education*, 85(1).
33. Kunalan, H., et al. (2025). Educational strategic leadership practices among leaders of selected Malaysian risky schools. IIUM Press.
34. Laguna, F., et al. (2025). The effect of educational leaders' competencies. *International Journal of Formal Methods in Research*, 4(51319).
35. Legaspi, F. P. (2025). ReTranS leadership: A qualitative case study on post-pandemic school leadership practices in Bulacan. *Lunday Research Journal*, 7(1), 1–116.
36. Leithwood, K., et al. (2020). Supporting teacher professional growth through leadership practices: Fostering collaboration and instructional leadership. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 58(3), 234–245.
37. Leithwood, K., et al. (2024). Role of effective HR strategies in enhancing overall school performance. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.
38. Macaspac, L. (2024). Utilizing PESTLE frameworks and scenario archetypes in DepEd strategic workshops.
39. Magdato, G. R. C., et al. (2025). Collaborative leadership capacity, data-driven decision-making capability, and socio-emotional competence on strategic foresight of school leaders. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(5), 2453–2465.

40. Mendoza, R. (2024). Disaster-risk reduction, emergency readiness, and school leadership effectiveness. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*.
41. Nurlina, et al. (2025). Collaborative leadership in elementary education: A systematic review of effective principal practices. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 17(4), 8676–8686.
42. Ogunyemi, O. A., et al. (2025). Crisis preparedness and strategic intervention in higher education: Burnout-mitigating models. *Nigerian International Journal of Research in Education*, 52(P1).
43. Pana, E. (2024). School heads' instructional leadership and performance: Basis for strategic leadership program. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 7(2).
44. Peñaranda, J. O. (2025). The “weaving of worthiness” continues? Alternative futures for a Philippine state university to 2051. *Open Access Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 9(02), 046–051.
45. Phebeni, N. M. (2025). Exploring the influence of collaborative leadership on the effectiveness of school improvement initiatives in Eswatini high schools. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 6(2), 125–142.
46. Pisapia, J., et al. (2009). Strategic thinking skills and its relationship with systems intelligence for Department of Education leaders. *EA Journals*.
47. Pisapia, J., et al. (2025). Strategic thinking skills and systems intelligence in educational administration.
48. Rivera, J., et al. (2025). Revitalizing the Philippine education system: Leadership, reforms, and post-pandemic transitions. *Education Commission 2 Policy Paper Series*.
49. Salibo, M. G. (2025). Development of emergency educational leadership scale for school heads. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 39(5), 656–677.
50. Samosa, R., et al. (2026). Towards a strategic foresight framework for sustainable learning recovery: Insights from public elementary school leadership in Cavite, Philippines. *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research (IJAMR)*, 10(2), 347–356.
51. Santos, R. M., et al. (2025). Examining the DepEd's national assessments: A review of framework, design, development, psychometric properties and utilization. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS)*.
52. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2023). Work engagement and educational effectiveness. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(2), Article 45.
53. Second Congressional Commission on Education (EDCOM II). (2026). Turning point: A decade of necessary reform (2026-2035), EDCOM II final report.
54. Spillane, J. (2006). *Distributed Leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
55. Tom-en, J. (2025). Leadership skills of school administrators and SBM implementation. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*.
56. UNESCO. (2021). *Building resilience in education systems: Lessons from the COVID-19 pandemic*.
57. Viador, M. R. (2024). School heads' and teachers' initiatives on Education 4.0: Basis for blueprint for a strategic foresight [Doctoral dissertation, Bulacan Agricultural State College].
58. Wood, M. S., & Fields, D. (2007). Exploring the impact of shared leadership on management team member outcomes. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 2(3), 251–272.
59. Yulo, J. P., & Dioso, D. P. D. (2020). Awareness and practices of distributed leadership among public elementary school teachers. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 3(2), 67–68.
60. Zolina, S. M. V., & Eulatic, P. L., Jr. (2026). Leadership and governance of school heads and performance of teachers. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 10(2), 4733–4753.