International Journal of Global Community
Volume IX No. 3 (November) 2026

Teacher-Leader Resilience and Instructional Practices Under Institutional Strain: A PPCT-Informed Qualitative Study

Christine Ann C. Juan, Lizamarie Campoamor Olegario

University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippine

Corresponding Author: lcolegario@up.edu.ph

Abstract
This qualitative study examined the experiences and responses of seven teacher-leaders in public secondary schools across three school divisions in the Philippines to the simultaneous institutional demands of their instructional and leadership roles. The study used thematic analysis of written responses to an online qualitative questionnaire, guided by Bronfenbrenner's Process–Person–Context–Time (PPCT) framework. Participants reported a range of resilience-related responses: emotional regulation, collegial consultation, reflective practice, adjustment to instruction, resourcefulness, and boundary-setting. Professional responses and personal consequences to institutional demands varied from instructional resourcefulness to exhaustion and the abandonment of professional development goals. The cross-participant analysis revealed different relationships between personal resources, professional interactions, institutional conditions, and retrospective experiences. Findings distinguish between psychological resources, coping practices, and reported professional adaptation and they challenge the assumption that coping practices are necessarily synonymous with individual resilience. This study adds to a contextual understanding of teacher-leader resilience and highlights the institutional responsibility to manage workloads, support professional relationships, and provide adequate instructional resources. The retrospective, self-reported evidence does not support causal relationships, developmental trajectories, or instructional effectiveness.

Keywords: Teacher-leader resilience; Teacher leadership; Instructional practices; PPCT framework; Institutional strain.

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

Introduction

Teachers who hold concurrent instructional and leadership responsibilities face professional demands beyond classroom teaching. Beyond facilitating student learning, teacher-leaders often coordinate programs, mentor colleagues, supervise professional activities, and contribute to school improvement (Lipscombe et al., 2025; Wiens et al., 2025). While these responsibilities may offer avenues for professional growth and collaboration, they can also create competing demands on teachers' time, energy, and well-being. Post-pandemic learning recovery, shifts in educational policies, and students' socio-emotional needs (Kim et al., 2022; OECD, 2025) have further complicated these demands. Understanding how teacher-leaders negotiate these demands is important for their professional well-being and instructional responsibilities.

More recent work tends to treat teacher resilience as both a necessity and a workplace resource rather than as an individual characteristic. Consistent with the Job Demands-Resources model, a systematic review has shown the importance of both individual and situational factors in teacher resilience research (Lu et al., 2024). Empirical reviews have also found a link between teacher resilience and self-efficacy (Mu et al., 2024), and studies have examined the relationship between emotion regulation, mindfulness, and teacher functioning and well-being (Wang et al., 2023; Zareian Jahromi et al., 2026). The literature is clearly establishing the importance of psychological resources and professional adaptation. The next question is how teachers actually use these resources in their day-to-day work as both teachers and leaders. To answer that, one must examine the details of everyday professional experience, relationships, and organizational context.

Bronfenbrenner's Process-Person-Context-Time (PPCT) paradigm underpins the study of these interlocking elements. It highlights the importance of the person, repeated interactions, and context and time (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). More recent bioecological work has used it to examine how teachers talk about resilience in terms of the person and the environment (Chu, 2026). The PPCT lens served as a sensitizing and interpretive framework for exploring teachers' views of their psychological resources, professional contacts, institutional pressures, and retrospective experience. It is not a model of causation or of developmental pathways over time.

Despite a growing body of scholarship that has come to recognize the ecological and relational dimensions of teacher resilience (Chu, 2026; Lu et al., 2024; Munezero et al., 2026), there is still a need for further research into how teachers who are in both an instructional and a leadership role respond to the demands of the institution. This issue is particularly pertinent in public secondary schools in the Philippines, where the administrative burden remains a concern even as the DOE actively works to reduce non-teaching work (Department of Education, 2024; IDinsight, 2025). Understanding teacher-leaders' experiences can illuminate how their personal resources, professional relationships, and the institution itself shape their resilience-related responses and instructional practice.

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

To address this gap, the study used a qualitative case study design grounded in the PPCT framework and drew on accounts from seven teacher leaders in public secondary schools in the Philippines. The study examined participants' stories of personal resources, professional relationships, institutional circumstances, retrospective experiences, and instructional responses through Bronfenbrenner's Process–Person–Context–Time (PPCT) framework. The qualitative accounts were the primary evidence, supplemented by descriptive questionnaire data on participants' psychological and professional characteristics. The study sought to understand how participants described their responses to the competing demands of teaching and leadership, without assuming that these responses would lead to sustained instructional engagement or improved teaching.

Here, teacher leader resilience is defined as a dynamic, contextually situated process through which teacher leaders (those with both instructional and leadership responsibilities) respond to and adapt in the face of professional adversity. Consistent with ecological perspectives, resilience is understood as a process rather than a static individual characteristic (Beltman et al., 2011; Gu & Day, 2007; Mansfield et al., 2016).

Teacher leaders have professional responsibilities beyond the classroom (e.g., coordination, mentoring, and organizational leadership; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Psychological resources (e.g., mindfulness, emotional regulation, self-efficacy) are not equated with resilience. The study also discusses instructional practice as a reported professional response rather than an outcome of resilience.

