Analysis of the Four Frames of Leadership of The School Principals Towards Resource Expansion in the Selected Elementary Schools in the Province of Romblon, Philippines

Addie O. Molo Jr., Rexy O. Molo
Teacher III
addiemolo@gmail.com
DepEd – Concepcion Norte Elementary School
Ph.D.Assistant Professor – IV/ Campus Director
rsurexymolo@gmail.com
Romblon State University – Calatrava Campus

HOW TO CITE:
Addie O. Molo Jr., Rexy O. Molo (2026). Analysis of the Four Frames of Leadership of The School Principals Towards Resource Expansion in the Selected Elementary Schools in the Province of Romblon, Philippines. International Journal of Special Education, 41(7s), 609-623.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:
Copyright: © 2026 Authors. Open access publication underthe terms and conditions of the Creative CommonsAttribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

ABSTRACT:

In the 2023 WB report, approximately 78 percent of public schools and 96 percent of students in the Philippines are exposed and vulnerable to multiple hazards. Hence, studying the performance of functions, and roles associated with school improvement towards resource expansion, involves investigating complex systems of actions of school principals: Structural; Human Resources; Political; and Symbolic frame, respectively. This study aims to determine the status of the four frames of leadership towards school resource expansion. The explanatory sequential design of mixed methods research was employed in this study involving 22 principals and 228 teachers. The findings revealed that leadership in schools is multi-dimensional and interconnected. The results of the Mann–Whitney U test revealed statistically significant differences between principals and teachers in the Structural, Human Resource, and Political frames. However, although these differences are statistically significant, the small effect sizes indicate that the magnitude is subject for collaborative and participatory engagement. Thus, the perceptual gap exists but is not deeply polarized. In contrast, no statistically significant difference was found in the Symbolic frame. Therefore, the null hypothesis for the Symbolic frame is not rejected. This study provides an opportunity for strategic institutional improvement.

Keywords: Four frames of leadership, resource expansion, school principals, and teachers.

Introduction

Education is extremely important for national development. In all fields of specialization, be it science, technology, law, medicine, teaching, industry, culture, and so on, education is expected to produce the human capital, along with primordial responsibility and accountability for the overall development of the country.

In the 2023 WB report, approximately 78 percent of public schools and 96 percent of students in the Philippines are exposed and vulnerable to multiple hazards. Between 2021 and 2023, around 4,000 schools were damaged due to

various disasters, resulting in the disruption of learning continuity for two million children. The Philippines was still among eight nations that registered a learning poverty rate higher than two-thirds, or 67 percent, despite the return of in-person classes in schools in November 2022. Hence, it is evidently proved that the problem in terms of schools' infrastructures and facilities in the Philippines from 2018 to 2023 consistently declined which demand serious attention and intervention.

According to the National School Building Inventory (NSBI Region IV-B Romblon), as of June 30, 2023, the researcher had gathered classroom computations of data as approved by the Schools Division Superintendent. There are a total of 216 elementary schools, with 621 major repairs and 582 minor repairs, including 9 condemned demolitions. From the school clinic (elementary level) based on BEIS, the schools with designated clinics had a total of 142 and a total of 314 personnel trained in basic life support as of January 10, 2023. It implies that there is a need for strong collaborative engagement among educational and political leaders towards school-resource expansion in the seventeen (17) municipalities in the Province of Romblon, Philippines.

Studying the performance of functions, tasks, and roles associated with school improvement particularly towards resource expansion, involves investigating complex systems of actions that show how school principals frame education challenges. The distinction of this study accentuates participants who are increasingly required to play larger roles in providing services and facilitating development in the education sector. There is very little knowledge on how governing bodies negotiate development, the process of change, and nurturing new relationships for collaborative arrangements. There is also very little evidence distinguishing between short-term and long-term collaboration by sharing practices and opportunities when considering the tenure. Therefore, further research and development in this field are needed, and more investigation is required to fully understand the occurrence.

Moreover, the distinction of this study highlights the identified variables using Deal and Bolman's (2017) Four Frames of Leadership Model: Structural Frame, Human Resources Frame, Political Frame, and Symbolic Frame to determine the status of leadership and management practices of school principals for school improvements concerning school resource expansion in the selected elementary schools in the Province of Romblon, Philippines, as the *gap of knowledge*. Hence, the birth of this research.

