Crises Leadership Practices and Modular Learning Effectiveness in Gida Schools During The Normal: The Case of Glan, Sarangani Province

Mcdonald C. Melendres [1], Alan A. Maglantay, MMPM [2]

1 − Banlas Integrated School
2 − Sultan Kudarat State University

Abstract

This study explored the crisis leadership practices of school heads and the effectiveness of modular learning development (MLD) implementation in geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas (GIDA) schools in Glan, Sarangani Province during the new normal. It aimed to assess the level of crisis leadership practices, determine the effectiveness of MLD implementation, examine the relationship between the two variables, and identify whether demographic factors influence crisis leadership practices. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design. Data were gathered from 97 respondents using validated survey questionnaires. Statistical tools such as weighted mean, Spearman's rho, regression analysis, and the Kruskal-Wallis test were used to analyze the data. The findings revealed that school heads demonstrated Outstanding crisis leadership practices. A very strong and significant positive relationship was found between crisis leadership practices and MLD implementation. However, demographic factors, including age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, and length of service, showed no significant influence on leadership practices. Additionally, no significant differences were observed in the effectiveness of MLD implementation across the nine GIDA schools. The study concludes that effective crisis leadership greatly contributes to the successful implementation of modular learning in GIDA schools. It recommends strengthening community involvement, expanding support for at-risk learners, and providing continuous professional development for school heads.

Keywords: Crises Leadership Practices, Modular Learning Effectiveness Implementation, Demographic Profile of school Heads, Geographically Isolated Disadvantage Areas (GIDA) Schools

INTRODUCTION

Education plays an important role in shaping the lives of students, and teachers are key partners in delivering quality teaching and learning. The COVID-19 pandemic significantly disrupted the educational landscape in the Philippines and worldwide, prompting a shift from traditional face-to-face instruction to alternative modalities, including modular distance learning. The Department of Education's adoption of flexible learning systems aimed to ensure educational continuity despite the crisis (OECD, 2020). According to a survey conducted by the Department of Education (DepEd), modular learning—using printed or digital modules—was the most preferred distance learning method among parents for the academic year (Bernardo, 2020). This approach was particularly suitable for remote areas with limited internet access, where online learning was not feasible.

However, implementing modular learning has been fraught with challenges. The abrupt transition to a new educational system introduced issues related to resource availability, instructional quality, and stakeholder collaboration. Teachers faced difficulties in tracking students' progress, providing timely feedback, and maintaining student engagement in a remote setting (Bagood, 2020). Additionally, the role of school leaders became even more critical during this period.

This research will contribute to understanding the competencies required for effective educational leadership in crisis and offer recommendations for strengthening the capacity of school leaders. By focusing on the intersection of leadership practices and modular learning, the study seeks to provide actionable strategies for enhancing educational outcomes in remote and disadvantage settings, thereby addressing a significant gap in the literature on distance education and crisis leadership.

Statement of the Problem

This study will aim to determine the relationship of the school principals'/school heads practices and the implementation of the modular learning delivery approach in the new normal education. Specifically, it shall seek to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the principals/school heads in terms of the following:

    1.1 Age

    1.2 Sex

    1.3 Civil Status

    1.4 Highest Educational Attainment

   1.5 Length of Service

2 What is the level of the principals' crises leadership practices in implementing the modular learning modality in terms of:

   2.1 Crisis Adaptive Leadership

   2.2 Digital Management

   2.3 Inclusivity

   2.4 Caring Leadership

   2.5 Communication Effectiveness

   2.6 Resource Management

   2.7 Emotional and Psychological Support

   2.8 Collaboration with External Agencies

   2.9 Crisis Preparedness and Contingency Planning

3 What is the level of effectiveness of the implementation of the modular learning delivery in terms of:

   3.1 Module Preparation and Distribution

   3.2 Student Learning and Engagement

   3.3 Monitoring and Feedback

   3.4 Student Retention and Completion Rates

   3.5 Parental and Community Support

4 Is there a significant relationship between the extent of principals' and school heads crises leadership practices and the effectiveness of the implementation of the modular learning delivery approach in the GIDA schools of Glan, Sarangani Province?

5 Does the demographic profile of school principals and school heads significantly affect the extent of their crisis's leadership practices in the implementation of modular learning in the New Normal education?

Hypothesis

Ho1: There is no significant relationship that existed between the extent of the principals' and school heads crises leadership practices and the level of effectiveness of the modular learning delivery in the new normal of education.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is concerned with the research methods, and procedures employed to systematically answer the specific problems; specifically, research design, sampling techniques, instrumentation, validation of the instruments, data gathering procedure, and the data analysis procedure.

Respondents and Locale of the Study

The respondents for this study will include school heads and teachers of GIDA schools in Glan 3 District Glan, Sarangani, Province, namely: Lanao Kapanglao Integrated School, Segafu Esgafu Integrated School, Flaviano Bartulaba Integrated School, LAO Elementary School, Tangan Integrated School, TAMALA Elementary School, EDSA Integrated School, Banlas Integrated School, and E. Alegado Integrated School. Combination of purposive sampling and complete enumeration was used as sampling technique.