The study was directed by the PPCT framework and addressed the following research questions:

1. How do teacher-leaders describe the institutional demands associated with their concurrent instructional and leadership responsibilities?
2. What personal resources, professional interactions, and instructional practices do teacher-leaders report in responding to these demands?
3. How does the PPCT framework illuminate the relationships, variations, and tensions in teacher-leaders' resilience-related experiences?

Material and Method

Research Design

The study employed a qualitative case study design informed by Bronfenbrenner's Process–Person–Context–Time (PPCT) model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). The case focused on seven teacher-leaders with concurrent instructional and leadership responsibilities in public secondary schools across three school divisions in the Philippines. The case was bounded by the participants' shared professional roles, the broader context of Philippine public secondary education, and the data collection period. The design enabled an examination of similarities and differences in participants' accounts of institutional demands, resilience-related responses, and instructional practices across organizational settings. Supplementary questionnaire responses provided descriptive contextual information rather than constituting a separate quantitative strand of the study.

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

A qualitative approach was appropriate because as the research questions focused on how participants described their professional experience, how they situated that experience within the school context, and how they made sense of the relationship between their role as a teacher and their role as a leader. We sought to identify patterns, contrasts, and interpretive boundaries from participants' accounts rather than from group-level questionnaire statistics. We didn't assume all participants would arrive at the same interpretive pattern; we considered both within-case and cross-case accounts.

We used PPCT as a sensitizing and interpretive framework rather than a prescriptive model of causality. The 'person' element was about the person's characteristics and psychological resources; the 'process' element was about the actual processes of interaction and practice among teacher-leaders, students, colleagues, and other school personnel; the 'context' element was about institutional responsibilities, the resources available and the relationships that were expected; and the 'time' element was about the retrospective accounts of the experience and the perceived changes. We would not regard a process as proximal simply because it had occurred; interview evidence would have to show that it was a recurrent, reciprocal, and complex process. The cross-sectional nature of our data collection meant that we could not establish any developmental trajectories.

The bulk of the evidence came from written replies by participants to an online qualitative open-ended questionnaire. Supplementary self-report questionnaires provided descriptive information about participants' psychological, relational, and work-related characteristics. The scores were not used to test relationships, validate qualitative accounts, or infer causal mechanisms. The study aimed for contextual understanding and analytical transferability rather than statistical generalizability.

Research Context and Case Boundaries

The study included seven teacher-leaders in public secondary schools across the Schools Divisions of Manila City, Antipolo City, and Quezon City. The participants worked within the larger policy and administrative framework of the Philippine Department of Education (DepEd), although their individual school and division contexts varied. All participants simultaneously held instructional and leadership roles, providing a common professional context for examining their experiences of institutional demands, professional relationships, and instructional practices.

The case was bounded by the dual professional roles of the respondents, the context of public secondary education in the Philippines, and the period of data gathering in October 2025. Units of analysis were participants' descriptions of resilience-related experiences, professional interactions, institutional conditions, and instructional responses. The analysis sought similarities and differences across participants, without assuming organizational demands, resources, or institutional support would be similar.

The study did not attempt to generalize statistically to Philippine public secondary schools per se. It aimed to develop a contextually grounded understanding of teacher-leader resilience. The participants' accounts of their past professional experiences,

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

curriculum reforms, and the pandemic were retrospective rather than longitudinal evidence of change. The study did not independently verify institutional policies or their implementation without the relevant documentation. The findings are therefore to be interpreted in the context of the particular DepEd division in which the participants worked, and their transferability to other contexts will depend on the degree of contextual similarity and difference.

Participants and Sampling

Researchers purposefully selected seven teacher-leaders from Philippine public secondary schools who were all concurrently engaged in classroom instruction and who also held formal or informal leadership positions (subject coordination, student org advising, program facilitation, committee leadership, etc.). All of the participants were engaged in some form of instructional leadership or in some form of professional decision-making. Four participants were from the Schools Division of Manila City, two from Quezon City, and one from Antipolo City. Their diverse backgrounds, ages, years of teaching, and leadership responsibilities provided the opportunity to examine a variety of professional experiences and resilience-related responses (Table 1).

Table 1.

Participant	Teaching assignment	Leadership responsibility	Years of teaching	School division	Eligibility verified
P1	Grade 7-8 Math Teacher	Master Teacher 1-Junior High Math Coordinator	15 years	Manila City	LET Passer
P2	Grade 11-12 English Teacher	ALS Coordinator	15 years	Manila City	LET Passer
P3	Grade 7-10 Math Teacher	Math Club Coach	10 years	Manila City	LET Passer
P4	Grade 7-10 Math Teacher	Grade 7 Coordinator	10 years	Manila City	LET Passer
P5	Grade 10 - English / Grade 12 - Practical Research 1 and 2	Asst. Principal/Student Governing Body Adviser	10 years	Antipolo City	LET Passer
P6	Grade 7, 8 & 10 Science	STE Coordinator, School Research Coordinator	15 years	Quezon City	LET Passer

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

P7	Grade 9 & 10 Science	LAC Coordinator 2019-2024 LAC Leader 2025-2026	13 years	Quezon City	LET Passer

Researchers recruited participants through an invitation letter that provided a brief background on the study. Participants were then sent a consent form. The letter made clear that the study aimed to add to the existing body of knowledge and, in turn, inform how education is delivered. Participation was entirely voluntary. Of the seven participants, none withdrew.