Methodology

Design

The explanatory sequential design of mixed methods research is utilized in this study. It emphasizes the quantitative phase, followed by the qualitative phase (Creswell, 2011). The purpose of the second qualitative phase is often to explain the results discovered in the first quantitative phase, and sometimes to explain outliers that are not entirely consistent with the collected data. Since the analysis of qualitative data was used to explain the quantitative phase's results, thus the term 'explanatory'. Explanatory sequential design of mixed methods research incorporates both quantitative and qualitative research tradition. Neither technique is superior to the other; rather, each has its own set of benefits and drawbacks and intended to ease the completion of a specific set of research tasks. While both qualitative and quantitative techniques employ a variety of methods for collecting data, including survey, interviews, in-depth interviews, focus group discussion and observation, their analytical framework is distinct. The distinction between qualitative and quantitative method is that qualitative techniques are not concerned with statistical evaluations and measurements, but with the comprehension and interpretation of empirical facts. They are often characterized by a focus on inductive reasoning, propositions, theory development, and the integration of social constructionism, and they offer answers to the 'how' and 'why' questions. But quantitative technique involves the strategies

of collecting and analyzing quantitative data. Frequencies, percentages, and weighted means were utilized as statistical tools in the interpretation of the results. The semi-structured interview guide served as the source in collecting prime data.

Individual interviews are recorded using a digital voice recorder to ensure more accurate data transcription and enable researcher to focus on the interviewee (Patton, 2002).

Research Locale and Time of the Study

One of the provinces in the MIMAROA Region 4-B is Romblon province with Two (2) Legislative districts composed of Seventeen (17) Municipalities with 219 barangays. This study was conducted on January, 2025.

Ethical Considerations

Give that extremely sensitive and confidential information is likely to surface in a study of this type (Cranston et al., 2005), a meeting was held with the participants prior to the conduct of the interview in order to inform them of the nature and purpose of the researcher, the plans for using the results from the interview, and the protocol to be observed to protect the privacy of the participants and the organizations they represent (Creswell, 2009). On the day of the interview, the participants are requested to read and sign a letter of consent to participate in the study and for the interview to be recorded. Participants are assured that their participation in the research is strictly voluntary and that they would have the freedom to withdraw their consent at any time. To enhance respondents' openness to share their experiences more freely and vividly (Viernes and de Guzman, 2005.

Establishing goodness and trustworthiness

In reporting, we ensured that no information would be concealed; most importantly reporting in thick descriptions to account for the cases' representation on each organizational frame and use of verbatim statements to be extracted from the cases. We reflect on our positionality and reflexivity as well as our paper trail generated throughout this investigation to control for personal bias that could impact the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Data Analysis and Procedure

The data gathered are sorted and encoded in the computer for analysis thru SPSS. The statistical tools used in this study are the following:

1. Frequency and percentage distribution – for demographic profile of the respondents.

2. Weighted Mean with descriptive interpretation in determining the perception of the principals and teachers using the sub-indicators of the four frames of leadership: structural frame, human resources frame, political frame, and the symbolic frame.

3. Independent T-Test to test the null hypothesis. A t-test statistical tool is used to compare the mean values and determine the significant difference between the perceptions of the principals and teachers on the four frames of leadership of the school principals toward school resource expansion.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

In the qualitative method, during recorded interview, the researcher transcribed statements. Efforts at immersing oneself in the data are found useful in data analysis to provide the researcher a sense of the data as a whole and intuit emergent insights for their work (Patton, 2009). To ensure accuracy of the transcription, spot-checking procedures is used (Maclean at al., 2004). After modifying transcripts for minor errors, extended text is a subject to phenomenological reduction following the steps proposed in collaizi's method (cited in Wojnar and swanson, 2007). We intended to generate rich detailed descriptions on representations of leadership and management practices dispensation to answer our research questions. Subsequently, we recognized and classified commonalities across the cases as well as perspectives that appeared distinct among them. In addition, we wrote analytic memos to reflect on emerging unique ideas which can form our themes and sub-themes. The analysis is based on the four organizational frames described in the

literature review as our guiding categories including structural, human resources, political, and symbolic frames. Our analysis focused on a particular frame, including how the frame is represented, the pattern in which it is represented including the interconnectedness with other frames. The leadership and managerial elements that depicted artistic or scientific in the organizational frames were all noted down in the analytic memos which guided our discussions. Themes were emerged inductively in this thematic analysis process as we closely read and interpret the writings for each case (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Saldana, 2016). We used a continual comparison amongst themes and align them into categories based on the four organizational frames to describe and determine predominant themes that are related to negotiating distinctiveness and look-alike extracts within and amongst the cases. This process allowed us to report an account individually and/or on case-based themes. In this study, we defined a certain category as the main descriptor representing the four organizational frames that include structural, human resources, political, and symbolic frames. Themes as those descriptors that emerged to support each category (frames). Findings are presented based on the categories (four organizational frames) and themes, concurrently with the discussions.