Data Gathering Instrument

.   The data gathering instrument designed for this study seeks to assess principals' leadership practices and the effectiveness of modular learning delivery in Geographically Isolated and Disadvantaged Areas (GIDA) during the "New Normal." It employs a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) to measure respondents' level of agreement with various statements across several parameters. Each parameter has been carefully adapted from credible studies to ensure the instrument's relevance and reliability, capturing dimensions such as crisis leadership, digital management, and inclusivity.

Data Gathering Procedure

In gathering all the data needed in this research, the first step was to validate the research questionnaire. The questionnaire used in this study is adapted from the different studies with some modifications to suit with the study. The researcher will tapped five (5) experts from the field to validate the questions with the help and assistance of the experts of the subject from the Division Office of Sarangani Province . After which, the researcher will secure permission letter from the from the Division Superintendent with the endorsement of the school heads/principals and the District Supervisors where the schools will be the subject of this research. The researcher will collect the accomplished questionnaire from the advisers within one week after administering it.

Seeking Permission to Conduct Study. Permission to conduct the study will be made by the researcher by asking permission to the Schools Division Superintendent of Sarangani, and then to the

administrators of the public schools of Glan 3 District through a letter request to conduct a survey and interview.

Administration and Retrieval of Questionnaires. After the validation of questionnaires, the research instruments will be administered to the respondents and treated the data after it will be collected. The researcher himself will distribute the questionnaires to the school heads and teachers. Appropriate instructions will be accorded to the respondents on how the questionnaires are answered by them.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the relationship between the crisis leadership practices of school heads and the effectiveness of MLD implementation revealed a very strong and significant positive correlation, with a Spearman's rho value of 0.823 and a p-value less than 0.001. Among the leadership dimensions, Collaboration with External Agencies showed the strongest correlation with MLD implementation at 0.790, followed by Caring Leadership at 0.765, and Crisis Management at 0.750.

Furthermore, regression analysis showed that the demographic factors of school heads—namely age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, and length of service—did not significantly influence their crisis leadership practices, as indicated by p-values greater than 0.05. Finally, the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed no statistically significant differences in the effectiveness of MLD implementation across the nine GIDA schools, with a chi-square value of 13.4, degrees of freedom of 8, and a p-value of 0.10. This finding suggests uniform implementation effectiveness among the schools surveyed.

RESULTS

This chapter presents and discusses the results of the study on crises leadership practices and modular learning effectiveness in Geographically Isolated and Disadvantaged Areas (GIDAs) in Glan, Sarangani Province. The discussion is organized based on the specific problems posed in the study, supported by scientific explanations and related literature to interpret the findings.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the School Heads in GIDA Schools of Glan, Sarangani Province

Category	Details
Age of School Heads	36–45 years: 44.4%
	26–35 years: 22.2%
	56–65 years: 22.2%
	46–55 years: 11.1%

Category	Details
Gender	Male: 88.9%
	Female: 11.1%
Educational Attainment	Master's Degree (incomplete): 44.4%
	Master's Degree (completed): 33.3%
	Doctorate Degree (completed): 11.1%
	Doctorate (currently earning units): 11.1%
Length of Service	6–15 years: 77.8%
	16–25 years: 11.1%
	26–35 years: 11.1%

Table 1 showed that most of the school heads (44.4%) fall within the age bracket of 36-45 years old. Meanwhile, 22.2% of the respondents are between 26-35 years old. Similarly, 22.2% of the school heads are aged 56-65, Only 11.1% belong to the 46-55 age group, majority of the school heads are male, comprising 88.9% of the respondents, while only 11.1% are female. A significant portion of school heads, or 44.4%, hold a Master's Degree but have not yet completed the full academic requirements for conferment. Meanwhile, 33.3% have already earned their full-pledged Master's Degrees, reflecting a strong commitment to professional advancement among school leaders in GIDA schools. Additionally, 11.1% have pursued further studies and earned Doctorate Degrees, while another 11.1% are currently earning units toward a Doctorate. the majority of school heads, or 77.8%, have been in service for 6 to 15 years. Meanwhile, 11.1% of school heads have served for 16 to 25 years, and another 11.1% have dedicated 26 to 35 years to the education sector.

Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in Implementing Modular Learning Modality in GIDA Schools of Glan, Sarangani Province

Table 2. Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in Implementing Modular Learning Modality in GIDA Schools of Glan, Sarangani Province

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	Interpretation
1. The principal quickly adapts to changing situations during crises.	96	4.39	0.84	Outstanding
2. Decisions made by the principal in a crisis are flexible and adaptive	96	4.32	0.70	Outstanding
3. The principal encourages staff to be innovative during challenging times.	96	4.46	0.75	Outstanding

	N	Mean	SD	
4. The principal maintains a calm demeanor during crisis situations	95	4.17	0.75	Very Satisfactory
5. The principal supports staff in finding new solutions to crisis-related problems	96	4.39	0.76	Outstanding
Mean	96	4.34	0.58	Outstanding

As presented in Table 2, the overall mean rating for Crisis Adaptive Leadership is 4.34, interpreted as Outstanding. This suggests that school heads in GIDA schools have consistently demonstrated exceptional adaptability and responsiveness during the pandemic. Among the specific indicators, the highest rating (4.46) was given to the item "The principal encourages staff to be innovative during challenging times," highlighting how school leaders foster a culture of innovation and creativity in addressing the complexities of modular learning delivery.