The seven participants were public high school teachers with over 5 years' experience, and all held leadership positions. They were given participant codes (P1-P7) to anonymize them and to ensure consistency with the interviews and the associated quantitative data.

The purposive sample enabled an exploratory investigation of teacher-leaders' professional experiences rather than statistical estimation. The analysis demonstrated the relevance of participants' experiences to the research questions, the particularity of their accounts and themes, and contrasts across participants.

Data Sources and Collection Procedures

The primary data source was an online, semi-structured, open-ended questionnaire in which participants shared their accounts of instructional and leadership responsibilities, psychological and relational resources, institutional demands, professional interactions, and retrospective experiences. Qualitative online questionnaires allow participants to describe their experiences in their words (Braun et al., 2021). The written responses were exported into participant-level analytic matrices, preserving participants' original wording for analysis and presentation.

A complementary questionnaire assessed descriptive indicators of mindful attention and awareness, emotion regulation, collegial support, self-reported resilience, and work engagement. Table 2 shows the instruments, constructs, scoring procedures, and their role in the PPCT-informed analysis.

Summary statistics for the additional questionnaire scores were the median and interquartile range. These indicators contextualized participants' reported psychological, relational, and professional characteristics rather than validating the qualitative findings themselves. We administered both ERQ subscales, but the main descriptive analysis focused on cognitive reappraisal, with expressive suppression as a supplementary indicator. Participants' retrospective accounts were interpreted as perceived professional experiences rather than as independently observed changes in resilience or instructional practice.

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

Table 2. Supplementary Questionnaire Instruments and Their Analytical Roles

Instrument	Construct	Analytical role	Reference
Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS)	Mindful attention and awareness	Personal resource (Person)	Brown and Ryan (2003)
Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ) – Cognitive Reappraisal Subscale	Cognitive reappraisal	Personal resource (Person)	Gross and John (2003)
Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC-10)	Self-reported resilience	Resilience-related characteristics (Person)	Campbell-Sills and Stein (2007)
Support System Scale	Perceived collegial support and collaboration	Relational and contextual resource (Process– Context)	Researcher-developed
Work Engagement Scale	Vigor, dedication, and absorption	Related professional functioning	Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006).

Note. Higher scores indicate higher levels of each construct. The indicators provide supplementary descriptive information relevant to RQ2 and RQ3 but do not independently answer either research question. Work engagement is distinguished from instructional engagement.

Data Analysis

The PPCT framework guided the thematic analysis of participants' written accounts (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and also allowed categories to emerge that were not explicitly part of the original framework. The data were first familiarized with and then coded for professional demands, personal and relational resources, coping, instructional responses, and perceived professional change.

The analysis split psychological resources and coping strategies from reported adaptation (Luthar et al., 2000; Skinner et al., 2003). Adaptation was defined as the reported maintenance, modification, or restoration of professional functioning in the face of an identified adversity. Accounts of resources or coping strategies without any evidence of adaptation were categorized as resilience-related responses rather than evidence of adaptation.

We conducted a within-participant analysis to understand how participants linked their personal resources, professional interactions, institutional context, and retrospective experience to the instructional and leadership practices they reported. A cross-participant analysis revealed the patterns, variations, contradictions, and gaps in the evidence. We

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

separated co-occurring experiences from relationships that were explicitly reported. We considered accounts to reflect potential proximal processes only when evidence showed professional interactions were recurrent, reciprocal, and increasingly complex (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006).

We used medians and interquartile ranges to summarize responses to the supplementary questionnaire. These indicators provided descriptive context for the qualitative findings, not independent validation or evidence of statistical relationships. The study interpreted retrospective reports and self-reported instructional practices without assuming causal relationships, longitudinal development, or instructional effectiveness.

We clustered the first codes into larger categories based on the PPCT framework and induced additional categories from participants' narratives. We checked candidate themes against original responses and refined them to capture both commonalities and contrasts in experience. We used cross-participant matrices to explore relationships across the PPCT dimensions and to identify limits of the available evidence.

Trustworthiness and Rigor

The team established trustworthiness by systematically comparing codes and interpretations with participants' original written responses, accounting for contradictory accounts and documenting discrepancies or alternative interpretations (Nowell et al., 2017). The team also maintained clear analytical distinctions between psychological resources, coping, reported adaptation, and instructional practices.

Other researchers and the research mentor reviewed written responses and analytic summaries. They used their feedback to refine codes, themes, and interpretations and strengthen their grounding in the qualitative evidence. Detailed information about the research context, participant selection, and analytical procedures was provided to help readers judge transferability.

Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary, and all participants provided informed consent. We used participant codes to protect identities. We de-identified research data and stored them securely, with access restricted to authorized researchers only. We reviewed the quotations and the associated context to ensure the confidentiality of individual participants and schools. We used all data exclusively for research purposes.

Results

The results are structured around the four PPCT dimensions and supplemented with descriptive indicators. A cross-cutting synthesis is appended. The qualitative tables cluster related accounts into analytical themes and provide selected quotations, evidence, and participant codes to indicate contributing accounts.