The Division of Romblon is composed of 13 districts. Twelve of these districts have full time district supervisors and the remaining 1 district has a coordinating principal. There are 216 elementary schools in the division managed by 77 principals, 84 head teachers, 54 teachers-in-charge. As of SY 2023-2024, the total number of regular teachers in the division is 1,659.

Sampling Procedure

The sampling technique used is voluntary sampling a non-probability sampling method where participants self-select into a study. Instead of using random selection, researcher rely on volunteers who express interest in taking part. A few key characteristics of volunteer sampling include its non-random nature and the absence of an explicit sampling frame. It is also particularly useful when you are studying hard-to-reach or specialized populations. It is commonly used when you require participants with specific characteristics or experiences. Examples of situations where this method is employed include online surveys, focus groups and studies involving support groups or advocacy organizations. It is an approach where participants willingly contribute their thoughts and experiences.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2.0. Structural Frame Leadership Orientation of School Principals and Teachers

#	Structural Frame Statement	Principal			Teachers			OVM	DI	Rank
		MW	DI	Sd	MW	DI	Sd			
1	I strongly emphasize careful planning, clear timelines.	4.68	O	0.57	4.22	Oc	0.76	**4.45**	Oc	3
2	I have extraordinary attention to detail.	4.32	Oc	0.72	4.02	Oc	0.81	**4.17**	Oc	8
3	I develop and implement clear, logical policies.	4.68	O	0.48	4.11	Oc	0.84	**4.40**	Oc	4
4	I approach problems with facts and logic.	4.68	O	0.57	4.10	Oc	0.79	**4.39**	Oc	5
5	I use logical analysis and careful thinking.	4.64	O	0.66	4.14	Oc	0.80	**4.39**	Oc	6

6	I strongly believe in a clear chain of command.	4.76	O	0.44	4.18	Oc	0.81	**4.47**	Oc	**1**
7	I have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.	4.50	O	0.60	4.07	Oc	0.85	**4.29**	Oc	7
8	I inspire others to do their best.	4.68	O	0.57	4.25	Oc	0.83	**4.47**	Oc	**2**
	Over all Mean	4.62	O	0.57	4.14	Oc	0.81	4.38	Oc	

Legend:
Often (O) = 4.51 – 5.00 (5)
WM-Weighted Mean
Occasionally (Oc) = 3.50 – 4.50 (4)
SD- Standard Deviation
Always (A) = 2.51 – 3.50 (3)
DI-Descriptive Interpretation
Sometimes (S) = 1.51 – 2.50 (2)
Never (N) = 1.00 - 1.50 (1)

Table 2.0 presents the Structural Frame Leadership Orientation of school principals and teachers. The table reflects the extent to which leadership behaviors aligned with the structural frame—such as planning, policy clarity, logical analysis, and chain of command—are practiced and perceived in the selected elementary schools.

Overall, principals rated themselves within the **"Often"** descriptive level, while teachers' ratings fell within **"Occasionally."** The overall weighted mean indicates that structural leadership practices are generally evident in schools, but principals perceive stronger manifestation of these behaviors compared to teachers. This pattern is consistent across most indicators. Among the structural statements, the highest-ranked item is the strong belief in a **clear chain of command**, followed closely by the ability to **inspire others to do their best** and the emphasis on **careful planning and timelines**. These findings suggest that school heads prioritize organizational clarity, authority structure, and systematic coordination.

Lower-ranked items, such as attention to detail and mobilizing people and resources, while still positively rated, suggest that although structural systems are in place, operational execution may vary in intensity. Teachers' slightly lower ratings across statements may indicate differences in how structural leadership is experienced at the implementation level.

When connected to the **Mann–Whitney results**, the consistent gap between principal and teacher mean scores suggests a perceptual divergence regarding the strength of structural leadership orientation. Thus, any statistical difference may not reflect disagreement in principle, but rather differences in role-based experience.

The findings also connect directly to the **problems encountered** in the study. Structural leadership is closely tied to resource expansion, strategic planning, allocation mechanisms, and procedural coordination. If teachers perceive structural practices as only occasional rather than consistently strong, this may contribute to concerns related to communication gaps, policy clarity, workload distribution, and transparency in decision-making. When structural clarity is unevenly perceived, implementation challenges may emerge.

The results **conform** to related literature on educational leadership, which consistently identifies structural leadership as a dominant orientation among school principals, especially in systems emphasizing accountability, governance, and resource management (Bush et al., 2019; Pont, 2020).

