

# Organizational narcissism and organizational flexibility of public elementary schools in the Department of Education Bambang II District

Villoso, Estelita F.

Department of Education, Bambang II District, SDO Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines  
([estelita.villoso001@deped.gov.ph](mailto:estelita.villoso001@deped.gov.ph))

Guyong, Fernando I. ✉

Nueva Vizcaya State University-Bambang Campus, Philippines ([fernandoguyong067@gmail.com](mailto:fernandoguyong067@gmail.com))



ISSN: 2243-7703  
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

OPEN ACCESS

Received: 29 October 2025

Revised: 8 December 2025

Accepted: 10 December 2025

Available Online: 12 December 2025

DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2025.25187

## Abstract

This study examined the relationship between organizational narcissism and organizational flexibility among public elementary schools in the Bambang II District for the academic year 2025–2026. Guided by Narcissistic Personality Theory and Organizational Identity Theory, the investigation sought to determine whether narcissistic organizational tendencies influence the schools' ability to adapt to internal and external demands. Using a descriptive–correlational research design, scientifically selected public elementary school teachers served as respondents. Data were collected through a standardized and pre-validated questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive statistics to measure perception levels, and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient to determine the relationship between the two variables at the 0.05 level of significance. Results revealed that the respondents perceived organizational narcissism at a moderate level (grand mean = 2.76), particularly in the dimensions of inflated self-image and need for admiration. In contrast, organizational flexibility was rated high (grand mean = 3.61), with strategic and structural flexibility emerging as the most prominent dimensions. Correlational analysis showed no significant relationship between organizational narcissism and organizational flexibility ( $r = -0.139$ ,  $p = 0.147$ ), indicating that existing narcissistic tendencies are not strong enough to hinder institutional adaptability. Based on the findings, a management intervention titled “Adaptive Schools, Empowered Leaders: Fostering Flexibility and Resilient Culture” was developed to enhance flexibility while mitigating narcissistic traits through leadership development, collaborative practices, and strategic policy refinement. The study underscores the importance of strengthening adaptive mechanisms in schools and recommends replication in other educational contexts to validate cross-institutional relevance.

**Keywords:** educational management intervention, organizational narcissism, organizational flexibility

## **Organizational narcissism and organizational flexibility of public elementary schools in the Department of Education Bambang II District**

### **1. Introduction**

In the dynamic landscape of modern organizations, adaptability and responsiveness to change have become indispensable qualities for sustained success. This capacity is often referred to as organizational flexibility, which encompasses the ability of an organization to modify its structures, strategies, and operations in response to internal and external environmental demands. According to Volberda (1996), organizational flexibility is a key determinant of organizational resilience, enabling institutions to survive and thrive amid complexity and uncertainty. In the educational sector, where change is both frequent and multi-dimensional, organizational flexibility becomes even more critical for institutional innovation, responsiveness, and sustainability. However, one psychological and cultural factor that may inhibit this flexibility is organizational narcissism. Rooted in psychological theory, organizational narcissism reflects a collective belief in the organization's inherent superiority, a desire for admiration, entitlement to special treatment, and a defensive stance against criticism (Brown, 1997; Stein, 2003). Narcissistic organizations often display excessive self-focus and resistance to change, perceiving feedback or reform efforts as threats to their identity. This mindset can severely limit their capacity to adapt or innovate, thereby undermining organizational flexibility (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007).

Despite growing interest in psychological and cultural influences on organizational performance, there remains a noticeable gap in empirical studies exploring how narcissistic traits at the organizational level impact adaptability, especially in educational institutions. While existing literature has explored organizational narcissism in corporate and political settings, its implications for educational systems—where collaboration, learning, and responsiveness are vital—are underexamined. This study seeks to fill this gap by investigating the relationship between organizational narcissism and organizational flexibility within the educational sector. Anchored in Narcissistic Personality Theory and Organizational Identity Theory, this research posits that higher levels of organizational narcissism negatively affect organizational flexibility. Specifically, it examines how dimensions such as inflated self-image, need for admiration, entitlement, lack of empathy, and reactive defensiveness influence the organization's capacity to remain agile and responsive. By understanding this relationship, the study aims to provide valuable insights for educational leaders and policymakers on the psychological barriers to organizational change and offer strategies to foster a more adaptive and less self-defensive organizational culture.

Organizational flexibility in education refers to an institution's ability to adapt its structures, policies, and practices to respond to changing educational demands, societal needs, and emerging global challenges. In a rapidly evolving educational landscape, this flexibility is essential for maintaining relevance, ensuring access, and promoting resilience. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the necessity of flexible educational systems that can transition seamlessly from traditional in-person instruction to remote or hybrid models (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020). Flexibility allows educational institutions to realign curricula, integrate digital technologies, and accommodate diverse learner needs. Strategic and structural flexibility in education supports innovation and responsiveness, particularly in aligning institutional goals with global educational trends, such as sustainable development, digital literacy, and inclusive learning (UNESCO, 2020). Furthermore, curricular and instructional flexibility—characterized by modular courses, flexible learning pathways, and the use of blended learning—empowers students to engage in personalized and self-paced education (Zhao, 2020). Such adaptability not only enhances learner engagement but also fosters equity and access for marginalized or non-traditional learners.

At the human resource level, organizational flexibility involves equipping educators with professional development opportunities to adapt to new pedagogical approaches and digital tools (Trust & Whalen, 2020). Flexible leadership also plays a pivotal role, enabling school administrators to make informed and context-sensitive decisions during times of uncertainty (Netolicky, 2020). Organizational narcissism in educational

institutions refers to a collective overvaluation of self-image, institutional prestige, and perceived superiority that often overshadows stakeholder needs and educational integrity. This phenomenon is commonly reflected in the overemphasis on institutional branding, global rankings, and external validation, sometimes at the expense of student-centered teaching and meaningful academic engagement (Brown, 2018). Educational organizations exhibiting narcissistic traits often pursue prestige-driven goals, such as expanding campuses or aggressively marketing programs, not primarily to improve learning outcomes but to enhance their image.

Stein (2019) argues that narcissistic tendencies within academic institutions can lead to strategic decisions that prioritize visibility and status over internal well-being and ethical accountability. This is evident in policies that neglect faculty welfare, ignore student feedback, or resist constructive criticism. Furthermore, when leadership reinforces a culture of perfectionism and elitism, it can suppress innovation, marginalize dissenting voices, and foster toxic work environments (Gabriel, 2020). In a study on higher education governance, Hatcher (2021) observed that institutions with narcissistic orientations often frame challenges as external threats, reinforcing an "us versus them" mentality. Such defensiveness hampers institutional learning and creates barriers to transparency and collaborative reform. Additionally, the obsession with maintaining a flawless image can lead to ethical lapses, such as data manipulation, grade inflation, or exclusionary practices under the guise of excellence. Therefore, organizational narcissism in education undermines the core mission of academic institutions—to serve learners, promote knowledge, and foster inclusive intellectual growth. Cultivating self-awareness, ethical leadership, and stakeholder dialogue is essential to counterbalance narcissistic tendencies and restore institutional humility and integrity.

