

Future-Ready Schools: Strengthening Organizational Effectiveness and Change Readiness

Carolyn Mae M. Olivar¹, Erlinda N. Magallanes², Lydia Y. Sumile³

Faculty
Medina College
Philippines

Abstract:

This study evaluated the organizational effectiveness and change readiness of schools according to administrator and teacher perceptions. The specific aims were to identify how administrators and teachers rated the significant organizational areas such as tasks, structure, people relationships, motivation, support, management leadership, attitude towards change, and performance. The study also sought to identify significant differences in administrators' and teachers' perceptions towards organizational effectiveness as well as between their ratings of the organizations' change readiness. Data were collected using a survey and analyzed using descriptive statistics and t-tests. The findings were that the two groups rated the significant organizational areas as moderately effective, with positive responses from the teachers compared to the administrators. Significant differences in people relationships and performance were confirmed. Both groups reported moderate change readiness, where administrators gave top priority to top management support. Overall, there were no differences in their ratings of change readiness. These findings emphasize the need for collaborative effort and proactive leadership to improve organizational effectiveness and change readiness in elementary schools. Recommendations for the future include improving administrators' teacher collaboration, modernizing teaching practices, establishing teacher motivation, improving community involvement, and embracing proactive leadership for improvement and adaptability to changing educational demands.

Keywords: Administrators, Teachers, Readiness for Change.

INTRODUCTION

Institutions of learning rely on the quality of human capital as knowledge forms the basis of education. As technologies like artificial intelligence and supercomputers keep on transforming industries, education is a sector where human experience, motivation, and knowledge are the driving forces behind excellence. Schools as change-managing organizations require being in a process of perpetual change to be able to adapt to the requirements of a transforming world. However, the same human forces driving an institution towards excellence can also undermine it, particularly in how it adapts to change. For institutions of education in today's times, quality teaching is succeeded by pressure to adapt to policy, pedagogy, and organizational reforms.

The capacity of an institution to learn and respond to change is a predictor of long-term success. Khaw et al. (2023) posits that organizational change demands a shift from the familiar to the unfamiliar, which is usually resisted. Allaoui & Benmoussa (2020) also recognize determinants of resistance to change in higher education institutions, and the preparedness of overcoming such resistance is of utmost concern. Robbins et al. (2020) note that change is not only unavoidable but also unavoidable for growth and adaptation, and therefore proactive approaches in managing change are essential. Burnes (2020) also argues that organizations that do not deal with mismatches in leadership and operating styles are incapable of transforming.

In the education sector, school administrators and leaders are the main players not only in recognizing the need for change but also in driving and facilitating it to ensure sustainable school growth. While the need for change readiness is strongly established, the literature on how elementary schools implement and adapt to organizational change effectively remains limited. While previous studies have extensively researched change management in the business sector and higher education, few have specifically addressed the special challenges of elementary schools. In particular, the impacts of leadership transitions, education policy reforms, and teachers' and administrators' readiness to adapt to change require more investigation. Addressing these gaps is essential to ensure that elementary schools continue to be adaptive, resilient, and able to provide quality education amidst shifting educational demands.

This research will measure the efficacy of change readiness in schools, specifically in public elementary schools, by establishing how administrators, teachers, and support staff adapt to organizational change. It will establish the vital factors that drive change preparedness and measures taken to ensure ease of adaptation. The research will also investigate the leadership style, institutional policy, and human resource management practices that increase or decrease successful transformation. The results of this research will give meaningful recommendations for enhancing change management processes, eventually enhancing the overall performance of schools in tackling future challenges.

METHODS

Research Design

The researcher employed the descriptive method to capture accurately the participants' characteristics, behaviors, and perceptions, and to provide an objective and comprehensive description of the variables under study. The method is best suited for establishing patterns, relationships, and trends without manipulation of variables, and it is best suited for understanding conditions as they exist in the real world. By systematic data collection and analysis, the study provides insightful findings that can be used to inform decision-making, policy-making, and future research in the field.

Research Setting

This study was conducted in the Central District, North District, and South District of Tangub City Division.

Research Respondents

The respondents of this were the 183 teachers and 55 administrators of all the Tangub City elementary schools.