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

Personal Resources and Coping (Person)

The participants discussed attentional awareness, emotional regulation, composure, and professional confidence in the context of their dual responsibilities. Table 3 shows that these resources and practices did not consistently map onto adaptation to institutional strain.

Table 3. Themes of Personal Resources and Coping

Theme	Participants	Illustrative evidence
Emotional management and composure	P1, P3, P6	"I try to control whatever emotions I feel when I am in front of learners." (P1)
Mindful attention and task management	P2, P5, P7	"There are times when I have many responsibilities, but being present helps me manage them one at a time." (P5)
Perceived professional confidence	P4, P5, P7	"Over the course of the school year, my leadership roles, decision-making confidence, and well-being continue to evolve through experience and reflection." (P4)

Professional Interactions, Instructional Practices, and Reflection (Process)

Professional practice included managing emotional tension, generating alternative viewpoints, responding to the learner, supporting colleagues, and reflecting on experience. These functions should not be considered as equivalent to evidence of instructional adaptation (Table 4).

Table 4. Themes of Professional Interactions and Practices

Theme	Participants	Illustrative evidence
Collegial consultation and feedback	P1, P2	"I ask for feedback from my MT or colleagues, because their advice helps me see things from a different angle." (P2)
Student-informed instructional responsiveness	P3, P5, P6	"I try as much as I can to adjust my teaching style to meet their attention level at the time." (P3)
Reflective practice	P4	"At the end of my day as a teacher, I take time to reflect on what happened and identify what I can do better next time." (P4)
Collegial resource sharing	P7	"I make it a point to help, especially our new teachers, by providing available resources and materials that they can use in their lessons." (P7)

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

Note. MT = master teacher. P6 described monitoring learning difficulties, not a confirmed subsequent instructional adjustment. Individual reflection is not necessarily a proximal process.

Institutional and Sociocultural Conditions (Context)

Institutional conditions varied across accounts. Expectations of collaboration and relationships co-existed with workload and resource constraints. P6 described the high personal costs, and P7 described searching for alternatives to poor instructional resources (Table 5).

Table 5. Themes of Institutional and Sociocultural Conditions

Theme	Participants	Illustrative evidence
Workload, role overlap, and inadequate accommodation	P1, P3, P5, P6	"It was a very challenging role because, aside from being a classroom teacher, I have to do monitoring and supervision." (P3)
Resource and scheduling constraints	P2, P7	"For the challenges experienced, I think it's the lack of a training room (because we only train in the corridors, in front of the math department) and the time and scheduling conflicts of the participants." (P2)
Collaborative school culture	P5	"Because we help one another, share responsibilities, and work together, especially when organizing school activities and addressing concerns or challenges." (P5)
Filipino relational values	P4	"Filipino values such as 'pakikipagkapwa-tao' and 'utang na loob' greatly influence my well-being and leadership relationships…" (P4)

Retrospective Professional Experiences and Perceived Change (Time)

Participants identified several experiences that were important in shaping their current understanding of their professional lives: early-career overwork, technological change, professional commitment, leadership changes, and resourcefulness. These accounts reflected perceived change rather than a shared developmental trajectory (Table 6).

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

Table 6. Themes of Retrospective Professional Experience

Theme	Participants	Illustrative evidence
Recognizing personal costs and work boundaries	P1, P6	"Now that I have been teaching for 15+ years, I learned to set boundaries for when work stops and when my own life takes over." (P6)
Instructional change and resourcefulness	P2, P7	"Perhaps it's the integration of technology in instructional delivery during asynchronous classes that made a significant impact on me." (P2)
Perceived professional commitment	P3	"I've grown to be more compassionate and committed to the profession." (P3)
Leadership transitions and expanded responsibility	P4, P5	"But when I started leading other teachers, I realized that my responsibility had become bigger." (P5)

Supplementary Quantitative Indicators

Table 7 gives the descriptive context for the psychological, relational, and work-related characteristics of the participants.

Table 7. Descriptive Questionnaire Indicators (N = 7)

Indicator	Median	IQR
Mindful attention and awareness	3.53	1.77
Cognitive reappraisal	5.33	1.75
Collegial support and collaboration	3.81	1.57
Resilience (CD-RISC-10 total)	34.00	10.50
Work engagement	5.00	0.78

Note. IQR = interquartile range. Resilience is a total score; other indicators are item averages. Work engagement is distinct from instructional engagement.

Cross-Dimensional Patterns in Participants' Accounts

The synthesis identifies relationships participants explicitly state, rather than those that merely co-occur. Table 8 sets out the findings in four cross-dimensional themes.

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

Table 8. Cross-Dimensional Themes in Resilience-Related Accounts

Analytical theme	Participants / PPCT dimensions	Reported relationships	Limits of evidence
Relationally supported coping	P1, P2 / Process–Person	Consultation eased tension (P1); feedback provided alternative perspectives (P2).	Participants reported institutional constraints but did not explicitly link them to these practices or instructional adaptation.
Instructional responsiveness and resourcefulness	P3, P5, P7 / Process–Context; Person–Process	P3 adjusted to learner needs; P5 linked listening to decisions and mindful attention to task management; P7 sought alternatives to scarce materials.	Only P7 explicitly connected resource shortages to an instructional response; effectiveness was not established.
Reflective professional development	P4, P5, P7 / Time–Person; Process	Leadership transitions and accumulated experiences were associated with perceived professional development. P4 also described journaling.	No longitudinal evidence or established link between journaling and increased confidence.
Personal costs and boundary-setting	P6 / Context–Person; Time–Person	Overload and inadequate accommodation were associated with exhaustion and abandonment of an academic goal. P6 recalled adopting firmer boundaries.	Recovery of professional functioning was not established.