This research aligns with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 4: Quality Education and SDG 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions. By examining how psychological and cultural dynamics, such as organizational narcissism, affect an institution's capacity to adapt and innovate, the study contributes to the goal of fostering inclusive and resilient education systems. Organizational flexibility is crucial in ensuring that public elementary schools remain responsive to changing pedagogical needs, societal expectations, and crises such as pandemics or natural disasters. Moreover, understanding and addressing organizational narcissism promotes transparent, accountable, and participatory school leadership—key elements of SDG 16. This research provides actionable insights for educational policymakers and administrators to nurture adaptive, collaborative, and reform-ready institutions that are better equipped to deliver high-quality education for all, thereby contributing to long-term sustainable development in the local context.

It also aligns with the National Research Agenda for Teacher Education (NRATE) under several key thematic areas. Most notably, it supports Theme 1: Teacher Quality and Professional Development, by investigating internal organizational traits that influence institutional adaptability and responsiveness—both of which directly affect the working environment and leadership dynamics that shape teacher performance. Furthermore, the study addresses Theme 4: Governance and Management in Teacher Education, as it explores how organizational narcissism impairs collaborative decision-making, innovation, and strategic responsiveness in schools. The study also indirectly contributes to Theme 5: Teacher Education and the Changing Environment, by emphasizing how psychological and cultural factors impact an institution's ability to respond to the rapidly evolving educational landscape. By generating empirical insights into how public schools can become more agile and less self-defensive, this research supports evidence-based improvements in leadership, organizational culture, and educational governance consistent with NRATE priorities. Furthermore, it aligns closely with DepEd's priorities on School Governance and Management and Education Leadership and Development. By examining how organizational traits affect the ability of schools to adapt and respond to changes, the study contributes to improving organizational effectiveness and institutional capacity, which are critical for enhancing school performance and learning outcomes.

Additionally, the study addresses the DepEd agenda's focus on creating enabling environments for learners and teachers by identifying psychological and cultural barriers such as organizational narcissism that hinder collaborative leadership and innovation. Understanding these factors helps guide policies and programs toward fostering a more supportive, responsive, and flexible educational system, thereby supporting DepEd's mission to

provide quality, inclusive, and relevant education nationwide. This research thus supports evidence-based interventions aligned with the DepEd Research Agenda to promote resilient and adaptive public schools. Finally, the study directly supports the Nueva Vizcaya State University's commitment to community-focused and responsive research that addresses local educational challenges. By investigating organizational dynamics within public schools, the study advances NVSU's priority to enhance educational quality, leadership, and management in the region.

Specifically, this research aligns with the College of Teacher Education's research agenda to promote effective school governance, educational leadership, and professional development among teachers and administrators. Understanding how narcissistic organizational behaviors impact flexibility provides actionable insights to improve institutional culture and collaborative decision-making, which are crucial for delivering relevant and inclusive education. Moreover, the study's focus on adaptability and psychological factors in school organizations supports the CTE's goal to develop innovative strategies and interventions that empower educators and leaders in Nueva Vizcaya, contributing to the overall mission of producing competent and socially responsible education professionals.

Public elementary schools in Bambang II District face numerous challenges that affect their organizational effectiveness and educational outcomes. Among these are frequent changes in policies, limited resources, and varying community demands, which require schools to be flexible and adaptive. However, anecdotal evidence and preliminary observations suggest that some schools struggle with rigid structures and resistant mindsets, impeding their ability to respond effectively to change. Additionally, issues related to leadership styles and organizational culture, such as tendencies toward organizational narcissism—manifested as overconfidence, entitlement, and defensiveness—may undermine collaboration and openness to innovation. These concerns create barriers to implementing reforms and improving school performance. Such challenges necessitate an empirical investigation into how organizational flexibility and narcissism interplay within the district's schools. Understanding these dynamics is essential to developing interventions that enhance adaptability, foster positive organizational culture, and ultimately improve educational delivery and student success in Bambang II District. Hence, this research investigation

## 2. Related Literature

This study is anchored on Narcissistic Personality Theory and Organizational Identity Theory, both of which provide a solid foundation for examining how psychological and cultural dynamics shape institutional adaptability in public schools. Narcissistic Personality Theory, derived from the work of Freud and further developed by Kernberg (1975) and Kohut (1971), characterizes narcissism as an inflated self-image, a strong need for admiration, a sense of entitlement, and low empathy—traits that can also manifest at the organizational level. Organizational narcissism, as conceptualized by Brown (1997), refers to a collective belief in the organization's superiority and an aversion to criticism, potentially undermining responsiveness to change. Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007) argue that such narcissistic tendencies can lead to strategic rigidity and reduced adaptability, thereby impeding innovation and reform efforts in institutional settings.

Complementing this framework, Organizational Identity Theory (Albert & Whetten, 1985) posits that organizations develop a collective identity that guides behavior and decision-making. When this identity becomes overly rigid or idealized—as is common in narcissistic organizations—it can obstruct the flexibility needed to respond to environmental changes (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). In the context of educational institutions, where collaboration, feedback, and reform are vital, a narcissistic identity may hinder the development of adaptive strategies. Therefore, the interplay of organizational narcissism and identity informs this study's analysis of how public elementary schools in Bambang II District navigate change and innovation. Together, these theories highlight the psychological and structural barriers to organizational flexibility and justify the investigation into how narcissistic traits influence institutional behavior in education.

Organizational narcissism, serving as the independent variable of this study, refers to the collective manifestation of narcissistic traits at the institutional level. This construct extends beyond individual pathology, encompassing behaviors and attitudes expressed through organizational culture, leadership, and decision-making. Rooted in psychoanalytic theory (Freud, 1914; Kohut, 1971), organizational narcissism has evolved into a recognized dynamic within organizations that are excessively self-admiring, entitled, and resistant to external feedback (Brown, 1997; Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). It has become particularly relevant in public sector institutions such as schools, where openness to reform, collaboration, and feedback is essential for effectiveness and sustainability.

In the context of this research, organizational narcissism is examined in terms of how it affects the dependent variable—organizational flexibility. As the independent variable, organizational narcissism is conceptualized through five key dimensions: inflated self-image, need for admiration, sense of entitlement, lack of empathy, and defensiveness toward criticism. Each of these dimensions plays a role in shaping the organization's ability—or inability—to remain open, adaptable, and responsive. The first dimension, inflated self-image, pertains to an organization's exaggerated sense of its own importance, achievements, or superiority. Braun (2019) noted that institutions with inflated self-perception often disregard feedback, assume infallibility, and make risky decisions under the assumption that their status ensures success. This overconfidence can hinder critical reflection and continuous improvement, particularly in educational settings.

The second dimension, need for admiration, is characterized by a compulsive drive to be recognized and praised by stakeholders. Fatfouta (2019) explained that narcissistic organizations invest heavily in public image and symbolic achievements rather than focusing on authentic growth. This leads to a disproportionate emphasis on branding and external recognition, rather than pedagogical quality or stakeholder satisfaction. Entitlement, the third dimension, refers to the belief that the organization deserves special treatment and is exempt from the norms and rules that apply to others. Morf and Rhodewalt (2020) pointed out that entitled organizations often reject accountability mechanisms, expect leniency from oversight bodies, and perceive critical feedback as unjustified attacks, further deepening organizational rigidity. A fourth key aspect is lack of empathy, which manifests as an inability or unwillingness to consider the perspectives and needs of others, including students, teachers, and community stakeholders. Ong et al. (2020) highlighted that this lack of empathic concern can result in authoritarian management styles and exclusionary decision-making processes that alienate members of the school community.