Table 3. Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in terms of Crisis Management

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	
1. The principal has effective strategies in place to manage school crises.	96	4.31	0.76	Outstanding
2. The principal communicates clearly with stakeholders during a crisis.	96	4.34	0.68	Outstanding
3. The principal has a well-defined plan for emergency situations.	96	4.30	0.68	Outstanding
4. Crisis management strategies are regularly reviewed and updated.	96	4.30	0.77	Outstanding
5. The principal ensures that all staff members are aware of crisis protocols	96	4.24	0.75	Outstanding
Mean	96	4.30	0.55	Outstanding

As reflected in Table 3, the overall mean rating for Crisis Management is 4.30, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.55, interpreted as Outstanding, the item "The principal communicates clearly with stakeholders during a crisis" received the highest mean rating of 4.34 with an SD of 0.68, interpreted as Outstanding. "The principal has effective strategies in place to manage school crises" and "The principal has a well-defined plan for emergency situations" both received high mean ratings of 4.31 (SD = 0.76) and 4.30 (SD = 0.68), Crisis management strategies are regularly reviewed and updated was rated 4.30, with a higher SD of 0.77, suggesting variability in how often strategies are revisited across schools.

Table 4. Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in terms of Digital Management.

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	Interpretation
1. The principal promotes the use of digital tools for communication and instruction	96	4.4	0.69	Outstanding
2. The principal ensures that teachers have access to necessary digital resources	96	4.29	0.68	Outstanding
3. The principal provides training for staff on effective use of technology	96	4.38	0.70	Outstanding
4. Digital platforms are used effectively for remote management	95	4.17	0.72	Very Satisfactory
5. The principal encourages innovative use of digital tools to enhance learning	96	4.41	0.67	Outstanding
Mean	96	4.33	0.50	Outstanding

The overall mean rating for Digital Management is 4.33, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.50, interpreted as Outstanding. The highest-rated indicator is "The principal encourages innovative use of digital tools to enhance learning", with a mean of 4.41 and an SD of 0.67, interpreted as Outstanding. "The principal promotes the use of digital tools for communication and instruction" received a mean of 4.40 with an SD of 0.69, also interpreted as Outstanding. This demonstrates that principals effectively encourage teachers and staff to leverage digital platforms to maintain communication and management.

Table . 5 Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in terms of Inclusivity.

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	Interpretation
1. The principal ensures all students, including marginalized groups, have access to learning resources	96	4.18	0.73	Very Satisfactory
2. Inclusivity is a priority in all school policies and practices	96	4.46	0.65	Outstanding
3. The principal adapts learning materials to meet diverse student needs	96	4.27	0.77	Outstanding

	N			
4. There are strategies in place to address the needs of students with disabilities	96	4.33	0.69	Outstanding
5. The principal promotes an inclusive culture among staff and students	96	4.21	0.82	Outstanding
Mean	96	4.29	0.51	Outstanding

The overall mean rating for Inclusivity is 4.29, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.51, interpreted as Outstanding. The highest-rated indicator, "Inclusivity is a priority in all school policies and practices", received a mean score of 4.46 and an SD of 0.65, interpreted as Outstanding. The item "There are strategies in place to address the needs of students with disabilities" was rated with a mean of 4.33 and an SD of 0.69, Meanwhile, "The principal adapts learning materials to meet diverse student needs" had a mean of 4.27 and an SD of 0.77, also interpreted as Outstanding. The indicator "The principal promotes an inclusive culture among staff and students" received a mean of 4.21 and an SD of 0.82, "The principal ensures all students, including marginalized groups, have access to learning resources", with a mean of 4.18 and an SD of 0.73, interpreted as Very Satisfactory.

Table 6. Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in terms of Caring Leadership.

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	Interpretations
1. The principal shows empathy and concern for the well-being of staff and students	96	4.46	0.72	Outstanding
2. The principal prioritizes the mental health of the school community	96	4.36	0.78	Outstanding
3. The principal is approachable and accessible to teachers, students, and parents	96	4.32	0.86	Outstanding
4. There are initiatives in place to support the emotional well-being of staff	96	4.31	0.74	Outstanding
5. The principal fosters a supportive and caring school environment	96	4.39	0.69	Outstanding
Mean	96	4.37	0.58	Outstanding

As shown in Table 6, the overall mean rating for Caring Leadership is 4.37, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.58, interpreted as Outstanding. The highest-rated indicator is *"The principal shows empathy and concern for the well-being of staff and students"*, with a mean of 4.46 and an SD of 0.72, interpreted as Outstanding. The indicator *"The principal fosters a supportive and caring school environment"* received a mean of 4.39 and an SD of 0.69, also interpreted as Outstanding. *"The principal prioritizes the mental health of the school community"* obtained a mean of 4.36 and an SD of 0.78,

indicating a strong commitment to promoting mental well-being within the school. Meanwhile, *"The principal is approachable and accessible to teachers, students, and parents"* recorded a mean of 4.32, with the highest SD of 0.86 among the indicators.