Note. PPCT = Process–Person–Context–Time. Themes are not mutually exclusive; dimension labels indicate relevant elements, not tested causal pathways.

Cross-Participant Synthesis

P1 and P2's accounts described relationally supported coping, with consultation and feedback providing both emotional and interpretive functions. Both noted institutional constraints, though neither linked them to their coping strategies or the

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

resulting instructional adaptation.

P3, P5, and P7 all described more direct forms of instructional responsiveness. P3 described matching activities to students' attention and motivation. P5 described listening to students, which in turn led to more considered instructional decisions. P7 gave the most detailed account of an instructional response to institutional adversity, citing the material shortages and the consequent search for alternative resources. P7 also mentioned the sharing of resources with colleagues.

P4 and P5's accounts of the leadership transitions they underwent, combined with P7's retrospective account of becoming more resourceful, point to reflective professional development. P4 also highlighted the importance of Filipino relational values and reflective journaling. These accounts reflected the participants' own understanding of their professional experience and didn't describe any developmental mechanisms.

P6's account of professional exhaustion, giving up an academic ambition, and the resulting focus on work-life boundaries clearly illustrated the personal costs and boundaries of adaptation. This narrative differed sharply from P7's account of being resourceful. P6's experience illustrated the personal cost of professional overload and the importance of recognizing personal and professional limits. The resilience resources and coping strategies were quite distinct from the adaptations participants reported in response to institutional pressure.

Discussion

This paper examined how seven teacher-leaders in Philippine public secondary schools conceived of and responded to institutional demands in their dual roles as teachers and leaders. Using Bronfenbrenner’s Process-Person-Context-Time (PPCT) framework as a guide, the study identified variation in institutional demands, personal resources, professional relationships, instructional practice, and retrospective experience of the role. Three related findings answered the research questions: There was variation in the nature of the institutional demands experienced depending on the professional responsibilities and level of support available; the range of responses that could be construed as being 'resilient' included psychological coping, consultation with colleagues, responsiveness to the demands of the role and the setting of boundaries; and the relationships between the PPCT dimensions were not uniform and did not necessarily reflect successful adaptation. The findings support an ecological understanding of teacher-leader resilience that considers both personal and organizational conditions, without equating coping with resilience.

Institutional Demands and the Context–Person Relationship

The first research question was about how teacher-leaders described the institutional demands of doing instructional and leadership work at the same time. Participants reported substantial institutional demands, excessive workloads, overlapping responsibilities, inadequate facilities and instructional resources, scheduling problems,

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

and conflicting professional demands. These were demands that went well beyond the classroom. They were demands of the institution where they worked.

The findings align with Lu et al.'s (2024) systematic review of teacher resilience from a job demands–resources perspective, which highlights the importance of both personal and situational resources. Beltman et al. (2011) also conceptualize teacher resilience as a product of the interplay between individual and situational factors rather than just individual characteristics. This study builds on that by examining those who were both teachers and leaders and showing how institutional demands interacted with the differing demands of the two roles.

In PPCT terms, the Context dimension refers to the organizational conditions under which the participants' experiences occurred, and the Person dimension refers to the personal resources and responses described in connection with these conditions (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). The two accounts of P6 and P7 depict different ways of configuring institutional demands and professional responses. P6 reported feeling exhausted and giving up an academic aim because of competing professional demands and a lack of institutional accommodation, while P7 described seeking alternative instructional materials in response to resource constraints. These accounts show how different kinds of institutional adversity can lead to different professional responses and personal consequences.

These concerns are more pertinent in the Philippine policy context. Department of Education Order No. 002, s. 2024, ordered the removal of administrative tasks from public school teachers, while Order No. 005, s. 2024, focused on rationalizing teachers' workload and paying for teaching overload (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). Such policies create a wider institutional context for participants' concerns about workload and competing responsibilities. However, the study did not independently examine policy implementation in their schools. Thus, participants' accounts should be interpreted as their reported experiences of institutional conditions, not as direct evidence of policy compliance or implementation failure.

The results suggest that understanding institutional strain cannot be reduced to the number or type of responsibilities assigned to teacher-leaders. It also depends on resources available, professional expectations, and personal consequences of meeting the responsibilities. This Context–Person reading highlights the importance of organizational conditions in studying teacher-leader resilience.

Personal Resources, Professional Interactions, and Instructional Responsiveness

The second research question centered on the personal resources, professional interactions, and instructional practices that teacher-leaders reported using to respond to professional demands. Participants named emotional regulation, mindful attention, composure, professional confidence, collegial consultation, reflective practice, instructional adjustment, and resource sharing. These responses served different functions and did not always reflect the same kind of adaptation.