Finally, organizational narcissism includes defensiveness and aggression toward criticism. Giacalone and Promislo (2019) emphasized that narcissistic institutions react with hostility to negative feedback, avoiding introspection and often targeting critics instead of addressing underlying issues. This defensiveness inhibits learning and adaptation, making the organization resistant to necessary change. It is noted by the current researcher that organizational narcissism, as the independent variable in this study, is a critical psychological and cultural construct that can significantly impair organizational learning and adaptability. Understanding its dimensions and implications is essential for promoting healthier, more responsive educational environments.

Organizational flexibility serves as the dependent variable in this study, particularly within the context of public elementary schools in the Bambang II District. Organizational flexibility in the context of education is increasingly seen as a cornerstone of institutional resilience, particularly in response to rapid societal, technological, and policy changes. Adapted from Volberda's (1996) foundational work, organizational flexibility in education refers to an institution's capacity to swiftly and effectively modify its administrative systems, academic programs, and instructional delivery methods to ensure ongoing relevance, innovation, and quality learning outcomes. This flexibility is crucial as educational institutions contend with global disruptions, such as pandemics, digital transformation, and evolving workforce demands.

Strategic flexibility in education involves the ability of schools or universities to realign long-term goals and directions in response to macro-level shifts, such as internationalization, technological advancement, and the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). As highlighted by Sharma and Sharma (2020), strategic

flexibility allows educational leaders to reassess priorities and reconfigure institutional missions to stay competitive and socially responsive. For instance, integrating digital literacy and sustainability into institutional goals represents a strategic pivot aligned with global educational reform. Structural flexibility refers to the capacity to reconfigure governance models, departmental structures, and organizational processes to become more agile and responsive. In educational settings, this may include forming interdisciplinary units, merging departments, or establishing inclusive councils for collaborative decision-making. According to Kamal et al. (2021), flatter and decentralized structures enhance communication and foster innovation, allowing educational institutions to act quickly when challenges arise.

Curricular flexibility is the extent to which academic programs can be revised, diversified, or modularized to meet evolving learner and industry needs. With the rise of lifelong learning and interdisciplinary education, flexibility in curricula has become a defining feature of quality educational institutions. As Yang and Li (2019) observe, institutions that adopt flexible curricula—such as hybrid majors or elective-rich general education programs—are more likely to produce adaptive, employable graduates. Instructional flexibility involves adapting pedagogical delivery methods based on learner needs and contextual demands. The COVID-19 pandemic underscored the importance of this dimension, prompting schools to transition to remote or blended learning environments. As noted by Trust and Whalen (2020), teachers' ability to shift between synchronous and asynchronous modalities is a hallmark of instructional flexibility and is essential for sustaining educational access and continuity.

Human resource flexibility encompasses efforts to continuously train and retool educators and administrators so they can navigate changes in content, pedagogy, and technology. Educational institutions must build teacher capacity to respond to diverse learner profiles and evolving teaching tools. Zehir et al. (2019) emphasize that investment in professional development enhances not only teacher performance but also the institution's overall adaptability. Technological flexibility is the integration and adaptive use of digital platforms for instruction, assessment, and administration. Schools that leverage learning management systems, cloud-based tools, and mobile applications demonstrate high levels of technological readiness. According to Khan et al. (2021), institutions with strong digital infrastructure and technology integration are more resilient in the face of disruptions.

It is noted that organizational flexibility is a multi-dimensional construct that allows educational institutions to remain effective and sustainable amid change. By strengthening structural adaptability, strategic responsiveness, operational agility, and cultural openness, public elementary schools can better serve their communities and fulfill their educational mandates in an increasingly complex world. Therefore, understanding the dynamics that enhance or impede organizational flexibility is crucial for educational leaders, policymakers, and stakeholders.

### 3. Methodology

**Research Design.** This study employed a **quantitative descriptive-correlational design** to examine the relationship between organizational flexibility and organizational narcissism among public elementary schools in Bambang II District for SY 2025–2026. Consistent with Creswell (2018), the quantitative approach enabled the systematic collection and analysis of numerical data to measure variables objectively and identify statistical associations. The correlational method was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to determine the extent of the relationship between the two constructs without manipulating any conditions in the natural school setting. This design supported objectivity, reliability, and generalizability, and provided empirical bases for interpreting organizational behaviors within public elementary institutions.

**Research Environment.** The study was conducted in **DepEd–Bambang II District**, Municipality of Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya, under the Schools Division Office of Nueva Vizcaya. The district, headed by the District Supervisor, oversees **15 public elementary schools**, comprising **281 teachers** and **3,224 learners**. These schools—differing in size, location, and demographic composition—offer a diverse and contextually rich environment to analyze organizational dynamics. The district's active participation in regional and national

educational initiatives provided an ideal setting for assessing organizational adaptability and leadership-related behaviors.

**Respondents.** A total of **112 teachers** participated in the study, representing **72.25%** of the district’s 155 teacher population. The sample size was determined using **Slovin’s Formula** with a 5% margin of error to ensure representativeness. Respondents were proportionately distributed across all schools.

**Sampling Procedure.** A **stratified random sampling** technique was used. Teachers were grouped according to their schools (strata), after which simple random sampling was employed within each stratum. Ethical protocols were strictly observed, including informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and secure data handling. Participants were assured that they could withdraw at any time without penalty.

**Research Instruments.** Two validated instruments were utilized:

- **Organizational Flexibility Descriptive Questionnaire (Santos, 2024)** – a 36-item tool measuring six dimensions of organizational flexibility, with a reliability coefficient of **0.876**.
- **Organizational Narcissism Benchmark Scale (Lopez & Reyes, 2019)** – a 30-item instrument assessing five components of organizational narcissism, with a reliability coefficient of **0.835**.

Both questionnaires used a **five-point Likert scale** (5 = Always to 1 = Never). Verbal descriptors for grand means followed standard ranges (Very High to Very Low). Prior to distribution, both tools were reviewed by a panel of examiners for clarity and contextual appropriateness.

**Data Gathering Procedure.** Permission to conduct the study was secured from the Schools Division Superintendent, with endorsement from the College of Teacher Education. Coordination with the District Supervisor enabled organized distribution of the questionnaires. Before data collection, an orientation was conducted to explain the research purpose, procedures, and ethical safeguards. Data were gathered with full respect for confidentiality, anonymity, and the emotional well-being of participants.

**Statistical Treatment** - Data were analyzed using the following:

- **Mean** – to determine the levels of organizational flexibility and organizational narcissism.
- **Pearson r** – to assess the significance and strength of the relationship between the two variables.

Correlation coefficients were interpreted using Garrett and Woodworth’s (1973) scale. All hypotheses were tested at the **0.05 level of significance**.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

**Problem 1.** What is the level of organizational narcissism among public elementary schools in Bambang II District along the dimensions of inflated self-image, need for admiration, entitlement and arrogance, lack of empathy, and reactive defensiveness?