Table 2.1 Human Resource Frame Leadership Orientation of School Principals and Teachers

#	Human Resource Frame Statement	Principal			Teachers			OVM	DI	Rank
		MW	DI	Sd	MW	DI	Sd			
1	I show high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.	4.64	O	0.58	4.25	Oc	0.79	4.44	Oc	4
2	I show high support and concern for others.	4.68	O	0.57	4.23	Oc	0.83	4.46	Oc	2
3	I am consistently helpful and responsive to others.	4.64	O	0.58	4.22	Oc	0.82	4.43	Oc	5
4	I build trust through open, collaborative relationships.	4.73	O	0.55	4.33	Oc	2.09	4.53	Oc	1
5	I listen well and am remarkably receptive to others' ideas and input.	4.59	O	0.59	4.24	Oc	0.81	4.41	Oc	6
6	I give personal recognition for work well done.	4.59	O	0.59	4.18	Oc	0.84	4.38	Oc	7
7	I am highly imaginative and creative.	4.41	Oc	0.59	4.07	Oc	0.87	4.24	Oc	8
8	I develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.	4.59	O	0.50	4.13	Oc	0.85	4.36	Oc	3
	Over all Mean	4.61	O	0.57	4.21	Oc	0.99	4.41		

Legend:

Often (O) = 4.51 – 5.00 (5)

MW- Weighted Mean

Occasionally (Oc) = 3.50 – 4.50 (4)

SD-Standard Deviation

Always (A) = 2.51 – 3.50 (3)

DI- Descriptive Interpretation

Sometimes (S) = 1.51 – 2.50 (2)

Never (N) = 1.00 - 1.50 (1)

Table 2.1 presents the Human Resource Frame Leadership Orientation of school principals and teachers. This frame emphasizes interpersonal relationships, trust-building, recognition, collaboration, and responsiveness to

the needs of others—core elements of people-centered leadership.

The overall mean shows that principals rated themselves within the **"Often"** descriptive level, while teachers rated the leadership behaviors within the **"Occasionally"** range. Although both groups indicate positive manifestations of human resource leadership, principals consistently rated these behaviors higher than teachers. This suggests that while supportive and relational leadership practices are present, there may be differences in how strongly they are experienced across roles.

Among the highest-ranked indicators is the ability to **build trust through open, collaborative relationships**, followed closely by showing **high support and concern for others**. These results reflect a leadership culture that values relational capital and collaborative engagement.

Lower-ranked items, such as being highly imaginative and creative and giving personal recognition for work well done, while still positively rated, suggest areas where relational leadership could be strengthened. Research on educational leadership consistently highlights that collaborative cultures and professional recognition enhance teacher commitment, engagement, and instructional effectiveness.

When connected to the **Mann–Whitney results**, the perceptual gap between principals and teachers may help explain any statistically significant difference identified. Principals may perceive themselves as consistently supportive and relational, whereas teachers may experience these behaviors as present but not as strongly or consistently demonstrated.

The findings also relate to the **problems encountered** in the study. Where teachers perceive human resource practices as only occasional, challenges may arise in areas such as morale, communication openness, professional recognition, and collaborative participation in resource expansion initiatives. Thus, strengthening the human resource frame may directly address concerns related to participation, motivation, and shared ownership of school resource initiatives. The results generally **conform** to related literature indicating that school principals often exhibit strong human resource orientation, particularly in contexts emphasizing collaboration and community involvement. However, the slight perceptual disparity suggests the need for more intentional relational reinforcement.

Table 2.2. Political Frame Leadership Orientation of School Principals and Teachers

#	Political Frame Statement	Principal			Teachers			OVM	DI	Rank
		MW	DI	Sd	MW	DI	Sd			
1	I am politically very sensitive and skillful.	4.14	Oc	0.64	3.77	Oc	0.90	**3.95**	Oc	6
2	I am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.	3.86	Oc	0.77	3.80	Oc	0.97	**3.83**	Oc	8
3	I am very skillful and insightful negotiator.	4.09	Oc	0.53	3.79	Oc	0.94	**3.94**	Oc	7
4	I am usually persuasive	4.00	Oc	0.82	3.84	Oc	0.92	**3.92**	Oc	5

	and influential.									
5	I succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.	4.00	Oc	0.82	3.85	Oc	0.89	**3.93**	Oc	4
6	I anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.	4.23	Oc	0.69	3.87	Oc	0.91	**4.05**	Oc	3
7	I set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.	4.55	Oc	0.60	3.88	Oc	0.92	**4.21**	**Oc**	**1**
8	I see beyond current realities to generate new opportunities and solutions.	4.45	Oc	0.51	3.91	Oc	0.92	**4.18**	**Oc**	**2**
	Over all Mean	4.16	Oc	0.67	3.84	Oc	0.92	4.00	Oc	