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

At the Person level, attentional awareness and emotional management were related to the participants' ability to manage professional responsibilities. These findings align with research that views psychological resources as important to teacher resilience and professional functioning (Beltman et al., 2011; Mansfield et al., 2016). However, the qualitative evidence does not indicate that participants used specific psychological strategies, such as cognitive reappraisal, merely because they reported staying calm or managing their emotions. Cognitive reappraisal is defined as changing how a situation that elicits an emotion is interpreted (Gross & John, 2003). Similarly, perceived professional confidence should not be confused with measured self-efficacy.

The Process dimension appeared in participants' engagement with colleagues and students. P1 and P2 described collegial consultation and seeking feedback as sources of emotional relief and alternative professional perspectives. P5 linked listening to students with instructional decision-making. P7 discussed sharing instructional resources with colleagues. These accounts illustrate relational processes participants considered relevant to their professional functioning.

Bronfenbrenner and Morris (2006), however, stressed that proximal processes are reciprocal, recurrent, and increasingly complex interactions. Participants did not consistently identify these characteristics in the available written responses. Thus, collegial consultation, feedback seeking, and resource sharing are best understood as reported professional interactions and potential proximal processes rather than as fully demonstrated developmental mechanisms.

The results also differentiate relationally supported coping from instructional responsiveness. P1 and P2 described the benefits they perceived from professional consultation but did not explicitly link these interactions to changes in their teaching practice. Conversely, P3, P5, and P7 described more direct instructional responsiveness, such as modifying activities in response to learners' attention and motivation, considering students' needs when making instructional decisions, and seeking alternative instructional materials. In P7's account, the link between limited resources and instructional adjustments was particularly clear.

These differences emphasize the significance of differentiating psychological resources, coping methods, and reported adaptation. Resilience research focuses on adaptation despite hardship as central to the construct, rather than merely the presence of protective resources as sufficient evidence of resilience (Luthar et al., 2000). Current findings similarly indicate that emotional management, consultation, and reflective practice may be associated with resilience, but not necessarily with maintaining or restoring professional functioning. Instructional changes are reported as a professional response, but the effectiveness and sustainability of such changes are not verified.

PPCT Relationships, Sociocultural Expectations, and Retrospective Professional Experiences

The third research question examined how the PPCT framework illuminated relationships, variations, and tensions in teacher-leaders' accounts. The cross-

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

dimensional analysis revealed several configurations, not a single pattern, linking personal resources, professional interactions, institutional conditions, and professional adaptation.

P1 and P2 illustrated the relationships between professional interactions and perceived psychological support, while P3, P5, and P7 offered more direct accounts of instructional responsiveness. P4 emphasized reflective professional development and relational expectations, while P6 highlighted the personal costs of institutional overload and the subsequent importance of work–life boundaries. These contrasting accounts suggest that the relevance of particular PPCT dimensions varies according to the professional experiences described. Their presence within the same account does not necessarily establish a relationship among them.

The sociocultural context further illustrates this variation. P4 identified Filipino relational values, especially *pakikipagkapwa-tao* and *utang na loob*, as important to leadership relationships and community building. These observations fit within the framework of Sikolohiyang Pilipino, which emphasizes culturally grounded understandings of interpersonal relationships and social experience (Pe-Pua & Protacio-Marcelino, 2000). However, P4's interpretation should not be taken as the voice of all participants or Philippine teacher-leaders in general. Cultural values can influence professional relationships, but they are not necessarily uniform protective resources.

The Time dimension offered another lens through participants' retrospective interpretations of their professional experiences. P1 and P6 recalled the personal costs of overwork and P2 described pandemic-related instructional technology as an important experience. P3 mentioned perceived changes in professional commitment. P4 and P5 linked leadership changes to broader perceptions of professional duties. P7 also spoke about perceived changes in resourcefulness and professional confidence.

The accounts illustrated how participants understood their current professional roles in relation to past experience. Nevertheless, the study was cross-sectional and did not determine developmental trajectories. Although time is central to Bronfenbrenner's bioecological theory, a complete PPCT investigation requires attention to the temporal organization of processes and their relation to development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Tudge et al., 2009). The present study therefore gives a PPCT-informed perspective on retrospective professional experiences and not a longitudinal test of bioecological development.

Together, the cross-dimensional findings suggest that teacher-leader resilience is best understood as situated relationships among professional demands, available resources, social interactions, and accumulated experiences, rather than as a single personal characteristic. They also show the analytic value of distinguishing between relationships explicitly stated and experiences that happened to be part of the same professional account.

Teacher-Leader Resilience Beyond Individual Coping

The patterns identified in this study among participants have implications for

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

understanding teacher resilience. In particular, P6's experience challenges the assumption that ongoing professional commitment or the use of coping methods necessarily implies successful adaptation. The participant described considerable personal costs from professional demands and, in retrospect, emphasized the need to set clearer work-life boundaries. Conversely, P7 described instances of resourcefulness and collegial support when instructional materials were scarce.

These accounts reveal different reactions to institutional adversity. One focused on overcoming instructional limitations by using alternative resources and working with colleagues. The other focused on the personal price of overwork. While neither account provides independently verifiable outcomes of resilience, their contrast suggests the limits of thinking of resilience as an individual's capacity to keep going regardless of institutional conditions.