Research Instrument

Two questionnaires were utilized in this study to collect the information required: the Organizational Diagnosis Questionnaire and the Readiness for Change Questionnaire. The Organizational Diagnosis Questionnaire, as developed by Carnall (1995), was made up of statements aimed at measuring eight key areas of organizational effectiveness: key tasks, structure, people relationships, motivation, support, management leadership, attitude towards change, and performance. Respondents were requested to note whether they strongly disagreed or disagreed with each statement on a one (Strongly Disagree) to five (Strongly Agree) scale. The instrument was given to the administrators and the teachers in an effort to obtain a comprehensive picture of organizational effectiveness.

The Readiness for Change Questionnaire, on the other hand, was specially designed by the researcher to assess the positive actions for the effective implementation of change in the schools. The questionnaire considered the factors of the expectation of change on the part of the school, change attitude, leadership support of the top management of the Department of Education (DepEd), acceptability of change, and change structures. The respondents were requested to rate statements under each factor, selecting from among five options. Each option was rated from one to five, with five being the highest readiness for change. The instrument was also administered to the management and the faculty members to assess their readiness for and attitude towards potential changes in the organization.

To determine the validity and relevance of the researcher-created Readiness for Change Questionnaire, a preliminary dry-run was also conducted among 20 participants of the non-final study sample. Pilot testing helped the researcher to verify if there were any errors or ambiguity in the questionnaire. Based on the feedback and result of these 20 participants, necessary changes and adjustments were incorporated in the instrument, and this enhanced the reliability and comprehensibility of the instrument for the actual study. This helped the questionnaire measure the intended constructs of readiness for change and yield correct and meaningful results for the research.

Instrument Validity

Carnall's (1995) Organizational Diagnosis Questionnaire (ODQ) is a valid questionnaire that is typically used in organizational effectiveness measurement to ensure its validity in this research. For the Readiness for Change Questionnaire, validity was ensured by pilot testing and expert review. The tool was reviewed by a panel of experts to ensure equivalence with study purposes, and recommendations were made and incorporated to best ensure clarity, relevance, and accuracy. Pilot testing with 20 non-final participants also further refined the questionnaire to ensure it was measuring readiness for change successfully.

Data-Gathering Procedure

Permission was obtained by the researcher from the Superintendent before data collection and was in two phases: preparation and administration. Preparation was the stage where the administration time table of the instruments was organized with school administrators to effect a well-planned strategy. Distribution and collection of questionnaires from teachers were organized through the principal's office with assistance from co-teachers. This collaborative process made it possible to have high participation and effective data collection.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to strict ethical research protocols, including informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary involvement. The participants were specifically explained to and their anonymity and responses guaranteed confidentiality. They had the freedom to withdraw at any time without facing any penalty. Prior approval was given by the School Division Office before the data was collected, and everything was done in a fair and transparent manner in accordance with honesty and accuracy in reporting. The findings were used only for academic purposes, upholding research ethical standards (NESH, 2021).

Statistical Treatment

The gathered data were tallied, tabulated, and analyzed using weighted means to determine the overall trends in responses. Hypothetical mean ranges were applied to interpret the effectiveness of organizational diagnosis and readiness for change. Frequency distributions were computed for each questionnaire, and weighted means were used to assess participants' perceptions. To test the study's hypotheses, Fisher's t-test was employed to compare responses between groups at a 0.05 significance level. The statistical results were analyzed and interpreted, forming the basis for the study's findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 - Respondents' Perception of Organizational Effectiveness

Key Area Evaluated	Administrators (n=55)		Teachers (N=183)	
	μ	Interpretation	μ	Interpretation
Key task	4.96	Moderately Effective	5.45	Effective
Structure	4.61	Moderately Effective	5.17	Moderately Effective
People Relationships	4.96	Moderately Effective	5.50	Effective
Motivation	4.90	Moderately Effective	5.24	Moderately Effective

Support	4.86	Moderately Effective	5.22	Moderately Effective
Management Leadership	5.02	Moderately Effective	5.40	Effective
Attitude Change	5.13	Moderately Effective	5.38	Effective
Performance	4.65	Moderately Effective	5.40	Effective
Overall Perception	4.89	Moderately Effective	5.35	Effective

LEGEND:

6.15-7.00 = Highly Effective

5.29-6.14 = Effective

4.43-5.28 = Moderately Effective

3.57-4.42 = Bare Effective

2.71-3.56 = Moderately Ineffective

1.00-1.83 = Highly Ineffective

Table 1 shows the respondents' organizational effectiveness perceptions based on the perception of the administrators and the teachers. The results indicate a statistically significant perceptual gap where the administrators view the organization as being moderately effective ($\mu = 4.89$), whereas the teachers view the organization as being effective ($\mu = 5.35$). The difference indicates that the teachers are more satisfied with the current situation of the organization, but the administrators see areas that are in need of improvement.