Legend:

Often (O) = 4.51 – 5.00 (5)
MW- Weighted Mean
Occasionally (Oc) = 3.50 – 4.50 (4)
SD- Standard Deviation
Always (A) = 2.51 – 3.50 (3)
DI- Descriptive Interpretation
Sometimes (S) = 1.51 – 2.50 (2)
Never (N) = 1.00 - 1.50 (1)

Table 2.2 presents the Political Frame Leadership Orientation of school principals and teachers. The political frame highlights leadership behaviors related to influence, negotiation, conflict management, coalition building, and strategic positioning within organizational power structures.

The overall mean for both principals and teachers falls within the **"Occasionally"** descriptive level, indicating that political leadership practices are evident but not strongly dominant. Principals consistently rated themselves higher than teachers across all indicators, though the differences are less pronounced compared to the structural and human resource frames.

The highest-ranked item is the ability to **set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results**, followed by seeing beyond current realities to generate opportunities and anticipating organizational conflict. These findings suggest that political leadership in this context is closely tied to accountability, foresight, and proactive conflict management.

Lower-ranked indicators include being effective in gaining support from influential individuals and being politically skillful. This may imply that external networking, power brokering, and coalition expansion are present but not maximized. In the context of school resource expansion, political leadership plays a crucial role in mobilizing external stakeholders, local government units, and influential partners. Moderate ratings in these areas may suggest opportunities for strengthening advocacy and external engagement

When connected to the **Mann–Whitney results**, the slight gap between principals and

teachers may help explain any statistical differences observed. Principals, by virtue of their position, are more directly involved in negotiation, policy discussions, and resource mobilization, which may influence their higher self-assessment. Teachers, operating primarily within instructional domains, may have less visibility into these political processes, resulting in comparatively lower ratings.

The findings also relate to the **problems encountered** in the study. If political leadership is only moderately practiced, challenges may arise in securing external support, resolving conflicts efficiently, and sustaining collaborative partnerships for resource expansion. When political skills are not fully optimized, resource expansion initiatives may encounter resistance or limited stakeholder engagement.

The results generally **conform** to related studies indicating that school leaders often demonstrate moderate political orientation, particularly in systems where formal authority structures dominate and political negotiation occurs within defined bureaucratic channels. However, the moderate descriptive level suggests room for growth in strategic networking, coalition-building, and power-based advocacy.

Table 2.3. Symbolic Frame Leadership Orientation of School Principals and Teachers

#	Symbolic Frame Statement	Principal			Teachers			OVM	DI	Rank
		MW	DI	Sd	MW	DI	Sd			
1	I am highly charismatic.	4.00	Oc	0.62	4.02	Oc	0.83	4.01	Oc	8
2	I foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.	4.41	Oc	0.67	4.04	Oc	0.83	4.22	Oc	4
3	I communicate strong and challenging sense of mission.	4.50	Oc	0.60	4.03	Oc	0.83	4.27	Oc	1
4	I am open-minded to diverse behaviors within the organization.	4.50	Oc	0.60	4.03	Oc	0.83	4.27	Oc	1
5	I serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.	4.41	Oc	0.67	4.10	Oc	0.84	4.25	Oc	3
6	I am a highly participative manager.	4.45	Oc	0.67	4.03	Oc	0.86	4.24	Oc	5

7	I communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.	4.36	Oc	0.66	4.08	Oc	0.84	4.22	Oc	6
8	I develop alliances to build a strong base of support.	4.36	Oc	0.66	4.06	Oc	0.84	4.21	Oc	7
	Over all Mean	4.37	Oc	0.64	4.05	Oc	0.84	4.21	**Oc**	

Legend:

Often (O)	= 4.51 – 5.00	(5)
Occasionally (Oc)	= 3.50 – 4.50	(4)
Always (A)	= 2.51 – 3.50	(3)
Sometimes (S)	= 1.51 – 2.50	(2)
Never (N)	= 1.00 - 1.50	(1)

Table 2.3 presents the Symbolic Frame Leadership Orientation of school principals and teachers. The symbolic frame emphasizes meaning-making, vision articulation, values formation, culture building, inspiration, and the use of symbols and rituals to strengthen organizational identity.

The overall mean for both principals and teachers falls within the **"Occasionally"** descriptive level, indicating that symbolic leadership behaviors are present but not overwhelmingly dominant. Principals rated themselves slightly higher than teachers across most indicators, though the difference is relatively narrow compared to other frames. This suggests that symbolic practices are moderately manifested and are generally perceived with consistency across roles.