This interpretation aligns with ecological perspectives on teacher resilience that emphasize the interaction of personal, relational, and contextual resources (Beltman et al., 2011; Gu & Day, 2007; Mansfield et al., 2016). It also aligns with the Job Demands–Resources perspective, which acknowledges the importance of organizational conditions and personal resources in understanding teachers' reactions to professional demands (Lu et al., 2024).

The present study does not contribute a new model of resilience; instead, it makes visible how these distinctions emerged in the lived experiences of Philippine public secondary school teacher-leaders. The PPCT framework enabled exploration of both the resources participants reported and the limits of the relationships supported by their accounts. The study thus emphasizes the need to frame resilience-related practices within the professional and organizational context in which they take place.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The results provide theoretical support for using PPCT as a sensitizing framework to examine teacher-leader resilience. The Person dimension refers to psychological resources and individual responses; the Process dimension refers to professional interactions and instructional practices. Context places these experiences within organizational and sociocultural contexts. Time shows how participants retrospectively make sense of their professional development. The framework is most useful when these dimensions are seen in relation to each other, rather than as unsupported causal or developmental relationships.

The findings also point to practical areas for institutional consideration. First, school leaders and education authorities may need to consider how instructional and leadership responsibilities are distributed, especially when overlapping duties create excessive workload. Second, collegial consultation, mentoring, and resource sharing can support teacher-leaders, provided that institutions offer these opportunities rather than impose them as additional responsibilities. Third, institutions must consider the availability of instructional materials and professional learning resources. We cannot assume that individual resourcefulness can sufficiently compensate for persistent

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

institutional shortcomings.

These implications align with Philippine policies on teachers' administrative responsibilities and workload rationalization (Department of Education, 2024a, 2024b). However, the study does not indicate whether some organizational interventions would improve teachers' resilience or instructional engagement. Instead, it points to areas for institutional review and empirical study.

In sum, the findings suggest that developing teacher-leader resilience requires attention to both individual professional capacities and the organizational contexts in which teachers enact teaching and leadership responsibilities. Therefore, resilience should not be framed as an expectation that teachers absorb avoidable institutional pressures.

Limitations and Future Research

These interpretations have several limitations. The study included seven teacher-leaders who recorded their experiences in written qualitative responses. While the accounts gave insight into their perceived professional demands and responses, the lack of follow-up probing may have limited the depth of some explanations. The retrospective cross-sectional design did not allow for examination of developmental change, and self-reported evidence did not allow for independent verification of instructional practices and their outcomes.

Participants came from three school divisions, but the small, uneven distribution of participants across settings did not allow systematic interdivisional comparisons. Hence, differences in participants' accounts cannot be explained by specific divisional policies or organizational characteristics.

In addition, the evidence was inconsistent in identifying proximal processes in the full bioecological sense, as the requisite recurrence, reciprocity, and increasing complexity were not consistently demonstrated. Thus, the results are interpretations based on the PPCT, not empirical tests of the full model. When validated, supplementary questionnaire indicators offer descriptive context but do not show relationships between constructs or validate the qualitative interpretations.

Future research could explore teacher-leader resilience through longitudinal and comparative multi-school designs that incorporate classroom observations, organizational records, and repeated accounts of professional interactions. These approaches would allow deeper analysis of how personal resources, institutional conditions, professional relationships, and instructional practices develop and interact over time. Research may also examine how Filipino relational values are negotiated within various leadership structures and organizational conditions.

Despite these limitations, the study adds to the complex understanding of teacher-leader resilience by showing that institutional demands, personal resources, professional relationships, and retrospective experiences do not lead to uniform professional responses. The findings emphasize the need to consider the organizational and sociocultural contexts of resilience-related practices rather than assuming that coping or

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

continued professional functioning indicates successful adaptation.

Conclusion

The study investigated how Philippine public secondary school teacher-leaders experienced and responded to institutional demands while performing instructional and leadership tasks. Using a PPCT-informed analysis, the authors found that institutional pressures, personal resources, professional interactions, and instructional responses varied. Participants described strategies for managing professional demands, including emotional regulation, collegial consultation, reflective practice, instructional responsiveness, resourcefulness, and boundary-setting. But these responses did not uniformly show successful adaptation. Stories of instructional resourcefulness and personal costs of institutional overload provided contrasting evidence that coping practices and sustained professional functioning should not be automatically equated with resilience.

The study offers a contextually grounded understanding of teacher-leader resilience that goes beyond individual psychological resources by examining the relationships and tensions among Person, Process, Context, and Time. The findings suggest that resilience-related responses should be interpreted in relation to professional relationships, organizational conditions and accumulated experiences. They also stress the shared institutional responsibility for managing the workload, supporting collegial collaboration, and providing adequate instructional resources. Retrospective, self-reported evidence cannot establish causality, longitudinal development, or instructional effectiveness, but it does suggest the value of an ecological perspective for understanding teacher-leaders' experiences of institutional strain. ***

Acknowledgement

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

We used Grammarly, ScopusAI, and ChatGPT (OpenAI) to help review the manuscript's organization, clarity, and concision and to identify relevant literature. The authors reviewed and revised the proposed text; the references were independently verified, and the authors had final responsibility for the study design, analysis and interpretation of data, and the final manuscript.