Both groups also rated structure, motivation, and support as moderately effective, suggesting that while the essential systems are established, these can be further improved. Similarly, the administrators rated key tasks, people relationships, management leadership, attitude toward change, and performance as moderately effective, while the teachers rated these as effective. To the researchers' surprise, teachers' top rating was on people relationships ($\mu = 5.50$), followed closely by management leadership and performance ($\mu = 5.40$). These findings suggest that while effective people relationships exist, these are short of the mark to be highly effective.

Teachers' tendency to grade more positively overall, with their grades of 5.17 to 5.50 (mean of 5.35), versus administrators' ratings of 4.61 to 5.13 (mean of 4.89), indicates that these administrators are consistently more critical in measuring effectiveness. This could indicate that administrators tend to have a strategic, rather than facilitative, leadership style in dealing with institutional development and change.

Significantly, teachers gave more positive ratings to relationship-based factors such as people relationships, management leadership, and attitude towards change, while administrators were more skeptical of these variables. This is because of long-term organizational relationships. Teachers enjoy long years of tenure in the organization, creating a sense of commitment and loyalty that colors their judgments. Not unheard of are teachers in their sixties or seventies, or even retired teachers, to occupy active roles, a sign of strong institutional commitment. The organization is, however, reluctant to relinquish long-term members of the faculty, fostering a culture of stability and continuity.

While positive work culture is created by healthy relationships, it can also be a barrier to organizational change. Research shows that organizations embracing continuous change are better placed to attract and retain employees driven by innovation, while organizations emphasizing stability are bound to experience resistance to change (Beus et al., 2020). Effective change management is a balancing act between leveraging institutional loyalty and developing adaptability. Zad (2022) highlight that organizational change is maximized when strategic change is guided by empirical facts as well as situational realities.

These results emphasize the need for balancing management action with employee feelings, so that organizational change should address both structure-based and relational dynamics requirements. Blending the areas of improvement, without undermining existing culture of loyalty and support, will be critical in an attempt to boost overall organizational performance and long-term viability.

Table 2 - Result of Fisher's t-test for Significant Differences between Administrators' and Teachers' Perception on Organizational Effectiveness

Key Area	Computed t	Critical t	Null Hypothesis is	Difference in Perception is
Key tasks	1.72	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant
Structure	1.913	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant
People Relationships	1.987	1.960	Rejected	Significant
Motivation	1.180	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant
Support	1.276	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant
Management Leadership	1.327	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant
Attitude toward change	0.944	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant
Performance	3.008	1.960	Rejected	Significant
Overall perception	1.661	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant

Table 2 presents the result of Fisher's t-test, the result of Fisher's t-test suggests that administrators and teachers have differing perceptions of organizational effectiveness, but there were significant differences only in people relationships and performance. Teachers provided a higher positive score for people relationships, possibly due to their structured working environment, routine relationships, and stable professional relationships. Administrators, on the other hand, have more complex interpersonal relationships, with leadership, conflict resolution, and resource management to contend with, which might result in a more critical appraisal. Similarly, in performance, teachers have defined job roles, with tangible measures of success like student progress and curriculum implementation, which provide them with more assurance of their effectiveness. Administrators, on the other hand, have general and less structured roles, like policy implementation and institutional leadership, which render performance measurement vaguer and more prone to higher self-criticism.

While no substantial difference in organizational effectiveness was established, these differences point to areas of improvement. Improving communication and collaboration between teachers and administrators can close gaps in interpersonal relationships, while improving performance measurement criteria and professional development programs for administrators can improve job satisfaction and effectiveness. Furthermore, creating a culture of continuous improvement and flexibility is necessary to maintain long-term organizational development. Research has established that institutions thrive when employees perceive change as necessary and unavoidable (Khaw et al., 2022). While the organization is largely perceived as effective, innovative strategies in leadership development, teamwork, and institutional innovation can improve overall effectiveness.