**Table 2**  
*Mean and qualitative description of organizational narcissism as perceived by the respondents (n=112)*

Organizational Narcissism	Area Mean	Qualitative Description
Inflated Self-Image	3.16	Moderate
Need for Admiration	3.08	Moderate
Entitlement and Arrogance	2.83	Moderate
Lack of Empathy	2.43	Low
Reactive Defensiveness	2.31	Low
Grand Mean	2.76	Moderate

The data reveal that the respondents generally perceived the level of organizational narcissism in their institution as moderate (grand mean = 2.76). Among the five dimensions assessed, “Inflated Self-Image” (M =

3.16) and “Need for Admiration” (M = 3.08) obtained the highest mean scores, both interpreted as moderate, indicating that the organization tends to project a positive but somewhat overstated image of itself and exhibits a noticeable desire for external validation, praise, and recognition. This suggests that self-promotion and reputation management are visible aspects of its culture, although not to an extreme extent. “Entitlement and Arrogance” registered a moderate rating as well (M = 2.83), implying that there are occasional manifestations of self-privileging attitudes or perceived superiority, though these tendencies are not deeply entrenched. In contrast, “Lack of Empathy” (M = 2.43) and “Reactive Defensiveness” (M = 2.31) were both rated low, indicating that respondents do not strongly associate the organization with emotional disengagement or dismissive reactions to criticism. This reflects a relatively acceptable degree of openness to stakeholder concerns and feedback. Taken together, the findings imply that while elements of organizational narcissism are present—mostly centered on image-building and the pursuit of external admiration—these tendencies are tempered by the organization’s capacity for feedback reception and concern for others. Thus, the organizational climate does not exhibit extreme narcissistic traits but demonstrates moderate self-focus without severely compromising empathy or accountability.

**Problem 2.** What is the level of organizational flexibility exhibited by the public elementary schools in Bambang II District along the dimension of strategic flexibility, structural flexibility, curricular flexibility, instructional flexibility, human resource flexibility, technological flexibility?

**Table 3**  
*Mean and qualitative description of organizational flexibility as perceived by the respondents (n=112)*

Organizational Flexibility	Area Mean	Qualitative Description
Strategic Flexibility	3.66	High
Structural Flexibility	3.66	High
Curricular Flexibility	3.53	High
Instructional Flexibility	3.64	High
Human Resource Flexibility	3.64	High
Technological Flexibility	3.57	High
Grand Mean	3.61	High

The results on organizational flexibility yielded a grand mean of 3.61, qualitatively described as high, indicating that the respondents perceive their schools as highly adaptive and capable of responding effectively to varied educational demands and institutional challenges. This high overall rating reflects an organizational climate that values responsiveness, continuous adjustment, and contextualized decision-making in pursuit of educational effectiveness. The highest mean scores were recorded for Strategic Flexibility (3.66, high) and Structural Flexibility (3.66, high), suggesting that the schools demonstrate a strong capacity to shift strategic priorities and realign organizational frameworks when necessary. This implies that school leadership shows readiness to recalibrate directions, policies, and initiatives in order to remain relevant and responsive to changing conditions in the educational landscape.

Close behind are Instructional Flexibility (3.64, high) and Human Resource Flexibility (3.64, high), which indicate that schools allow teachers significant latitude in adapting instructional methods, learning materials, and pedagogical approaches to meet learners’ diverse needs. At the same time, the deployment and development of personnel are managed with adaptability, providing room for differentiated roles, reassignments, and capacity-building opportunities. This combination strengthens teacher empowerment and supports improved learning outcomes. Technological Flexibility (3.57, high) further reflects the schools’ willingness to integrate emerging technologies into instructional and administrative functions. The high rating suggests that digital tools and platforms are embraced not only as supplementary resources but as integral components of modern education delivery.

Finally, Curricular Flexibility (3.53, high)—though the lowest among the dimensions—still reflects a strong level of adaptability. This indicates that while curricular frameworks are generally guided by national or regional standards, schools have the capacity to contextualize implementation, incorporate localized content, and adjust delivery based on learners’ needs and situational factors. It is observed by the current researcher that the consistently high ratings across all dimensions demonstrate that the schools possess a well-developed adaptive

orientation. This suggests an educational environment that is proactive rather than reactive, open to innovation, and capable of evolving alongside emerging pedagogical, structural, and technological demands. Such flexibility serves as a critical foundation for sustaining school effectiveness, resilience, and long-term development.

**Problem 3.** What is the perception of the respondents of their organizational harmony along the Problem 3. Is there a significant relationship between the perceived organizational narcissism and organizational flexibility of the respondents?

**Table 4**

*Correlation coefficient between the dimensions of organizational narcissism and organizational flexibility as perceived by the respondents (n=112)*

Organizational Narcissism	Correlation Coefficient	<i>p-value</i>	Statistical Inference
Inflated Self-Image	-0.072	0.451	Not Significant
Need for Admiration	-0.073	0.444	Not Significant
Entitlement and Arrogance	-0.161	0.089	Not Significant
Lack of Empathy	-0.165	0.082	Not Significant
Reactive Defensiveness	-0.125	0.189	Not Significant
Overall Correlation	-0.139	0.147	Not Significant

The correlational analysis sought to determine whether a significant relationship exists between organizational narcissism and organizational flexibility as perceived by the respondents. The overall correlation result revealed a coefficient of  $r = -0.139$  with a  $p$ -value of 0.147, which is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This indicates that organizational narcissism, taken as a whole, does not meaningfully relate to or predict the extent of organizational flexibility among the respondent group. In practical terms, the level of narcissistic tendencies within the organization does not appear to hinder nor facilitate adaptive change, operational responsiveness, or institutional openness in a measurable way.

This finding is particularly noteworthy in light of contemporary literature associating narcissistic organizational culture with rigidity, authoritarianism, and negative climate outcomes (Giessner & van Quaquebeke, 2019). While several scholarly analyses suggest that narcissistic leadership can constrain collaborative innovation and weaken organizational trust (Braun, 2017), the present result implies that such tendencies are either inadequately strong to affect organizational functioning, or that mitigating institutional factors—such as shared governance, distributed authority, or professional standards—buffer their effects. According to Hochwarter (2020), the observable impact of narcissistic climates often depends on their embeddedness in everyday decision-making structures. When institutional norms counterbalance individual ego-oriented patterns, their behavioral effect diminishes. This seems to explain why the respondents in this study reported no statistically significant connection between narcissism and flexibility.

The dimensional analysis further clarifies this pattern. The first dimension, Inflated Self-Image, yielded a correlation coefficient of  $r = -0.072$  with a corresponding  $p$ -value of 0.451, which is not statistically significant. This suggests that an organization's tendency to overestimate its capabilities or portray itself as superior does not directly diminish its operational flexibility. Research by Kark and Liviatan (2018) indicates that inflated self-perception in organizations becomes harmful only when it translates into restrictive leadership practices or institutional neglect of feedback. In some contexts, positive illusion can even reinforce confidence and strategic resilience, mitigating possible negative effects (Sedikides et al., 2019). However, the weak and non-significant negative relationship observed implies no clear evidence of either advantage or drawback within the current organizational setting.