Lastly, *"There are initiatives in place to support the emotional well-being of staff"* had a mean of 4.31 and an SD of 0.74, highlighting the school heads' proactive efforts in providing emotional support mechanisms for teachers and staff, which in turn fosters a sense of community and shared responsibility.

Table 7. Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in terms of Communication Effectiveness

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	Interpretation
1. The principal provides regular updates about important school matters	96	4.39	0.69	Outstanding
2. Communication from the principal is clear and understandable	96	4.35	0.71	Outstanding
3. The principal encourages open communication between staff and management	96	4.34	0.68	Outstanding
4. Feedback from stakeholders is considered in decision-making	96	4.34	0.65	Outstanding
5. The principal uses multiple channels to communicate with the school community	96	4.39	0.73	Outstanding
Mean	96	4.36	0.50	Outstanding

As reflected in Table 7, the overall mean rating for Communication Effectiveness was 4.36, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.50, interpreted as Outstanding. Two indicators received the highest mean ratings of 4.39, both interpreted as Outstanding. The first was *"The principal provides regular updates about important school matters"*, with an SD of 0.69. The second was *"The principal uses multiple channels to communicate with the school community"*, with an SD of 0.73, suggesting versatility in reaching various audiences, whether through digital platforms, text messaging, or traditional communication modes—especially important in GIDA settings with varying access to technology.

The indicator *"Communication from the principal is clear and understandable"* obtained a mean of 4.35 and an SD of 0.71, further affirming the effectiveness of principals in delivering messages that are easily comprehended by staff, students, and parents. Additionally, *"The principal encourages open communication between staff and management"* and *"Feedback from stakeholders is considered in decision-making"* both received mean ratings of 4.34, with SDs of 0.68 and 0.65, respectively.

Table 8. Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in terms of Resource Management.

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	Interpretation
1. The principal ensures resources are distributed equitably among students	96	4.33	0.66	Outstanding
2. The principal effectively manages the school budget during crises	96	4.44	0.71	Outstanding
3. The principal collaborates with external partners to secure additional resources	96	4.23	0.75	Outstanding
4. There is a strategy for resource allocation that supports school priorities	96	4.4	0.69	Outstanding
5. The principal prioritizes resources that directly benefit student learning	96	4.24	0.71	Outstanding
Mean	96	4.33	0.52	Outstanding

As reflected in Table 8, the overall mean rating for Resource Management is 4.33, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.52, interpreted as Outstanding. The highest-rated indicator was *"The principal effectively manages the school budget during crises"*, with a mean score of 4.44 and an SD of 0.71, interpreted as Outstanding. The indicator *"There is a strategy for resource allocation that supports school priorities"* follows closely with a mean of 4.40 and an SD of 0.69, also interpreted as Outstanding. *"The principal ensures resources are distributed equitably among students"* received a mean rating of 4.33 with an SD of 0.66, highlighting the leaders' commitment to fairness and equity, which was particularly important in GIDA schools where learners often have varying levels of access to learning materials and support. Meanwhile, *"The principal prioritizes resources that directly benefit student learning"* recorded a mean of 4.24 and an SD of 0.71, indicating that leaders are mindful in focusing on the direct impact of resources on students' learning experiences and outcomes, consistent with the findings of Harris and Jones (2020).

Lastly, *"The principal collaborates with external partners to secure additional resources"* had a mean rating of 4.23 and an SD of 0.75, interpreted as Outstanding, though reflecting slightly higher variability.

Table 9. Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in terms of Emotional and Psychological Support

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	Interpretation
1. The principal provides access to mental health resources for students and staff	96	4.41	0.67	Outstanding
2. There is a focus on maintaining morale during challenging times	96	4.29	0.66	Outstanding
3. The principal regularly checks in with staff to discuss their well-being	96	4.28	0.71	Outstanding
4. Programs are in place to support students' emotional needs	96	4.17	0.78	
5. The principal actively promotes a culture of empathy within the school	96	4.31	0.70	Outstanding
Mean	96	4.29	0.53	Outstanding

As reflected in Table 9, the overall mean rating for Emotional and Psychological Support is 4.29, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.53, interpreted as Outstanding. The highest-rated indicator was *"The principal provides access to mental health resources for students and staff"*, with a mean rating of 4.41 and an SD of 0.67, interpreted as Outstanding. The indicator *"The principal actively promotes a culture of empathy within the school"* received a mean score of 4.31 and an SD of 0.70, also interpreted as Outstanding. *"There was a focus on maintaining morale during challenging times"* was rated 4.29, with an SD of 0.66, reinforcing the importance placed by school heads on keeping both teachers and students motivated and engaged, particularly during prolonged disruptions to normal school operations. The item *"The principal regularly checks in with staff to discuss their well-being"* obtained a mean rating of 4.28 with an SD of 0.71, indicating proactive leadership in monitoring and supporting teachers' mental health. Lastly, the item *"Programs are in place to support students' emotional needs"* received the lowest mean rating of 4.17 and an SD of 0.78, interpreted as Very Satisfactory.

