

Legacy Leadership Competency among Public Elementary School Heads at Bago City Philippines: Practices and Organizational Thrust

Reynan S. Tongcua¹, Maylin M. Tongcua², Trudy C. Cerbo³

¹Department of Education, Division of Bago City, Philippines

^{2,3}La Carlota City College, La Carlota City, Philippines

Abstract: This descriptive research determined the level of competency of school heads in terms of the five best practices of legacy leadership as assessed by the school heads, teachers, non-teaching personnel, and PTA members. Conducted during school year 2020-2021, the study also focused on the organizational thrusts and legacies that the school heads wanted to leave in their organization in terms of administration, curriculum and instruction, research and community and extension. Weighted mean and frequency count were used for descriptive analyses, and Kruskal Wallis was used for inferential analyses. The level of legacy leadership competency as self-assessed by the school heads was very high whether they were taken as a group or were categorized according to age, sex, length of service, and educational qualifications. The teachers, non-teaching personnel, and PTA members rated the legacy leadership competency in all practices to a very high level. The teachers and the school heads, and the PTA members and the school heads differed significantly in their assessments of competency particularly in the role of school heads as *Advocator of Differences and the Community*, and as *Calibrator of Responsibility and Accountability*. In administration, the school heads prioritize the development of an organizational culture of transparency, productivity, punctuality, and optimism which is the legacy that they want to leave in their schools. In curriculum and instruction, the school heads underscore the importance of the delivery of instruction based on curriculum that is “Maka-diyos, Makatao, Makabansa, and Makakalikasan”, the quality of curriculum and instruction as legacy that they want to leave in their organizations. In research, the administrative thrust of the school heads hinges upon the generation of relevant, useful, profound, collaborative, and published researches which are the legacy that they want to offer to their organizations. In Community Involvement, the school heads put their administrative thrust on the establishment of community involvement programs that are based on committedness, kindness, and cooperativeness, a robust community engagement that they want to leave as legacy to their schools.

Keywords: Legacy, Leadership, Practices, Administration, Curriculum and Instruction, Research, and Community and Extension

I. INTRODUCTION

Good leadership has been a mantra anywhere. As time goes by, it was found out that this is not enough because the new trend in leadership in the 21st century is already termed as “legacy leadership”. This posts another challenge to the leaders nowadays for the focus is not only leadership but also legacy.

Legacy leadership is the permanent and vivid fingerprint that a leader leaves behind. That legacy can mean anything which gives an idea of who that person was and what they intended to put forth into the organization they serve (Shimek 2015).

Legacy leadership is the quality of who we become, and this is a very present day oriented perspective because the real work for leaders is becoming the person that they can be, the best that they can be (Thorn 2015).

Matched with an equally impressive ability to transform vision into reality, legacy leadership created positive lasting meaningful change for the leaders and people around him.

The purpose of this study was to determine the legacy leadership competency of the Public Elementary School Heads.

Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the public elementary school heads in terms of:
 - a. age
 - b. sex
 - c. length of service
 - d. educational attainment
2. What is the level of legacy leadership competency of public elementary school heads when they were taken as a whole and when grouped according to their profile in terms of the following best practices of legacy leadership:
 - a. Holder of Vision and Values
 - b. Creator of Collaboration and Innovation
 - c. Influencer of Inspiration and Leadership
 - d. Advocator of Differences and Community
 - e. Calibrator of Responsibility and Accountability
3. What is the level of legacy leadership competency practices of public elementary school heads as assessed by themselves, by the teachers, by the non-teaching personnel and by Parents Teachers Association (PTA) members in terms of the aforementioned best practices of legacy leadership?

4. Is there a significant difference in the level of legacy leadership competency of school heads as assessed by themselves, teachers, non-teaching personnel and PTA members in terms of the aforementioned best practices of legacy leadership?
5. What organizational thrust and legacies do public elementary school heads would want to leave in their organizations in terms of the following functions?
 - a. Administration
 - b. Instruction
 - c. Research
 - d. Community Involvement
6. What intervention/s can be proposed based on the results of this study?

II. THE METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The Descriptive Research Design was used to gather the needed data for this research. According to Ardales (2008), this design attempts and analyzes, interprets and reports the status of the institution or group. It is a fact finding study with adequate and accurate interpretation of the findings, describes what is and describes with emphasis what actually exist such as current conditions, practices, situations, or any phenomenon that are developing. The Quantitative Methods was used to obtain data from the respondents through survey questionnaire.