The second dimension, Need for Admiration, likewise showed a minimal and nonsignificant correlation ( $r = -0.073$ ,  $p = 0.444$ ). This dimension reflects the organizational desire to be praised, validated, or held in high esteem by internal or external stakeholders. Although previous studies emphasize that admiration-seeking organizations may prioritize image over innovation, thus weakening long-term adaptability (Campbell & Miller, 2018), the data reveal no such effect in this particular sample. This supports the possibility that symbolic validation is not inherently harmful unless it displaces developmental priorities or evidence-based practices. As Smith (2021)

explains, some admiration-oriented organizations sustain flexibility by aligning impression management with strategic reform, thereby neutralizing potential dysfunction.

The third dimension, Entitlement and Arrogance, showed a comparatively stronger, though still non-significant, negative relationship ( $r = -0.161$ ,  $p = 0.089$ ). While not meeting the threshold for statistical significance, it is nonetheless suggestive of a mild trend whereby entitlement-based beliefs could be associated with less adaptability. Entitlement predisposes organizations to assume superiority and expect special treatment, which can undermine adaptive responsiveness (Nevicka et al., 2018). Although the present data fall short of significance, the directional tendency is consistent with theoretical literature that links arrogance to resistance to change or diminished institutional humility (Hodzic et al., 2020). If entitlement were more pervasive, it might exert a stronger influence on organizational flexibility.

The dimension Lack of Empathy similarly yielded a moderately negative but statistically nonsignificant relationship ( $r = -0.165$ ,  $p = 0.082$ ). Empathy is widely regarded as a foundational competency in socially responsive and people-centered workplaces (Clark et al., 2019). Empathetic organizations cultivate participatory processes, shared emotional intelligence, and broader stakeholder alignment, all of which promote flexibility (Carroll & Levy, 2020). Conversely, low empathy can foster detachment, disengagement, or dismissiveness toward employee concerns, resulting in organizational stagnation. While the present study does not confirm this statistically, the observed direction of association is still theoretically meaningful. This subtle pattern aligns with findings by Eisenbeiss et al. (2018), who argue that subclinical levels of narcissistic detachment may not immediately manifest as rigidity but may gradually erode adaptability over time.

The last dimension, Reactive Defensiveness, demonstrated a correlation of  $r = -0.125$ , with a  $p$ -value of 0.189, also not statistically significant. Reactive defensiveness occurs when organizations respond to feedback or criticism with justification or avoidance rather than constructive adaptation. This trait is closely associated with fragile organizational ego structures (Wink, 2020). While the correlation is mild, its negative direction supports the argument that defensive cultural postures inhibit flexibility by discouraging organizational learning processes. Garza and Eggen (2021) note that defensiveness narrows institutional openness and impedes experiential reflection, both of which are central to adaptive functioning. Nevertheless, the absence of significance implies that such reactions are either episodic or remain insufficiently influential to affect organizational adaptability at a systemic level.

Altogether, the results collectively indicate that none of the narcissism dimensions demonstrate a statistically significant relationship with organizational flexibility. However, the directional trend—negative across all subdomains—suggests that although not yet impactful in a measurable way, narcissistic cultural patterns may still pose latent risk factors for organizational rigidity when left unchecked. The very presence of slightly negative correlations is consistent with theoretical frameworks linking narcissism to control orientation, ego-preservation, and resistance to feedback (Braun, 2017; Nevicka et al., 2018). Organizational flexibility is generally supported by humility, shared accountability, interpersonal trust, and openness to learning (Carroll & Levy, 2020). Narcissistic traits, in contrast, reinforce self-protection over adaptive change. Although the relationships in this study are not statistically strong enough to confirm causality, the trends support ongoing scholarly observations that narcissistic value orientations are incompatible with collaborative, resilient, learning-based organizational cultures.

In summary, this correlation analysis reveals that organizational narcissism, when measured within the sampled context, has not yet matured into a disruptive or detrimental institutional pattern capable of undermining organizational flexibility. The weak, non-significant correlations imply that compensating organizational mechanisms—such as leadership accountability, peer collaboration, policy frameworks, or professional norms—likely buffer and regulate ego-based tendencies before they interfere with adaptive functioning. Nonetheless, emerging literature cautions that narcissistic traits often evolve progressively and can become more damaging when institutional safeguards deteriorate (Giessner & van Quaquebeke, 2019). The subtle negative trends observed

here thus underscore the importance of maintaining a culture of reflection, empathy-based decision-making, and open systems governance to forestall potential long-term risks.

**Problem 4.** Based on the findings of the study, what management intervention could be developed to sustain organizational flexibility and mitigate organizational narcissism?

The findings of the study provided the foundation for developing the topics and course content included in the training design, which serves as the management intervention crafted by the researcher. Specifically, the benchmark statements across the various dimensions that received the lowest mean scores were identified as priority areas for improvement and served as the basis for content development. These included: the revision of long-term strategic plans in response to national and international policy shifts; openness to revising institutional hierarchy to enhance decision-making; provision of multiple options for students to customize their academic pathways; equipping instructors to effectively transition between face-to-face, online, and blended teaching modes; openness to hiring multidisciplinary professionals to strengthen academic flexibility; and the integration of online assessment tools into regular academic practices. These six benchmark statements directly informed the formulation of course topics, ensuring that the training intervention targets specific areas where schools demonstrated limited flexibility or responsiveness. By aligning the course content with these identified gaps, the intervention is designed to enhance institutional adaptability, instructional innovation, and strategic responsiveness, thereby addressing key areas for organizational improvement.

In the context of organizational narcissism, the dimensions with the highest mean scores—namely, inflated self-image and need for admiration—were identified as priority areas for the development of training topics. Focusing on these two dimensions will provide targeted strategies aimed at reducing the prevalence of narcissistic tendencies within schools. By addressing behaviors related to self-aggrandizement and excessive desire for recognition, the intervention seeks to promote a culture of humility, collaborative decision-making, and empathetic leadership, thereby fostering a healthier organizational climate conducive to flexibility, inclusivity, and effective institutional functioning.

## 5. Conclusions

- The respondents perceived the level of organizational narcissism in their schools as *moderate*, suggesting that while self-enhancing behaviors and the desire for recognition are present, they are not dominant enough to adversely affect the organizational climate.
- The organizational flexibility of the schools is perceived to be *high*, indicating that these institutions demonstrate strong adaptability in terms of strategic planning, structural arrangements, instructional practices, human resource deployment, technological integration, and curriculum responsiveness.
- The findings revealed *no significant relationship* between organizational narcissism and organizational flexibility, implying that the existing level of narcissistic tendencies does not appear to hinder the school's capacity to adapt to institutional and environmental changes.
- In response to the salient findings and identified areas for development, the researcher designed a management intervention titled “Adaptive Schools, Empowered Leaders: Fostering Flexibility and Resilient Culture”, aimed at further strengthening school responsiveness while mitigating tendencies that may impede collaborative and growth-oriented organizational practices.

## Recommendations

- Strengthen value-based leadership orientations to gradually reduce manifestations of organizational narcissism by promoting humility, shared accountability, and ethical self-reflection among school heads and administrators. Leadership workshops and coaching sessions emphasizing servant leadership, collaborative governance, and stakeholder inclusivity may be integrated into existing school-based

development programs.