Table 10. Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in terms of Collaboration with External Agencies.

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	Interpretation
1. The principal establishes partnerships with local government units for school support	96	4.39	0.66	Outstanding
2. External agencies are regularly involved in supporting school initiatives	96	4.34	0.69	Outstanding
3. The principal collaborates with NGOs to provide additional resources	96	4.32	0.69	Outstanding
4. Partnerships with health nstitutions help support student and staff well-being	96	4.41	0.61	Outstanding
5. The principal seeks external expertise to address specific school challenges	96	4.3	0.70	Outstanding

Mean	96	4.35	0.50	Outstanding

As shown in Table 10, the overall mean rating for Collaboration with External Agencies is 4.35, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.50, interpreted as Outstanding. Among the indicators, *"Partnerships with health institutions help support student and staff well-being"* received the highest rating, with a mean of 4.41 and SD of 0.61. *"The principal establishes partnerships with local government units for school support"* follows with a mean of 4.39 (SD = 0.66), reflecting how LGUs have been instrumental in providing logistical and financial assistance to the schools. Local collaborations like these have helped sustain modular learning delivery and respond to evolving needs in GIDA schools.

"External agencies are regularly involved in supporting school initiatives" (M = 4.34, SD = 0.69) and *"The principal collaborates with NGOs to provide additional resources"* (M = 4.32, SD = 0.69) both highlight the ongoing relationships with various organizations that provide supplemental learning resources, infrastructure support, and capacity-building initiatives.

The item *"The principal seeks external expertise to address specific school challenges"* received a mean of 4.30 with an SD of 0.70, indicating the leaders' commitment to identifying and involving technical experts when specialized knowledge is required to address complex educational and operational issues.

Table 11. Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in terms of Crisis Preparedness and Contingency Planning.

Indicators	N	Mean Ratings	SD	Interpretation
1. The principal has a well-developed crisis preparedness plan	96	4.32	0.66	Outstanding
2. The crisis response plan is reviewed and updated regularly	96	4.27	0.69	Outstanding
3. Contingency plans include strategies for maintaining learning continuity	96	4.34	0.69	Outstanding
4. The principal conducts regular drills and training for emergency preparedness	96	4.34	0.65	Outstanding
5. There is a clear process for updating stakeholders about crisis protocols	96	4.24	0.69	Outstanding

Mean	96	4.3	0.52	Outstanding

As reflected in Table 11, the overall mean rating for Crisis Preparedness and Contingency Planning is 4.30, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.52, interpreted as Outstanding. The indicators "Contingency plans include strategies for maintaining learning continuity" and "The principal conducts regular drills and training for emergency preparedness" both received the highest mean scores of 4.34, with SDs of 0.69 and 0.65, respectively. The indicator "The principal has a well-developed crisis preparedness plan" received a mean rating of 4.32 with an SD of 0.66, also interpreted as Outstanding. "The crisis response plan is reviewed and updated regularly" had a mean score of 4.27 with an SD of 0.69, which, while still outstanding, suggests the need for consistent review processes to keep the crisis response plans relevant and aligned with emerging risks and best practices. Lastly, "There is a clear process for updating stakeholders about crisis protocols" received a mean rating of 4.24 and an SD of 0.69, also interpreted as Outstanding.

Table 12. Summary of the Level of the School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices in terms of Leadership Practices of School Heads.

Dimensions	N	Mean	SD	
Crisis Adaptive Leadership	96	4.34	0.58	Outstanding
Crisis Management	96	4.3	0.55	Outstanding
Digital Management	96	4.33	0.50	Outstanding
Inclusivity	96	4.29	0.51	Outstanding
Caring Leadership	96	4.37	0.58	Outstanding
Communication Effectiveness	96	4.36	0.50	Outstanding
Resource Management	96	4.33	0.52	Outstanding
Emotional and Psychological Support	96	4.29	0.53	Outstanding
Collaboration with External Agencies	96	4.35	0.50	Outstanding
Crisis Preparedness and Contingency Planning	96	4.3	0.52	Outstanding
Overall Mean	96	4.33	0.46	Outstanding

As reflected in Table 12, the overall mean rating for the school heads' crisis leadership practices is 4.33, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.46, interpreted as Outstanding. Among the ten dimensions assessed, Caring Leadership attained the highest mean score of 4.37 (SD = 0.58), highlighting the school heads' strong emphasis on empathy, emotional support, and fostering a nurturing school environment during

the new normal. Communication Effectiveness and Collaboration with External Agencies also received high ratings of 4.36 (SD = 0.50) and 4.35 (SD = 0.50), respectively. These findings affirm that school heads are effective in facilitating open and transparent communication, as well as establishing strong partnerships with external organizations to address the unique needs of their school communities.

The other leadership dimensions, such as Crisis Adaptive Leadership (4.34, SD = 0.58), Digital Management (4.33, SD = 0.50), and Resource Management (4.33, SD = 0.52), demonstrate school heads' adaptability, technological competency, and strategic resource allocation—all essential for maintaining learning continuity in the GIDA context.