The highest-ranked indicators include communicating a **strong and challenging sense of mission** and being **open-minded to diverse behaviors within the organization**. These results indicate that leadership within the schools places importance on articulating purpose and fostering inclusivity. Indicators related to serving as a model of organizational values and fostering participation also received relatively high rankings. The lowest-ranked item, being highly charismatic, suggests that leadership is perceived as more mission-driven and participative rather than personality-centered.

When connected to the **Mann–Whitney results**, the slight difference between principal and teacher ratings may explain any statistical variation found between groups. Principals, who are responsible for articulating mission statements, leading ceremonies, and shaping school culture, may perceive stronger symbolic engagement. Teachers participating in these processes, may experience them as moderately evident rather than consistently dominant.

The findings also connect to the **problems encountered** in the study. If symbolic leadership is only moderately practiced, schools may experience challenges in sustaining shared commitment, strengthening morale, and reinforcing collective identity—particularly in resource expansion initiatives that require unified support. When vision communication is not consistently internalized, implementation efforts may lack emotional and cultural reinforcement.

The results generally **conform** to related studies showing that school leaders demonstrate moderate to high symbolic orientation, particularly in articulating mission and fostering

participation. However, the descriptive level suggests that symbolic leadership can still be deepened to strengthen cultural coherence and shared identity.

Table 3. Qualitative Analysis of the Emerging Themes, Frames, Problems Encountered by the respondents, Initial code, category, its interpretation, and Remarks

Emerging Theme	Frame Concern	Problems Encountered	Initial Code	Category	P (f)	T (f)	Total (f)	Interpretation	Remarks
Structural Resource Deficiency	Structural / Political	Insufficient funding, inadequate facilities, procurement delays, poor internet connectivity	Limited budget, lack of classrooms, insufficient materials	Financial & Infrastructure Constraints	4	22	26	Resource limitation is the most dominant barrier to school resource expansion.	Highest frequency; core structural issue
Organizational Structural Inefficiency	Structural	Unclear policies, overlapping roles, delayed approvals, weak monitoring systems	Weak coordination, role confusion	Organizational System Gaps	3	18	21	Weak internal systems create delays and reduce expansion efficiency.	Needs structural redesign
Human Capital Overextension	Human Resource	Heavy workload, administrative overload, burnout, curriculum burden	Multiple designations, stress	Capacity Strain	1	20	21	Teachers experience role overload that limits engagement in resource expansion.	Strongly teacher-reported
Political Resource Contestation	Political	Rivalry, favoritism, unequal allocation, centralized decision-making	Competition for funds	Internal Power Dynamics	2	16	18	Scarcity intensifies competition and power imbalance within schools.	Political tension evident
Participatory Leadership Deficiency	Structural / HR / Political	Limited teacher involvement in MOOE planning, weak transparency, poor communication	Communication gaps	Governance Gaps	2	15	17	Weak inclusive leadership reduces trust and shared ownership.	Governance improvement needed
Motivational and Morale Erosion	Human Resource / Symbolic	Low morale, lack of recognition, undervaluation	Feeling unappreciated	Emotional Climate	1	14	15	Emotional dissatisfaction affects institutional engagement.	Impacts sustainability
Symbolic and Cultural Inertia	Symbolic	Resistance to change, attachment to traditional	Cultural resistance	Cultural Misalignment	1	13	14	Cultural conservatism slows innovation	Requires change management

		practices, weak shared vision						and modernization .	
Professional Capacity Gaps	Human Resource	Limited training, lack of professional development	Inadequate preparation	Developmental Deficit	0	11	11	Expansion initiatives lack matching capacity-building support.	Training intervention needed
Limited Strategic Advocacy Capacity	Political	Weak LGU negotiation, limited partnerships, low external funding	Weak external linkage	External Political Constraints	1	9	10	Limited political capital restricts resource mobilization.	Partnership strengthening needed

The qualitative analysis presents the emerging themes, leadership frames, and problems encountered by respondents in relation to school resource expansion. The themes were systematically derived from initial codes and clustered into categories, providing a deeper contextual explanation of the quantitative findings. The results reveal that challenges are multi-dimensional, cutting across structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames.

The most dominant theme is **Structural Resource Deficiency**, with the highest total frequency. Both principals and teachers strongly identified insufficient funding, inadequate facilities, procurement delays, and poor internet connectivity as major constraints. This confirms that financial and infrastructure limitations remain the most pressing barrier to resource expansion. Literature on school improvement emphasizes that while leadership matters, inadequate baseline resources significantly hinder implementation capacity (Pont, 2020). The high frequency indicates that structural inadequacies are foundational challenges. (Timperley et al., 2020).