- Sustain and institutionalize current practices on organizational flexibility by reinforcing mechanisms that support adaptive decision-making, innovative instructional delivery, and responsive resource allocation. Schools should regularly review their policies and operational frameworks to ensure they remain aligned with emerging educational demands.
- Enhance teacher and staff capacity-building programs by providing continuous professional development focused on flexible pedagogy, technological integration, and context-sensitive curriculum implementation. These initiatives should prioritize practical skill-building and application for different learning modalities and diverse learner needs.
- Establish monitoring and evaluation systems to track organizational responsiveness and leadership behaviors over time. Feedback loops involving teachers, students, parents, and community stakeholders should be formalized to ensure that policy adjustments and innovations reflect grounded institutional realities.
- Replicate the study in different educational districts or institutional settings to validate the findings across wider contexts and further examine whether the absence of a significant relationship between organizational narcissism and flexibility holds in other environments. This will contribute to the broader body of knowledge in organizational behavior within the education sector and support benchmarking for continuous improvement.

## 6. References

- Abdurahman, M. A. (2023). *Organizational flexibility and teaching styles of secondary school teachers in Jolo, Sulu* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mindanao State University, Sulu Campus.
- Alase, A., & Adegbe, F. F. (2021). *Strategic agility and organizational resilience in educational institutions*. *Journal of Educational Management and Leadership*, 9(2), 45–60.
- Alavi, S., & Gill, C. (2020). Leading change: Adaptability and flexibility in educational leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(7), 1134–1147. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-10-2019-0363>
- Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 263–295). JAI Press.
- Alonderiene, R., & Majauskaite, M. (2020). Leadership openness and organizational responsiveness in educational settings. *Management in Education*, 34(4), 153–161.
- Aynew, M., & Assaye, A. (2020). Institutional power relations and perceived organizational privilege in higher education. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 5(2), 54–68.
- Bautista, A., & Kim, J. (2020). Educational policy and school collaboration: Toward more participatory governance in 21st-century schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 28(5), 1–18.
- Boddy, C. R. (2021). *Corporate Psychopaths and Organizational Narcissism: Leadership Failures in the Corporate World*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bond, M. (2020). Facilitating student engagement through the flipped learning approach in K-12: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 151, 103819.
- Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to the Coronavirus pandemic. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 1–6.
- Bozkurt, A., Jung, I., Xiao, J., Vladimirschi, V., Schuwer, R., & Egorov, G. (2021). A global outlook to the interruption of education due to the COVID-19 pandemic: Navigating in a time of uncertainty and crisis. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 1-126.
- Bozkurt, A., Jung, I., Xiao, J., Vladimirschi, V., Schuwer, R., Egorov, G., ... Paskevicius, M. (2020). A global outlook to the interruption of education due to COVID-19 pandemic: Navigating in a time of uncertainty and crisis. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 1–126.

- Braun, S. (2017). Leader narcissism and outcomes in organizations: A review at multiple levels of analysis and implications for future research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 773. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00773>
- Braun, S. (2019). Narcissism and entitlement in organizational leaders. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 26*(3), 289–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051818824522>
- Braun, S. (2019). Organizational narcissism: Conceptualization and implications for leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 40*(7), 873–887. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-01-2019-0012>
- Brown, A. D. (1997). Narcissism, identity, and legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(3), 643–686. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9708210723>
- Brown, A. D. (2018). *The narcissistic organization: Diagnostic and remedial perspectives*. Routledge.
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2020). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly, 31*(6), 101495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101495>
- Buluç, B., & Demir, S. (2020). School climate as a predictor of organizational commitment and empathy in educational institutions. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 26*(3), 569–594.
- Cachero-Paderog, J. (2023). Flexible learning in higher education institution: Experiences of instructors in a private higher institution. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research, 53*, July 2023. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5473-4857>
- Cai, Y. (2020). Organizational adaptation in higher education: A review of the literature. *Tertiary Education and Management, 26*(4), 325–341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-020-09062-2>
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2019). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Campbell, W. K., & Miller, J. D. (2018). *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Carroll, B., & Levy, L. (2020). Leadership development as identity construction: Insights from collective leadership narratives. *Human Relations, 73*(8), 1041–1067. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719879935>
- Çetin, M., & Koyuncu, M. (2021). Empathy-based leadership and organizational trust in schools. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research, 8*(1), 12–25.
- Chalab, I. D., & Chraimukh, H. G. (2023). The role of organizational flexibility in interpreting the relationship between adaptive organizational culture and structural differentiation: Applied study. *Journal of Survey in Fisheries Sciences, 10*(3S), Article 1704. <https://doi.org/10.17762/sfs.v10i3S.1704>
- Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 52*(3), 351–386. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.52.3.351>
- Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2020). Executive personality, capability cues, and risk-taking: How narcissistic CEOs react to their successes and stumbles. *Academy of Management Journal, 63*(5), 1525–1550. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2017.0824>
- Choi, Y., & Lee, M. (2022). Personalized learning and curricular flexibility in secondary education: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Educational Innovation, 15*(2), 101–118.
- Çınar, F., & Arslan, A. (2021). Organizational image management and institutional legitimacy in educational organizations. *Journal of Educational Administration Research and Review, 36*(2), 112–128.
- Clark, M. A., Robertson, M. M., & Young, S. (2019). “I feel your pain”: A critical review of empathy research in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 40*(2), 166–192. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2348>
- Çolak, I., & Altınkurt, Y. (2021). Organizational openness to criticism and learning culture in schools. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 27*(2), 221–242.
- College of Teacher Education, Nueva Vizcaya State University. (2023). *CTE research agenda 2023–2028*. Retrieved from <https://www.nvsu.edu.ph/cte/research/agenda>
- Crampton, S. M., & Mishra, J. M. (2021). Organizational defensiveness and narcissistic leadership: A toxic combination. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 29*(4), 933–947. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-06-2020-2251>