Subject and Respondents of the Study

The subjects of the study were the thirty-nine (39) School Heads in the Public Elementary Schools, Division of Bago City. The respondents who rated the legacy leadership competency of the school heads were the 39 school heads themselves, 268 teachers, 76 Parent Teachers Association

(PTA) members, and 109 non-teaching personnel of the said Division.

Population and Sample Size

The sample size of the population was computed using the formula by Slovin as reflected as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + \left[\frac{N(e)}{2} \right]^2}$$

Where: N = population size

n = sample size

e = margin of error

The total population of teachers was 808 and using the Slovin formula obtained the sample size of 268.

There were 259 PTA members who were represented by a sample of 76.

The total population of the non-teaching personnel was 117 and this group was represented by a sample of 109.

Considering the small number of school heads, all of them (39) were taken as respondents

Sampling Techniques

In determining the number of respondents respectively per school, Stratified Random Sampling Technique was used given the formula as follows:

$$n_i = \frac{N_i(n)}{N}$$

Where: n_i = sample size

N_i = population per school

N = total population

n = total sample size

The data in Table 1 present the distribution of respondents.

Table 1. Distribution of Teachers, PTA Members and Non- Teaching Personnel

SCHOOLS	Teachers		PTA Members		Non-Teaching Personnel	
	N	n	N	n	N	n
DISTRICT IA						
NEWTON JISON ES	29	10	7	2	1	1
M.R. ARANETA ES	20	7	7	2	4	3
I MAKILAN ES	26	8	7	2	4	3
J.L. ARANETA ES	42	14	7	2	3	2
T. MORADA ES	27	9	7	2	6	4
DISTRICT IB						
A.M. ESPINOS ES	13	4	7	2	3	2
ABUANAN ES	23	8	7	2	4	3
INOCENIO LUCASAN ES	10	3	7	2	3	2
V. CAUNTOY ES	29	10	7	2	5	4
GUANZON BALGOS ES	6	2	7	2	2	2
DISTRICT IIA						
M.L. ARANETA ES	28	9	7	2	3	2
BAGO CITY ES	73	24	7	2	3	2
GENERAL JUAN ARANETA ES	38	12	7	2	4	3
LEONOR DELA RAMA ES	10	3	7	2	2	2
DISTRICT IIB						
DR.A.R.SIAN ES	14	4	7	2	3	2
LAG-ASAN ES	27	9	7	2	5	4
B. ARANETA ES	17	6	7	2	2	2
JALSIS ES	29	10	7	2	3	2
DISTRICT IIIA						
ASTRO FARMS ES	8	3	7	2	2	2
MA-AO SUGAR CENTRAL ES	37	12	7	2	5	4
ATIPULUAN ES	21	5	7	2	3	2
ALIANZA ES	12	4	7	2	2	2

DISTRICT IIIB						
BAGROY ES	10	3	7	2	3	2
SAGASA ES	25	8	7	2	3	2
CARIDAD ES	15	5	7	2	2	2
RM SALAS ES	16	5	7	2	2	2
DISTRICT IVA						
MA-AO ES	60	20	7	2	7	5
J MONTILLA ES	19	6	7	2	3	2
DON SALVADOR BENEDICTO ES	16	5	7	2	4	3
NAJABA ES	18	6	7	2	6	4
DR. P.F. ELIZALDE ES	9	3	7	2	2	2
DISTRICT IVB						
R AND S ABINDAN ES	20	7	7	2	2	2
RM ARANETA ES	14	4	7	2	2	2
CRISTETA A. DORMIDO ES	9	3	7	2	2	2
MAILUM ES	21	7	7	2	2	2
LOUISIANA ES LOURDES EXT.	7	2	7	2	2	2
LOUISIANA ES	25	8	7	2	3	2
TOTAL	80	26	25	76	117	10
	8	8	9			9

III. RESULTS

On the level of Legacy Leadership Competency Practice as a whole, and when grouped according to their Profile in terms of Creator of Collaboration and Innovation:

When taken as a whole group, the School Heads obtained a very high level of legacy leadership competency in terms of their practice Creator of Collaboration and Innovation as indicated by overall mean of 4.4.

Age . School Heads whose age bracket falls in 51 years and above got the highest competency level As Creator of Collaboration and Innovation with the mean of 4.6, interpreted as very high.

Sex . Female School Heads got higher in level with the mean of 4.5 than male.