Closely related is **Organizational Structural Inefficiency**, characterized by unclear policies, overlapping roles, and weak monitoring systems. This suggests that beyond external shortages, internal systems also contribute to delays. The findings align with structural leadership theory, which emphasizes clarity of roles, measurable goals, and systematic coordination as prerequisites for organizational efficiency (Bolman & Deal, 2017).

The theme **Human Capital Overextension** reveals heavy workload, administrative overload, and burnout, particularly reported by teachers. This strongly teacher-reported concern highlights role strain and capacity limitations. Research in educational leadership shows that excessive administrative burden reduces teacher engagement and limits innovation (Harris & Jones, 2021). When teachers are overstretched, participation in expansion initiatives diminishes, weakening collective efficacy.

Under the political frame, **Political Resource Contestation** reflects rivalry, favoritism, unequal allocation, and centralized decision-making. Scarcity appears to intensify internal competition. Political frame theory views organizations as arenas of negotiation and power dynamics, especially when resources are limited (Bolman & Deal, 2017). The findings indicate that political tension may affect equity and collaborative governance.

The theme **Participatory Leadership Deficiency** cuts across structural, human resource, and political frames. Limited teacher involvement in MOOE planning, weak transparency, and communication gaps reduce shared ownership. Research on governance and school improvement consistently highlights the importance of inclusive decision-making and transparency to build trust and accountability (OECD, 2020). Weak participatory mechanisms

may partly explain the perceptual gaps observed in the Mann–Whitney results.

In the human resource and symbolic dimensions, **Motivational and Morale Erosion** and **Symbolic and Cultural Inertia** reflect emotional dissatisfaction, lack of recognition, resistance to change, and attachment to traditional practices. These findings suggest that beyond structural issues, the emotional and cultural climate influences institutional sustainability. School culture research emphasizes that strong shared vision and recognition systems enhance motivation and commitment (Harris & Jones, 2021).

Professional Capacity Gaps highlight limited training and insufficient professional development support. Expansion initiatives without matching capability-building efforts risk ineffective implementation. Literature on strategic leadership underscores the importance of aligning human resource development with institutional goals (Bush et al., 2019).

Finally, **Limited Strategic Advocacy Capacity** indicates weak negotiation with local government units and limited external partnerships. Political capital and alliance-building are essential for resource mobilization. Governance research emphasizes that effective school leaders must engage external stakeholders to strengthen funding and partnership networks (Pont, 2020).

The findings suggest the need for: 1. Structural redesign and clearer monitoring systems; 2. Capacity-building programs to address teacher overload and professional gaps; 3. Strengthened participatory governance to enhance transparency and trust; 4. Strategic external partnerships to increase political leverage and funding support; and 5. Cultural transformation initiatives to align vision, morale, and innovation.

CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that leadership orientations of school principals and teachers across the four frames are generally positive but not uniformly perceived. The statistical findings provide important evidence regarding the acceptance and rejection of the null hypotheses. The results of the Mann–Whitney U test revealed statistically significant differences between principals and teachers in the Structural, Human Resource, and Political frames. Therefore, the null hypotheses for these three frames are rejected. This means that principals and teachers differ significantly in their perceptions of leadership practices related to structural systems, people management, and political engagement. However, although these differences are statistically significant, the small effect sizes indicate that the magnitude of these differences is modest. Thus, the perceptual gap exists but is not deeply polarized.

In contrast, no statistically significant difference was found in the Symbolic frame. Therefore, the null hypothesis for the Symbolic frame is not rejected. This indicates that principals and teachers share relatively similar perceptions regarding mission clarity, shared values, and school culture. The rejection of the null hypotheses in the Structural, Human Resource, and Political frames implies that leadership practices are not always experienced equally across organizational roles. Structural systems may be designed at the administrative level but perceived differently by teachers in implementation. Human Resource practices may be initiated by principals but may not fully translate into consistent experiences of support and empowerment. Political leadership may be visible in goal-setting and accountability but may not be fully recognized by teachers as inclusive or participatory. Meanwhile, the non-rejection of the null hypothesis in the Symbolic frame indicates shared cultural cohesion. Both principals and teachers appear to have common understanding of the school's mission and values. This shared meaning can serve as a strategic anchor for institutional reform.