Funding: No public, commercial, or not-for-profit agencies funded this research.

Declaration of competing interests: The authors report no conflicts of interest.

References

Beltman, S., Mansfield, C., & Price, A. (2011). Thriving not just surviving: A review of research on teacher resilience. Educational Research Review, 6(3), 185–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2011.09.001

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development (6th ed., pp. 793–828). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470147658.chpsy0114

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., Clarke, V., Boulton, E., Davey, L., & McEvoy, C. (2021). The online survey as a qualitative research tool. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 24(6), 641–654. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1805550

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84(4), 822–848. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822

Campbell-Sills, L., & Stein, M. B. (2007). Psychometric analysis and refinement of the Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC): Validation of a 10-item measure of resilience. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 20(6), 1019–1028. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.20271

Chu, W. (2026). Exploring the development of EFL teachers' resilience in China: A bioecological theory perspective. European Journal of Education, 61(4), Article e70891. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70891

Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). Depression and Anxiety, 18(2), 76–82. https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10113

Davidson, J. R. T. (2020). Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) manual [Unpublished manual]. https://www.cd-risc.com/aRISC%20Manual%2001-01-20_F.pdf

Department of Education. (2024a). Immediate removal of administrative tasks of public school teachers (DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2024). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2024_002.pdf

Department of Education. (2024b). Rationalization of teachers' workload in public schools and payment of teaching overload (DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2024_005.pdf

Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85(2), 348–362. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

Gu, Q., & Day, C. (2007). Teachers resilience: A necessary condition for effectiveness. Teaching and Teacher Education, 23(8), 1302–1316. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.06.006

IDinsight. (2025). Removing the burden of administration from teachers [Policy brief]. Second Congressional Commission on Education. https://edcom2.gov.ph/publications/removing-the-burden-of-administration-from-teachers/

Kim, L. E., Oxley, L., & Asbury, K. (2022). "My brain feels like a browser with 100 tabs open": A longitudinal study of teachers' mental health and well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 92(1), 299–318. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12450

Klassen, R. M., Yerdelen, S., & Durksen, T. L. (2013). Measuring teacher engagement: Development of the Engaged Teachers Scale (ETS). Frontline Learning Research, 1(2), 33–52. https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v1i2.44

Lipscombe, K., Harris, J., Tindall-Ford, S., & Groth, S. (2025). School middle leadership: A systematic review revisited 2020–2024. Educational Management Administration & Leadership. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432251362970

Lu, J., Chen, J., Li, Z., & Li, X. (2024). A systematic review of teacher resilience: A perspective of the job demands and resources model. Teaching and Teacher Education, 151, Article 104742. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104742

Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. Child Development, 71(3), 543–562. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00164

Mansfield, C. F., Beltman, S., Broadley, T., & Weatherby-Fell, N. (2016). Building resilience in teacher education: An evidenced informed framework. Teaching and Teacher Education, 54, 77–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.11.016

Mu, G. M., Gordon, D., Liang, J., Zhao, L., Aguilar Alonso, R., Juri, M. Z., Zhang, X., Vo, H., Gao, D., Hu, Y., & Xing, C. (2024). A meta-analysis of the correlation between teacher self-efficacy and teacher resilience: Concerted growth and contextual variance. Educational Research Review, 45, Article 100645. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2024.100645

Munezero, E., Hódi, Á., & Tóth, E. (2026). Assessing teacher resilience and its protective factors: A systematic review. International Journal of Educational Research Open, 10, Article 100561. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2025.100561

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025). Results from TALIS 2024: The state of teaching. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®

Pe-Pua, R., & Protacio-Marcelino, E. A. (2000). Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino psychology): A legacy of Virgilio G. Enriquez. Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 3(1), 49–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-839X.00054

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Preliminary manual (Version 1.1). Utrecht University. https://www.wilmarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/Test%20Manuals/Test_manual_UWES_English.pdf

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66(4), 701–716. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471

Skinner, E. A., Edge, K., Altman, J., & Sherwood, H. (2003). Searching for the structure of coping: A review and critique of category systems for classifying ways of coping. Psychological Bulletin, 129(2), 216–269. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.2.216

Tudge, J. R. H., Mokrova, I., Hatfield, B. E., & Karnik, R. B. (2009). Uses and misuses of Bronfenbrenner's bioecological theory of human development. Journal of Family Theory & Review, 1(4), 198–210. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2009.00026.x

Wang, H., Burić, I., Chang, M.-L., & Gross, J. J. (2023). Teachers' emotion regulation and related environmental, personal, instructional, and well-being factors: A meta-analysis. Social Psychology of Education, 26, 1651–1696. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-023-09810-1

Wiens, P. D., Vongkulluksn, V., Beck, J., & Pearson, B. (2025). Understanding teacher leadership: Development and testing of the survey of teacher leadership. Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 12, Article 101738. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101738

York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. Review of Educational Research, 74(3), 255–316. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074003255

Zareian Jahromi, A., Brown, J. L., & Jennings, P. A. (2026). The impacts of mindfulness-based interventions (MBIs) on teachers' mindfulness, mindful teaching, and self-efficacy: A systematic review. Mindfulness, 17, 643–666. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-025-02749-8

RIKSAWAN INSTITUTE®