- Cucchiella, F., Gastaldi, M., Orzes, G., & Terzi, S. (2022). Organizational flexibility and resilience: Evidence from supply chain disruptions. *Journal of Business Research*, 150, 576–587. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.06.034>
- Daniel, J., & West, M. (2021). Flexible learning and instructional adaptation in contemporary schools. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 105, 101714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101714>
- de Vries, M. F. R. K., & Balazs, K. (2018). The shadow side of leadership and followership. *Journal of Management Development*, 37(6), 457–470. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-01-2018-0003>
- Del Rosario, A. P. (2022). *The influence of narcissistic leadership styles on organizational flexibility in private schools in Cebu City* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Cebu, Cebu City, Philippines.
- Del Rosario, A., & Herrera, S. (2018). Organizational narcissism and conflict management in Philippine secondary education. *Philippine Educational Review*, 9(2), 88–102.
- Delgado, M., & Santos, R. (2020). Leadership styles and organizational climate in Philippine schools: The role of narcissism. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 12(2), 45–62.
- Department of Education. (2020). *Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP)*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/DepEd-Order-No.-012-s.-2020.pdf>
- Department of Education. (2021). *DepEd research agenda 2021–2026*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/DepEd-Research-Agenda-2021-2026.pdf>
- Duchon, D., & Drake, B. (2019). Organizational narcissism and virtuous behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(3), 301–308. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9771-7>
- Dutta, S., & Sahney, S. (2021). School leadership and alignment with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 81, 102341.
- Eisenbeiss, S. A., van Knippenberg, D., & Boerner, S. (2018). Transformational leadership and R&D innovation: Taking a curvilinear approach. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 27(2), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12260>
- Fatfouta, R. (2019). Narcissism and impression management: Evidence from a field study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 137, 165–169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.08.031>
- Fatfouta, R. (2019). Narcissism and leader-member exchange: The role of need for admiration. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 142, 78–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.01.033>
- Gabriel, Y. (2020). Organizations in a state of narcissism: Reflecting on the dark side of institutional pride. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 29(3), 289–299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492619859969>
- Garcia, M. L. (2023). Organizational flexibility and teacher performance in secondary schools in the Bicol Region. Unpublished manuscript, [Institution Name], Philippines.
- García-Peñalvo, F. J., Corell, A., Abella-García, V., & Grande-de-Prado, M. (2020). Curriculum design in higher education: Adaptability and stakeholder involvement. *Education Sciences*, 10(8), 218. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10080218>
- Garza, A. S., & Eggen, R. (2021). Defensiveness in leadership cultures: Effects on communication climate and team adaptability. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 28(3), 342–357. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051821998403>
- Giocalone, R. A., & Promislo, M. D. (2019). Broken organizational morality and the role of narcissism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 157(4), 987–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3643-7>
- Giessner, S. R., & van Quaquebeke, N. (2019). On the instrumental value of leader self-sacrifice for followers' motivational processes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 159(3), 575–590. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3783-5>
- Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. (2000). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 63–81. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.2791603>
- Göksoy, S., & Argon, T. (2022). Institutional defensiveness and adaptability in school leadership: Implications for trust and reform. *Journal of Educational Change*, 23(1), 87–105.
- Gonzales, L. M., & Cruz, T. (2021). Teacher perspectives on narcissistic leadership in Philippine rural schools. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 15(3), 134–150.
- Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., Tay, L., Donnellan, M. B., Harms, P. D., Robins, R. W., & Yan, T. (2020).

- differences in narcissism: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(3), 259–301.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000219>
- Gupta, M., Singh, A., & Sharma, P. (2020). Organizational identity, image construction, and reputation in academic institutions. *International Journal of Management Studies*, 7(3), 45–59.
- Guzman, M. & Francisco, C. (2023). Rethinking school management in Philippine public schools post-COVID. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 101(1), 77–89.
- Hamedoğlu, M. A. (2019). Perceptions of principals and teachers on the level of organizational narcissism: High schools in Sakarya province sample. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 9(1), 148–170.  
<https://doi.org/10.19126/suje.541414>
- Hatcher, R. (2021). Governance and narcissism in higher education: Performance, rankings and resistance. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 69(4), 445–462.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2020.1756430>
- Hochwarter, W. (2020). Accountability at work: A double-edged sword. *Organizational Dynamics*, 49(2), 100683. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2019.100683>
- Hochwarter, W. A., Hancock, J. I., & Thompson, K. W. (2020). The dark side of organizational narcissism: CEO hubris and employee burnout. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(3), 237–251.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819848990>
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review*, 27, 1–12.
- Hodzic, S., Ripoll, P., Lira, E., & Zenasni, F. (2020). Are emotionally intelligent leaders more resilient? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 161, 109944. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.109944>
- Husain, Z., Dayan, B., & Chaudhry, I. S. (2024). Roles of organizational flexibility and organizational support on service innovation via organizational learning: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 10(3), Article 100367.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2024.100367>
- Kahveci, G. (2023). Does organizational narcissism affect organizational citizenship? An empirical study on teachers. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 11(S1), 155–166.  
<https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v11iS1-July.6157>
- Kamal, S. M., Bhuiyan, M. Z. A., & Rahman, M. M. (2021). The impact of organizational flexibility on employee performance: The mediating role of work engagement. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 70(4), 1155–1175. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-09-2020-0513>
- Kark, R., & Liviatan, I. (2018). Authentic leadership and followers' emotional boundaries: Sometimes less is more. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(2), 164–179.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.05.006>
- Kernberg, O. F. (1975). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. Jason Aronson.
- Khan, I., Bashir, M., & Abbas, M. (2021). Digital readiness and technological flexibility in educational institutions: A COVID-19 lens. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26, 7173–7192.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10525-4>
- Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self*. International Universities Press.
- Koornhof, C. (2001). Developing a framework for flexibility within organisations. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 32(4), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v32i4.727>
- Lee, J., & Shin, J. (2021). Leadership narcissism and organizational adaptability: Evidence from educational institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(5), 675–690. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2021-0035>
- Lee, N., & Carpenter, N. C. (2019). Narcissism in the workplace: A review and future research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(1), 53–68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2320>
- Lemay, D. J., Doleck, T., & Bazalais, P. (2022). Strategic foresight and adaptive leadership in post-pandemic schooling. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(4), 617–635.
- Lopez, J. A., & Reyes, P. (2019). Organizational narcissism and its influence on school governance in private educational institutions. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 8(1), 77–89.

- Maric, S., & Djurkovic, D. (2020). Narcissism in organizational contexts: Antecedents, outcomes, and interventions. *European Management Journal*, 38(2), 249–260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.07.004>
- Martinez, E., & Villanueva, H. (2022). The impact of narcissistic leadership on organizational trust in Philippine higher education. *Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 10(4), 201–215.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2020). Narcissism and the self: Dynamics, processes, and structure. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 71, 299–327. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011710>
- Murphy, M. P., Devaney, L., & Schneider, C. (2022). Instructional agility in schools: Strategies for responsive teaching and learning continuity. *Journal of Educational Change*, 23(2), 203–224.
- Naciri, A., & Hossain, M. T. (2023). Educational strategic planning in volatile policy environments: Challenges and prospects. *Global Journal of Education and Development*, 15(1), 112–130.
- Nadkarni, S., & Herrmann, P. (2018). A framework for dynamic organizational capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(5), 1344–1372. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2760>
- Nenonen, S., & Storbacka, K. (2020). Don't adapt, shape! Use the crisis to shape your minimum viable system. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 88, 404–416.
- Netolicky, D. M. (2020). School leadership during a pandemic: Navigating tensions. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5(3/4), 391–395.
- Nevicka, B., De Hoogh, A. H. B., Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2018). Narcissistic leaders and their victims: Followers' low self-esteem and low core self-evaluations as vulnerability factors. *Personnel Psychology*, 71(3), 333–355. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12261>
- Nevicka, B., De Hoogh, A. H. B., Van Vianen, A. E. M., & Ten Velden, F. S. (2018). Narcissistic leaders: An asset or a liability? *Leadership Quarterly*, 29(6), 689–703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.03.002>
- Nevicka, B., Van Vianen, A. E. M., De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Voorn, B. (2018). Narcissistic leaders: An asset or a liability? Leader self-views and followers' perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(6), 619–631. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000281>
- Nguyen, H. M., & Ngo, T. H. (2021). Cultural openness and organizational agility in education. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 10(3), 345–361. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-07-2020-0172>
- Nueva Vizcaya State University. (2023). *NVSU research agenda 2023–2028*. Retrieved from <https://www.nvsu.edu.ph/research/agenda>
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. A. (2020). Transforming narcissistic organizations. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(1), 46–62. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2018.0050>
- OECD. (2020). *Transforming education for the future: A global competency framework for future-ready learners*. OECD Publishing.
- Ong, D. L. T., Walter, F., & Ashton-James, C. E. (2020). Collective narcissism in organizations: The role of leader personality and team identification. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(4), 356–370. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000436>
- Özsoy, N., & Gözükar, E. (2022). Organizational narcissism and its effects on leadership and institutional identity. *Management Studies Quarterly*, 14(2), 65–82.
- Philippine Normal University. (2019). National Research Agenda for Teacher Education (NRATE) 2019-2023. <https://www.pnu.edu.ph/research/national-research-agenda-for-teacher-education-nrate/>
- Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 144, 103701. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103701>
- Reimers, F. M., & Schleicher, A. (2020). *A framework to guide an education response to the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020*. OECD Publishing.
- Rienties, B., Tempelaar, D., & Jindal-Snape, D. (2021). Adaptive curricula and learning design in higher education: Preparing students for the future. *Computers & Education*, 165, 104131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104131>
- Rivera, A. (2018). Flexibility and adaptability of secondary school managers to 21st century skills. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)*, 40(2), 169–185.