The study confirms that effective leadership cannot rely solely on one dominant frame. Structural clarity must be complemented by human empowerment, political competence, and symbolic alignment. The findings support the argument that sustainable school resource expansion requires balanced integration of the

four leadership frames rather than isolated emphasis on structural efficiency alone. The rejection of the null hypotheses in three frames and the non-rejection in one frame collectively indicate that leadership in schools is both differentiated and unified—differentiated in operational practices, yet unified in cultural meaning. This duality provides both a challenge and an opportunity for strategic institutional improvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings and conclusions, several recommendations are proposed to strengthen school leadership and resource expansion efforts. First, structural systems should be enhanced through clearer policy guidelines, streamlined workflows, transparent financial reporting, and systematic monitoring mechanisms. Schools may adopt digital tracking systems to improve efficiency and accountability; Second, Human Resource development should be prioritized. Schools should implement structured mentoring programs, workload management strategies, professional development initiatives, and recognition systems that address teacher motivation and well-being; Third, Political capacity should be strengthened. Principals should actively cultivate partnerships with local government units, private organizations, and community stakeholders. Training in negotiation, advocacy, and resource mobilization may enhance institutional sustainability; Fourth, Symbolic leadership practices should be reinforced through regular mission communication, participatory forums, recognition ceremonies, and activities that strengthen school identity and shared purpose; For future research, longitudinal studies may examine the long-term impact of integrated multi-frame leadership. Researchers may also explore leadership perceptions in different educational levels or investigate mediating variables such as experience, tenure, or organizational size; and the study highlights that balanced multi-frame leadership is essential for sustainable school improvement. When structural clarity, human empowerment, political competence, and symbolic coherence operate in alignment, schools are better positioned to expand resources, enhance teacher performance, and achieve improved student outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The investigators are extremely pleased to Erly M. Molo, Ed.D and Rev. Marne M. Molo for their unfailing support in formulating this study. To Romblon State University President, Merian P. Catajay-Mani, Ed.D., CESE for the extensive knowledge and support. To Retchell L. Morales, DBA, Ma. Eliza P. Cruz, Ed.D., Philip R. Baldera, Ed.D., and GEPS Staff for their professional and technical support to make this piece of work refined and be published.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

All authors have equal contributions in the completion of this research and preparation of the manuscript.

Conflict Of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2017). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership a. (6th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Bolman and Deal (2017). Four-Frame Model of Successful Organizational Leadership DOI: a. 10.13140/RG.2.2.31126.45121

Bolman and Deal (1992) Leadership and Management Effectiveness: A Multi-Frame, Multi-a. Sector Analysis

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2021). Artistry, choice, and leadership: Reframing organizations. a. Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2017). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership a. (6th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Bush, T., Bell, L., & Middlewood, D. (2019). Principles of educational leadership and a. management (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence a. Erlbaum Associates.
Cranston et al., 2005). Ethical Dillemas Faced by School Leaders: An examination of their Nature, a. Complexities, and challenges
Creswell, J.W. and Vicki L. Plano Clark (2011). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods a. Research. SAGE, 2011.ISBN 1412975174, 9871412975179. Education Research.
Field, A. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
Gibbons, J. D., & Chakraborti, S. (2011). Nonparametric statistical inference (5th ed.). Chapman a. & Hall/CRC.
Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2021). Leading educational change and improvement at scale. School a. Leadership & Management, 41(1–2), 1–7.
Lisa Evans1, Bill Thornton2, and Janet Usinger2, (2012)Theoretical Frameworks to a. Guide School Improvement
Maclean et. Al (2004). Improving Accuracy of Transcripts in Qualitative Research. Qualitative a. research 14 (1),113-123,2004
OECD (2018). Education at a Glance 2018: Estonia Country Note. Paris: OECD Publishing.
OECD. (2020b). How teachers differ in their perceptions of leadership for learning: Clustering a. teacher data from TALIS 2018. (Teaching in Focus, 31), OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/83880b97-en
Pallant, J. (2020). SPSS survival manual (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
Patton, M. Q. (2002) Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods.Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
Pont, B. (2020). A literature review of school leadership policy reforms. OECD Publishing.
Saldana, J. (2016). The coding manual for qualitative researchers. Sage.
Shank, G. D. (2006). Qualitative research: A personal skills approach. Pearson.
Viernes and De Guzman (2005). Filipino teacher's experiences of supportive relationship with colleagues: A narrative-biographical inquiry
Wojnar and swanson, (2007). Phenomenology an Exploration. http://onlinesagepub.com
World Bank Australian Aid.2016. Assessing the Role Played by Local Government in Supporting Basic Education in the Philippines
World Bank and Australian Agency for International Development (WB and AusAID).
2012. Philippines: Basic Education Public Expenditure Review. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/13809 (accessed on October 10, 2021).
World Bank (2018). World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise. The World Bank Group, Washington, DC.