Length of Service. Those School Heads who served for 11 to 20 years got the highest competency with the mean of 4.5 interpreted as very high.

Educational Qualification. School Heads with Baccalaureate and Doctorate Degrees had the same level of competency with the mean of 4.6 interpreted as very high.

On the level of Legacy Leadership Competency Practice when taken as a whole and when grouped according to their Profile in terms of Influencer of Inspiration and Leadership:

When taken as a whole group, the School Heads obtained a very high level of legacy leadership competency in terms of their practice Influencer of Inspiration and Leadership as indicated by overall mean of 4.6.

Age. School Heads On the age brackets 51 years old and above got the highest competency level as Influencer of Inspiration and Leadership, with the mean of 4.8 interpreted as very high.

Sex. Male School Heads was higher in level of competency with the mean of 4.7 than female School Heads.

Length of Service. The School Heads had the same level of competency regardless of the number of years served, with the mean of 4.6.

Educational Qualification. School Heads with Baccalaureate and Doctorate Degrees had the same competency level with the mean of 4.7 higher than the Master's Degree Holder.

On the level of Legacy Leadership Competency Practice when taken as a whole and when grouped according to their Profile in terms of Advocator of differences and Community:

When taken as a whole group, the School Heads obtained a very high level of legacy leadership competency in terms of their practice Advocator of Differences and Community as indicated by overall mean of 4.6.

Age. School Heads on the age brackets 31 to 40 years old and 51 years old and above got the highest level of competency with the mean of 4.6.

Sex. Males and Females School Heads had the same level of competency with the mean of 4.5 interpreted as very high.

Length of Service. School Heads 11 to 20 years and 21 years and above in service had the same level of competency with the mean of 4.5, interpreted as very high.

Educational Qualification. School Heads with Doctorate Degree got the highest level of competency with the mean of 4.7 interpreted as very high.

On the level of Legacy Leadership Competency Practice when taken as a whole and when grouped according to their Profile in terms of Calibrator of Responsibility and Accountability:

When taken as a whole group, the School Heads obtained a very high level of legacy leadership competency in terms of their practice Calibrator of Responsibility and Accountability as indicated by overall mean of 4.6.

Age. School Heads in the age brackets 31 to 40 years old and 51 years old and above got the highest competency level with the mean of 4.6., interpreted as very high

Sex. Female School Heads was higher in competency level with the mean of 4.6 compared to male. Length of Service. School Heads who rendered service for 11 to 20 years got the highest competency with the mean of 4.6, interpreted as very high.

Educational Qualification. School Heads with Doctorate Degree got the highest competency level with the mean of 4.7 interpreted as very high.

On the level of Legacy Leadership Competency Practice as assessed by Themselves

Holder of vision and Values. The Level of Legacy Leadership Competency Practice was very high, with the mean of 4.6.

Creator of Collaboration and Innovation. The Level of Legacy Leadership Competency Practice was very high, with the mean of 4.4.

Influencer of Inspiration and Leadership. The Level of Legacy Leadership Competency Practice was very high, with the mean of 4.6.

Advocator differences and Community. The Level of Legacy Leadership Competency Practice was very high, with the mean of 4.5.

Collaborator of Responsibility and Accountability. The Level of Legacy leadership Competency Practice was very high, with the mean of 4.6.

As a whole, the result was very high, with the mean of 4.6.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. In terms of profile, Public Elementary School Heads are dominantly in the middle age group from 40 to 50 years age bracket. Most of them are females, who have been in the service for a long period of time. Most of them are Master's Degree holders.
2. The levels of legacy leadership competency in the five best practices of legacy leadership when taken as a whole and when group according to profile are very high but the outmost mean was not reached.
3. The levels of legacy leadership competency when taken as a whole and when grouped according to profile as assessed by the Public Elementary School Heads Themselves, Teachers, Non-Teaching Personnel, and PTA Members are very high but the outmost mean was not reached.
4. There was significant difference in the levels of legacy leadership competency of school heads particularly between the assessment of Teachers and the School Heads and between PTA members and School Heads on their practices as Advocator of Differences and the Community and as Calibrator of Responsibility and Accountability.
5. The Public Elementary School Heads wanted to leave legacies to their organizations in terms of the following functions. For administration, most of them wanted to leave the legacy of transparency. For Curriculum Instruction, the legacy of being Master's Degrees. For Research, the legacy of Relevancy and Usefulness. For Community Involvement the legacy of commitment.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations were formulated:

1. Since most of the Public Elementary School heads are Master's Degree Holders, it is recommended that scholarship and grants be made accessible to them for them to finish the doctorate degree. Their knowledge and experience in obtaining the degree can help them reach maximum levels of leadership competencies.
2. The school heads can be given opportunity to attend the School Heads Development Program (SHDP) and National Education Academy of the Philippines (NEAP) courses, seminars, trainings and colloquium for further knowledge, skills, internalization and practice. This is because although, the level of leadership competency of the school heads was rated very high, it is noted that they do not possess yet the maximum level of competency.
3. The Division Office may provide programs to cause utmost encouragement to the teachers, the non-teaching personnel, PTA members, and other stakeholders to support the school heads in their quest for maximum level of competency and best administrative practices.
4. Venue for professional advancement and leadership-enhancing programs can be created for school heads to maximize the development of competency in all the best practices of legacy leadership.
5. The results of this study can be disseminated to the respondents and other stakeholders to promote clear perspectives on legacy leadership competencies and practices for common understanding of the roles of school heads as legacy leaders.
6. Revisiting organizational thrusts can be done to encompass other concerns that can create more legacies which administrators can offer to the organizations where they have served.
7. Future researches covering other variables may be identified as research areas to further generate insights on legacy leadership.
8. The adoption of the Intervention plan by implementing Leadership Training Plan via virtual engagement among school heads to support them in reaching their real possibility of becoming as legacy leaders

REFERENCES

- [1] Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- [2] Avolio, B. J., & Gibbons, T. C. (1988). Developing transformational leaders: A life span approach. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 276- 308). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [3] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [4] Calo, T. J. (2005). The generativity track: A transitional approach to retirement. *Public Personnel Management*, 34(4), 301-312.
- [5] Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- [6] Erikson, E. H. (1958). *Young man Luther*. New York: W. W. Norton.

- [7] Erikson, E. H. (1969). *Ghandi's truth. On the origins of militant non-violence*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- [8] Galford, R. M., & Fazio Maruca, R. (2006). *Your leadership legacy: Why looking toward the future will make you a better leader today*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- [9] Grant, A. M., & Wade-Benzoni, K. (in press). The hot and cool of death awareness at work: Mortality cues, aging, and self-protective and prosocial motivations. *Academy of Management Review*.
- [10] Hedge, J. W., Borman, W. C., & Lammlein, S. E. (2006). *The aging workforce: Realities, myths, and implications for organizations*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- [11] Hunter, E. G., & Rowles, G. D. (2005). Leaving a legacy: Toward a typology. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 19(3), 327- 347.
- [12] Humphreys, K. (2004). *Lasting investments: A pastor's guide for equipping workplace leaders to leave a spiritual legacy*. Colorado Springs, CO: Navpress.
- [13] Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A metaanalytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89,755-768.
- [14] Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (2004). Aging, adult development, and work motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 440-458.
- [15] Karp, D. A. (1986). Academics beyond midlife: Some observations on changing conscientiousness in the fifty to sixty year decade. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 22(2), 81-103.
- [16] Kotre, J. (1999). *Make it count: How to generate a legacy that gives meaning to your life*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- [17] Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). *A leader's legacy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Age and Leadership 18
- [18] Lopez, A. (2003). *The legacy leader: Leadership with a purpose*. Bloomington, IN: 1st Books Library
- [19] Lopez, A. (2005). *Breakthrough thinking: The legacy leader's role in driving innovation*. Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse.
- [20] Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425.
- [21] McAdams, D. P., & Logan, R. L. (2004). What is generativity? In E. de St. Aubin, D. P.
- [22] McAdams & T.-C. Kim (Eds.), *The generative society: Caring for future generations* (pp.15-31). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. McKenna, D. L. (2006). *The leader's legacy*. Newberg, OR: Barclay Press.
- [23] Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2008). The relationship of age to ten dimensions of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 392-423.
- [24] Parsons, R. A. (2015). *The impact of age on innovation*. Management Research Review. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- [25] Quinking, Mary Ann (2016) *Leadership Legacy Competency of State Universities and Colleges (SUC's) Administrators in Region 6, Philippines*. Asia Pacific Journal Multidisciplinary Research Vol.7 2019
- [26] Shultz, K. S., & Adams, G. A. (2007). *Aging and work in the 21st century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [27] Simonton, D. K. (1998). Political leadership across the lifespan: Chronological versus career age in the British monarchy. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9(3), 309-320.