Table 3 - Comparative Ranking of Administrator's and Teacher's Perception of Organizational Effectiveness

Key Area Evaluated	Administrators		Teachers	
	μ	Rank	μ	Rank
Attitude toward change	5.13	1	5.38	5
Management leadership	5.02	2	5.40	3.5
Key tasks	4.96	3.5	5.45	2
People Relationships	4.96	3.5	5.50	1
Motivation	4.90	5	5.24	6
Support	4.86	6	5.22	7
Performance	4.65	7	5.40	4
Structure	4.61	8	5.17	8

The relative ranking of administrators' and teachers' perceptions of organizational effectiveness also identifies significant areas of agreement and disagreement. Both ranked motivation and support in the same order, which supports that organizational effectiveness is most frequently measured on qualitative dimensions like attitude toward change and leadership, but structural and performance standards were rated lower. Administrators ranked attitude toward change first, which signifies trust in the capacity to change, while teachers focused more on people relationships and key tasks, which signifies their focus on interpersonal relationships and teaching responsibilities.

These findings point towards a positive attitude towards the organization's preparedness for change, as perceptions and attitudes are less likely to change than structural factors. However, there is still a problem in actually establishing a resilient school culture. Administrators need to view the school as a complex system, knowing that issues cannot be solved by linear or mechanical approaches. There needs to be a more adaptive strategy since administrators have a pivotal role in shaping the school culture and directly impacting the teacher's well-being (Kwatubana, 2024). Facilitating more collaboration among administrators and teachers will be necessary to ensure the organization's continued development and effectiveness.

Table 4 - Respondents' Perception of Readiness for Change

Criterion Evaluated	Administrators		Teachers	
	μ	Interpretation	μ	Interpretation
Expectation of Change	3.32	Somewhat ready	3.28	Somewhat ready
Attitude to Change	3.49	Ready	3.54	Ready
DepEd Top Management support	4.09	Ready	3.69	Ready
Acceptability of Change	4.35	Ready	3.96	Ready
Structures for Change	3.81	Ready	3.67	Ready
Overall perception	3.70	Ready	3.56	Ready

The results indicate a high level of similarity of administrators' and teachers' views on change readiness of the organization. Both the administrators and the teachers rated themselves as somewhat ready in change expectation but exhibited reported readiness in change attitude, support of DepEd top management, acceptability, and change structures. Administrators were slightly more change-oriented compared to teachers and exhibited a high sense of change urgency from the leadership perspective.

Among the most striking findings from respondents' remarks is that past changes were not well internalized in the school's culture, where facts were easily forgotten and effects felt as moderately successful but short of expectations. Moreover, administrators were seen as the change agents, while other stakeholders only had a general idea of changes required. This shows that the school is dominated by the status quo with minimal, long-term changes, and that no effort is present among members to identify and trigger change. Moreover, communication gaps on past changes have led to poor appreciation and comprehension among stakeholders. While both are largely open to change, administrators scored themselves as highly ready in acceptability, while teachers remained moderately open. This disparity can be explained by administrators' higher dissatisfaction with school effectiveness and thus being more willing to accept change as a solution to current problems. Organizational readiness for change is dependent on drivers such as awareness, engagement, and facilitated structure, according to Roos & Nilsson (2020), focusing on active attempts to build readiness among all stakeholders. The results indicate that, in order to effectively implement change, schools need to build a culture of continuous improvement, enhance communication about change efforts, and promote collective responsibility in identifying and solving organizational problems.

Table 5 - Result of Fisher's t-test for Significant Differences between Administrators' and Teachers' Perception on the Organization's Readiness for Change

Criterion	Computed t	Critical t	Null Hypothesis is	Difference in Perception is
Expectations of Change	0.145	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant

Attitude to Change	0.321	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant
DepEd Top management support	1.647	1.960	Not Rejected	Not Significant
Acceptability of Change	1.728	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant
Structure for Change	0.651	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant
Overall perception	0.629	1.960	Not rejected	Not significant

Fisher's t-test results show that there are no significant differences in teachers' and administrators' perceptions of organizational readiness for change since all the calculated t-values were lower than the critical value of 1.960. This agreement is a sign of a common understanding based on shared experience. Wulandari et al. (2020) note that organizational readiness is a product of leadership, employee engagement, and available resources, and this is a sign of the need for a participative style of change.