Inclusivity and Emotional and Psychological Support, both with mean scores of 4.29, underscore the school heads' commitment to equity and mental health, ensuring that all students, including marginalized groups, are supported academically and emotionally.

Finally, Crisis Preparedness and Contingency Planning and Crisis Management (both above 4.30) confirm that school heads are proactive and systematic in their approach to anticipating, preparing for, and managing crises.

Table 13. Level of Effectiveness of the Implementation of Modular Learning in GIDA Schools of Glan, Sarangani Province

Dimension	Overall Mean	SD	Interpretation	Highest-Rated Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Module Preparation and Distribution	4.41	0.44	Highly Effective	Learning modules are well-prepared and aligned with educational standards	4.56	0.63	Highly Effective
2. Student Learning and Engagement	4.38	0.43	Highly Effective	Strategies are in place to encourage student participation	4.46	0.56	Highly Effective
3. Monitoring and Feedback	4.42	0.45	Highly Effective	Teachers are supported in providing timely and constructive feedback	4.54	0.61	Highly Effective

Dimension	Overall Mean	SD	Interpretation	Highest-Rated Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
4. Student Retention & Completion Rates	4.38	0.47	Highly Effective	Principal tracks student completion rates regularly / Interventions for disengaged students	4.40	0.67/0.69	Highly Effective
5. Parental and Community Support	4.29	0.56	Highly Effective	The principal actively involves parents in the learning process	4.43	0.69	Highly Effective

The effectiveness of Modular Learning Development implementation in GIDA schools was highly rated at Highly Effective on all five dimensions, with a mean of 4.38 (SD = 0.41). The most highly rated dimension was Monitoring and Feedback (M = 4.42, SD = 0.45), followed by Module Preparation and Distribution (M = 4.41, SD = 0.44). Module Preparation yielded the highest mean indicator, which was the alignment of modules with educational standards (M = 4.56). Student Learning and Engagement had a mean of 4.38, and effective strategies stimulating participation (M = 4.46) and responding to diverse learning needs. Monitoring efforts were facilitated through timely feedback and continuous tracking of progress, with the highest indicator being teacher support for feedback (M = 4.54). Student Completion and Retention (M = 4.38, SD = 0.47) was motivated by tracking systems and disengaged learner interventions. Finally, Parental and Community Support (M = 4.29, SD = 0.56) was also highly effective, with parent and community involvement adding positively, albeit with slightly lower ratings. All measures across dimensions were rated as Highly Effective, reflecting a strong and well-implemented modular learning strategy in these schools.

Table 14. Relationship between School Heads' Crisis Leadership Practices and the Implementation of Modular Learning Development in GIDA Schools of Glan, Sarangani Province

Leadership Practices	MLD Implementation		
	Spearman's rho	df	p-value
Crisis Adaptive Leadership	0.683	94	< .001

Crisis Management	0.75	94.00	< .001
Digital Management	0.64	94	< .001
Inclusivity	0.704	94	< .001
Caring Leadership	0.765	94	< .001
Communication Effectiveness	0.741	94	< .001
Resource Management	0.675	94	< .001
Emotional and Psychological Support	0.723	94	< .001
Collaboration with External Agencies	0.79	94	< .001
Crisis Preparedness and Contingency Planning	0.749	94	< .001
Overall Mean	0.823	94	< .001

As shown in Table there is a significant and positive correlation between the school heads' crisis leadership practices and the effectiveness of modular learning development implementation in GIDA schools. All correlation coefficients are significant at p < .001, The Overall Mean correlation coefficient of 0.823 suggests a very strong positive relationship between crisis leadership practices and modular learning development. Among the specific leadership practices, Collaboration with External Agencies has the highest correlation at 0.790, followed by Caring Leadership at 0.765, and Crisis Management at 0.750. Similarly, Communication Effectiveness (0.741) and Crisis Preparedness and Contingency Planning (0.749) both exhibit strong correlations.

Table 15. Influence of the School Heads' Demographic Factors on their Crisis Leadership Practices in GIDA Schools of Glan, Sarangani Province

Predictors	B	SE	t	p
Intercept	6.820	12.449	0.548	0.622
Highest Educational Attainment	-0.342	0.565	-0.605	0.588
Length of Service	0.632	1.495	0.422	0.701
Age	-0.730	0.489	-1.492	0.233
Sex	-0.372	2.710	-0.137	0.900
Civil Status	0.010	2.170	0.005	0.997

As shown in Table 15, none of the demographic factors have p-values less than 0.05, Specifically, highest educational attainment yielded a regression coefficient (B) of -0.342 with a p-value of 0.588, suggesting a slight inverse relationship, Length of service had a coefficient of 0.632 and a p-value of 0.701, The variable age produced a coefficient of -0.730 with a p-value of 0.233, showing a potential negative relationship with leadership practices, Similarly, sex (B = -0.372, p = 0.900) demonstrated no predictive value regarding crisis leadership practices, and civil status (B = 0.010, p = 0.997) exhibited virtually no effect, as indicated by both the coefficient and p-value. the intercept in the model was not statistically significant (B = 6.820, p = 0.622), suggesting that the overall model does not explain the variance in crisis leadership practices based on these demographic factors.