<https://www.gssrr.org/index.php/JournalOfBasicAndApplied/article/view/9123>

- Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2020). Leaders' narcissism and organizational effectiveness: Revisiting the “dark side”. *Leadership Quarterly*, 31(1), 101350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2019.101350>
- Sabilal, R. A. (2023). *Organizational flexibility and leadership empowerment as determined by levels of professionalism among school heads of private schools in Tawi-Tawi* (Unpublished master’s thesis). Mindanao State University–Tawi-Tawi College of Technology and Oceanography.
- Sahin, S., Aydin, E., & Tuncay, M. (2022). Exploring the determinants of organizational flexibility in schools. *Journal of Organizational Change in Education*, 15(2), 256–274. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCE-08-2021-0087>
- Salmi, J. (2018). *The tertiary education imperative: Knowledge, skills and values for development*. Sense Publishers.
- Santos, M. L. (2024). Organizational flexibility among public schools in Davao City: Dimensions and implications. *Journal of Philippine Educational Management*, 15(2), 45–60.
- Sedikides, C., & Campbell, W. K. (2018). Narcissistic organizations: Theoretical framework and research agenda. *Journal of Personality*, 86(5), 904–918. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12348>
- Sedikides, C., Rudich, E. A., Gregg, A. P., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. (2019). Are normal narcissists psychologically healthy? Self-esteem matters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 116(6), 906–921. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000214>
- Shah, F., & Gani, A. (2022). Ethical sensitivity and empathy in educational leadership: Safeguarding stakeholder dignity. *Journal of Educational Administration and Ethics*, 14(2), 39–53.
- Sharma, R., Sushil, & Jain, R. (2020). Operational agility and competitive advantage. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 41(3), 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-05-2019-0088>
- Sharma, S., & Sharma, S. K. (2020). Strategic flexibility and its impact on performance. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 21, 113–125. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-020-00241-6>
- Shin, J. C. (2020). Organizational flexibility and responsiveness in higher education: A global perspective. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 74(3), 321–336. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12242>
- Shin, Y., & Konrad, A. M. (2019). Organizational flexibility and its impact on firm performance: Evidence from educational institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(3), 247–263. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2018-0206>
- Shin, Y., Taylor, M. S., & Seo, M. G. (2021). Flexibility for what? Exploring the role of flexibility in education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 20(1), 28–47. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2019.0141>
- Shkoler, O., & Kimura, T. (2020). How does work motivation impact employees’ investment at work and their job engagement? A moderated–moderation perspective through an organizational narcissism lens. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 360.
- Smith, R. J. (2021). Organizational identity, impression management, and adaptability: When public image sustains flexibility. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 35(4), 507–533. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318921995554>
- Smollan, R. (2020). Narcissistic leadership and organizational change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 41(6), 813–828. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-11-2019-0489>
- Stein, H. F. (2003). Organizational narcissism. *The Psychoanalytic Review*, 90(3), 429–451. <https://doi.org/10.1521/prev.90.3.429.23190>
- Stein, M. (2019). Organizational narcissism: Origins, dynamics and consequences. *Human Relations*, 72(12), 1919–1941. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718812602>
- Tarhini, A., Alalwan, A. A., Al-Qirim, N., & Alshurideh, M. (2019). Factors influencing educational institutions’ adaptability: The role of strategic orientation and organizational learning. *Education and Information Technologies*, 24(4), 2431–2456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-018-09858-9>
- Toth, A., & Surmacs, R. (2023). Reputation, recognition, and institutional credibility: A contemporary view of public image in education. *Education and Society*, 41(1), 78–95.
- Tourish, D. (2019). *Management Studies in Crisis: Fraud, Deception and Meaningless Research*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/97811085656804>

- Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). K-12 teachers' experiences and challenges with online instruction during the pandemic. *TechTrends*, 64, 553–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-020-00555-7>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action*. UNESCO.
- United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
- Volberda, H. W. (1996). Toward the flexible form: How to remain vital in hypercompetitive environments. *Organization Science*, 7(4), 359–374. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.7.4.359>
- Wamba, S. F., Gunasekaran, A., Akter, S., Ren, S. J., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2020). The performance effects of organizational flexibility in dynamic environments. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 223, 107532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2019.107532>
- Wang, H., Jiao, R., & Li, F. (2022). Research on the effect of narcissistic leadership on employee job embeddedness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 927529. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.927529>
- Wink, P. (2020). Two faces of narcissism. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(3), 271–276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420917725>
- Yang, S., & Li, L. (2019). Flexible curriculum design for student-centered learning in higher education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 51(6), 821–838. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2019.1625161>
- Yong, A., Saad, M., & Hassan, R. (2021). Enhancing institutional resilience through organizational flexibility: Lessons from education systems. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(6), 687–705. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-09-2020-0184>
- Yu, B., Meng, Y., Li, C., & Liu, D. (2022). How does employees' narcissism influence organizational commitment? The role of perceived supervisor support and abusive supervision. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 910739. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.910739>
- Yusof, N., Hashim, M., & Ariffin, S. (2019). The future of higher education in Asia: Curricular and pedagogical flexibility. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 15(1), 75–89. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v15i1.5313>
- Zehir, C., Narcikara, E., & Akyüz, B. (2019). Does organizational culture mediate the effect of transformational leadership on organizational flexibility? *Procedia Computer Science*, 158, 409–416. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.060>
- Zehir, C., Narcikara, E., & Akyüz, B. (2019). Does organizational culture mediate the effect of transformational leadership on organizational flexibility? *Procedia Computer Science*, 158, 409–416. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.060>
- Zhang, L., & Wang, Y. (2023). Image protection and legitimacy-seeking behaviors in academic institutions. *Journal of Organizational Culture and Society*, 12(1), 101–118.
- Zhang, L., & Wang, Y. (2023). Institutional technological flexibility and educational resilience: Enhancing adaptive capacity in schools. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 26(1), 45–61.
- Zhao, Y. (2020). COVID-19 as a catalyst for educational change. *Prospects*, 49, 29–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09477-y>
- Zhou, Q., & Huang, X. (2022). Entitlement perceptions and authority dynamics in educational organizations. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 8(4), 167–175.