Table 6 - Comparative Ranking of Administrator's and Teacher's Perception of Readiness for Change

Key Area Evaluated	Administrators		Teachers	
	μ	Rank	μ	Rank
Acceptability of Change	5.13	1	3.96	1
DepEd Top Management Support	5.02	2	3.69	2
Structures for Change	4.96	3	3.67	3
Attitude to Change	4.90	4	3.54	4
Expectations of Change	4.86	5	3.28	5

Both administrators and teachers put acceptability of change as number one in their willingness to embrace organizational change. This being a key factor indicates that the organization can then be prepared for change. DepEd top management support comes second to this and is also key and most likely the determinant of effective change.

Though change structures are third, they are worth a closer look. Organizational structures and practices cannot be assumed to be perfectly well-suited to the use of readiness for change. There is essentially always room for improvement, although this may be more than orientation programs or courses. Structural change may involve the redesign of administrative processes, leadership, and information systems, and this will be an effort in concert over the long term.

Attitude changes towards change and communication improvement are also important drivers of change readiness in organizations. These factors must be combined with structural change in order to achieve optimal effectiveness and overall readiness within the organization. On the other hand, Syafwan and Fathia (2023) confirmed that communication is an essential element of effective change management programs because it can influence employee attitude towards change and overall acceptance of new procedures.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

On the basis of the research findings, school organization in each of the critical areas has to be made more effective. To become improvement-ready in such areas is to make the organization change-ready because improvement is all about evolving and adapting. A central part of it is good performance management in which goals are achieved systematically. The leaders need to develop change management skills as well in order to lead such changes. To enhance organizational performance, there must be an overall and well-integrated plan. The plan must include long-term interventions and strategies that involve significant reallocation of resources and maximum support from DepEd Management. This commitment is necessary to ensure sustainable improvements and create a good climate for sustained organizational improvement.

Recommendation

Administrators and teachers have to work together to enhance organizational design, motivation, support systems, leadership, and performance to attain highest overall effectiveness. Administrators need to avail

themselves of DepEd's help to stay updated on educational trends, and teachers need to adapt continuously to improvements. School leaders need to concentrate on inspiring teachers to innovate and improve the teaching-learning process. Increased involvement of the community can also supplement educational programs and foster a healthy atmosphere. Lastly, administrators need to spearhead a proactive change system by embracing challenges, fostering dialogue, and developing a culture of continuous improvement.

REFERENCES:

1. Allaoui, A., & Benmoussa, R. (2020). Employees' attitudes toward change with Lean Higher Education in Moroccan public universities. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*.
2. Beus, J. M., Solomon, S. J., Taylor, E. C., and Esken, C. A. (2020). Making sense of climate: a meta-analytic extension of the competing values framework. *Organ. Psychol. Rev.* 10, 136–168. doi: 10.1177/2041386620914707
3. Burnes, B. (2020). The Origins of Lewin's Three-Step Model of Change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(1), 32–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886319892685>.
4. Fidan, T., & Balci, A. (2017). Managing schools as complex adaptive systems: A strategic perspective. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 10(1), 11–26. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.stockton.edu/10.26822/iejee.2017131883>
5. Isik, M., & Cetin, M. (2018). Analysis on learning perceptions of school administrators at different career phases. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*
6. Khaw, K. W., Alnoor, A., Al-Abrow, H., Tiberius, V., Ganesan, Y., & Atshan, N. A. (2023). Reactions towards organizational change: a systematic literature review. *Current Psychology*, 42(22), 19137-19160.
7. Kwatubana, S. (2024). The role of principals in enhancing teacher well-being in schools in rural communities. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*, 19(1), 85–109. <https://doi.org/10.20355/jcie29562>
8. National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities. (2021). *Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities* (5th ed.). Revised 2023. English translation 2024. Retrieved from <https://www.forskningsetikk.no/en/guidelines/social-sciences-and-humanities/guidelines-for-research-ethics-in-the-social-sciences-and-the-humanities/>
9. Robbins, S. P. & Coulter, M. (2016). *Management* (13th. Ed.). Essex, England: Pearson.
10. Zad, I. (2022). Organizational Change Management: Leadership Roles in Adapting New Norms. *European Journal of Business Management and Research*, 7(4), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2022.7.4.1477>