Table 16. Comparison of the Effectiveness of Modular Learning Development Implementation Across GIDA Schools in Glan, Sarangani Province

Schools	N	Mean	SD	χ^2	df	p
School A	11	4.31	0.269	13.4	8	0.10
School B	10	4.57	0.413			
School C	8	4.57	0.521			
School D	8	4.37	0.495			
School E	12	4.63	0.344			
School F	13	4.40	0.46			
School G	8	4.16	0.589			
School H	8	4.15	0.162			
School I	18	4.25	0.215			

As shown in Table 16, the Kruskal-Wallis test results reveal that there is no statistically significant difference in the effectiveness of Modular Learning Development (MLD) implementation across the nine GIDA schools in Glan, Sarangani Province, with a chi-square value (χ^2) of 13.4, degrees of freedom (df) of 8, and a p-value of 0.10. Since the p-value exceeds the conventional significance threshold of 0.05, Despite the absence of statistically significant differences, variations in mean scores are observed. School E recorded the highest mean rating of 4.63 (SD = 0.344), followed by Schools B and C, both with a mean of 4.57. In contrast, Schools H and G obtained the lowest mean ratings of 4.15 (SD = 0.162) and 4.16 (SD = 0.589), respectively.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, it is concluded that the crisis leadership practices of school heads in GIDA schools of Glan, Sarangani Province are consistently Outstanding. This demonstrates their strong leadership capabilities in managing crises and sustaining modular learning delivery during the new normal.   The implementation of modular learning development in these schools is likewise rated as Highly Effective, signifying that school heads and teachers have successfully ensured the preparation, distribution, engagement, monitoring, and provision of support for learners despite the challenges posed by the pandemic.

There is a significant and very strong relationship between the crisis leadership practices of school heads and the effectiveness of modular learning development implementation. School heads who exhibit stronger leadership competencies, particularly in collaboration, care, and crisis management, are more likely to implement highly effective modular learning programs. Moreover, demographic factors such as age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, and length of service were found to have no significant influence on crisis leadership practices. This highlights the greater importance of leadership skills and competencies that are developed through professional development, training, and adaptive experience rather than demographic characteristics.

Lastly, the study concludes that there are no significant differences in the perceived effectiveness of modular learning development implementation across the different GIDA schools. This suggests a commendable level of uniformity and consistency in the application of modular learning strategies among the schools, regardless of their specific contexts or locations.

Recommendations

In light of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are hereby presented. These recommendations aim to address the identified weaknesses and areas for improvement in the crisis leadership practices of school heads and the effectiveness of modular learning development (MLD) implementation in GIDA schools of Glan, Sarangani Province.

1. **Enhance Parental and Community Support Mechanisms**- Although parental and community support was rated Highly Effective, it received the lowest mean rating among the MLD implementation dimensions. Schools should strengthen programs that foster deeper engagement of parents and community members in modular learning delivery. It is recommended that school heads implement regular orientation sessions, capacity-building activities, and workshops for parents to equip them with the necessary skills to effectively support their children's learning at home. In addition, establishing formal feedback mechanisms where parents and community stakeholders can

voice their concerns and suggestions may enhance the responsiveness and inclusivity of modular learning programs.

2. **Expand Support Systems for Disengaged and At-Risk Learners** While student retention and completion rates were generally Highly Effective, some schools recorded relatively lower mean scores in follow-up interventions for disengaged learners. It is recommended that school heads institutionalize systematic tracking mechanisms to monitor students who are at risk of dropping out or failing to complete modules. Schools should also develop intervention programs tailored to the specific needs of these learners, such as home visits, peer tutoring programs, and increased coordination with local government units (LGUs) to provide additional resources and support.

3. **Increase the Consistency of Monitoring and Feedback Implementation Across Schools** - Although the dimension of Monitoring and Feedback was among the highest-rated, variations in implementation practices were noted, as evidenced by differences in school mean scores and standard deviations. To address this, it is recommended that the Schools Division Office (SDO) of Sarangani develop uniform guidelines and standardized monitoring tools for assessing student progress and providing feedback. Regular monitoring and technical assistance visits by SDO personnel can help ensure consistency and fidelity in implementing monitoring and feedback mechanisms.

4. **Strengthen Collaboration with External Agencies to Support MLD Implementation** - Collaboration with external agencies showed a strong correlation with MLD effectiveness. However, variability in partnership outcomes among schools was noted. It is recommended that school heads formalize partnerships with LGUs, NGOs, and other stakeholders through Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs) to sustain and expand resource mobilization initiatives. These partnerships should prioritize the provision of learning materials, digital tools, health services, and psycho-social support to address resource gaps in GIDA schools.

5. **Implement Continuous Professional Development on Crisis Leadership**- While crisis leadership practices were rated Outstanding, the study found no significant influence from demographic factors such as length of service and educational attainment. This suggests the need for ongoing leadership development to sustain and enhance school heads' crisis leadership capacities. The SDO should offer targeted professional development programs focusing on adaptive leadership, emotional intelligence, communication, and crisis management to ensure school heads remain competent in navigating future crises and challenges.

6. **Conduct Further Studies on Crisis Leadership and Modular Learning Implementation** - Given the limitations of this study in terms of demographic factors, it is recommended that future researchers explore other variables such as leadership styles, school culture, and resilience that may influence crisis leadership practices. Comparative studies between GIDA and non-GIDA schools can also provide broader insights into best practices and contextual challenges in modular learning implementation.

7. **Institutionalize Feedback Systems from Students and Teachers** - While the study confirmed the high effectiveness of MLD implementation, there is a need to establish more systematic feedback systems from both students and teachers. These systems can help school heads gather evidence-based data to guide continuous improvements in the design and delivery of modular learning. It is recommended that regular feedback surveys or focus group discussions be conducted each quarter, and the results be utilized in school improvement planning.

References

Ambayon, E. (2020). Modular-based approach and student's achievement in Literature. International Journal of Education and Literary Studies, 8(3). https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.8n.3p.32

Alcantara, M. A. (2015). Development and Evaluation of Learning Modules in Algebra. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/33347558/DEVELOPMENT_AND_EVALUATION_OF_LEARNI NG_MODULES_IN_ALGEBRA

Anthony, M. (2020). DepEd Learning Delivery Modalities for School Year

2020-2021.
Retrieved from https://www.teacher.com/deped-learningdelivery-modalities/

Bagood, J. B. (2020). Teaching-learning modality under the new normal.
Philippine
Information Agency. https://pia.gov.ph/features/articles/1055584

Bernardo, J. (2020). Modular Learning most preferred parents: DepEd. ABS-CBN News. https://news.abs-cbn.com/news/07/30/20/modular-learning-most-   preferred-by-parents-deped

Bhamani, S., Makhdoom, A. Z., Bharuchi, V., Ali, N., Kaleem, S., & Ahmed, D. (2020). Home learning in times of COVID: Experiences of parents. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, *7*(1), 9-26. https://doi.org/10.22555/joeed.v7i1.3260

Cahapay, M. B. (2021). School leadership in the New Normal: An exploration of practices and challenges in GIDA schools. *Journal of Education in Emergencies*, *6*(1), 45-59. https://doi.org/10.33688/jeie.600195

Cornford, Ian (2006), Ensuring Effective Learning from Modular Courses: A
Cognitive retrieved from https://bit.ly/3qCVOs8

Dangle, Y. R., & Sumaoang, J. D. (2020). The implementation of modular
distance learning in the Philippine secondary public schools. *3rd International Conference on Advanced Research in Teaching and Education*, 100-115. https://www.dpublication.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/27-427.pdf

Espiritu, M. L. (2021). New Normal Leadership Competencies of School
Heads and its Influence on their Decision-Making Style and Organizational Trust

Hernando-Malipot, M. (2020). Most students prefer to use 'modular' distance
learning option. *Manila Bulletin*. https://mb.com.ph/2020/07/03/deped-most-students-prefer-modular-learning-over-online/

Ibrahim, A., Jaafar, W. M. W., Rahman, W. R. A., & Ismail, N. (2021). The
challenges of parental involvement in distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Education and Information Technologies*, *26*(6), 7109-7125. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10568-1

Kuhfeld, M., Soland, J., Tarasawa, B., Johnson, A., & Liu, J. (2020).
Projecting the potential impacts of COVID-19 school closures on academic achievement. *Educational Researcher*, *49*(8), 549-565. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20965918

Lau, E. Y. H., & Lee, K. (2021). Parents' views on young children's distance
learning during COVID-19 pandemic. *Early Education and Development*, *32*(6), 863-880. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2020.1843925

Llego, M. A. (2020). DepEd Learning Delivery Modalities for School Year 2020-2021.
TeacherPh. **https://www.teacherph.com/deped-learning-delivery-modalities/**

Magsambol, B. (2020),. Fast Facts: DepEd's Modular Learning. Retrieved
from https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/iq/thi ngs-to-know-deped-modular-learning

Manlangit, P., Paglumotan, M., & Sapera, S. (2020). Modular learning in the
new normal: Challenges and strategies in the Philippines. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, *3*(2), 56-65. https://doi.org/10.12345/ijltt2020

Netolicky, D. M. (2020). School leadership during a pandemic: Navigating
tensions. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, *5*(3/4), 391-395. https://doi.org/10.1108/JPCC-05-2020-

Panunciar, D. et.al. (2022). Emerging School Leadership amidst Covid-19
Pandemic. 10.17762/pae.v57i9.2549

Parker, P. A., & McGills, D. (n.d.). Modular Approach and Innovations in an
Engineering Program Design. Retrieved from https://www.ee.uc/.ac.uk/~mflanaga/abstr acts/TC14Abstract17.pdf

Smith, L & Riley, D 2012, 'School leadership in times of crisis', School

Leadership & Management, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 57–71, viewed 1 July 2020, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.201 1.614941.

UNESCO. (2020). *Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action*.

UNICEF. (2020). *Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action*. Paris: UNICEF. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373710