

Management styles of secondary school heads in Bacacay districts

Janelle L. Batalla

Pili National High School

Pili, Bacacay, Albay

Email: kallos_raffy_102462@yahoo.com

Abstract: This study explored the management styles of school heads in the secondary schools of Bacacay East District, Bacacay South District and Bacacay West District, School year 2023-2024. It answered the following sub-problems: 1. What are the management styles of school heads in Bacacay Districts? 2. What is the level of usage of the management styles along decentralized, collaborative, transformational, data-driven and participatory? 3. What is the extent of effectiveness of the management styles? 4. What are the issues in the management styles of school heads?; and 5. What management action plan may be proposed to address the issues? The research study utilized the quantitative research design. Specifically, it employed the descriptive survey method. The data was gathered from a total of 283 respondents composed of 276 secondary teachers and seven (7) school heads using a validated questionnaire. The statistical measures used were frequency count, percentage, weighted mean and ranking. Results of the study revealed that there are were 234 respondents or 82.10 % who answer decentralized as the management style of school heads in the secondary schools of Bacacay Districts; followed by participatory with 223 or 78.80 %; collaborative with 205 or 72.44 %; transformational with 186 or 65.72 %; and data-driven with 181 or 63.96 %. The combined averages of the two (2) groups of respondents on the level of usage of the management style indicated that the highest weighted average is obtained in participatory with 4.42 with an adjectival description of always. Likewise, management style which is transformational has a combined average of 4.27 with an adjectival description of always. The rest of the management styles have an adjectival description of often. These are collaborative with 4.11, decentralized with 4.01 and data-driven with 3.92. The combined averages on the extent of effectiveness of the management styles as rated by the secondary teachers and the school heads manifested that there are three (3) areas with adjectival description of very effective. These areas are participatory with 4.39; transformational with 4.24 and collaborative with 4.23. The last two (2) indicators with effective adjectival description are decentralized with 4.00 and data-driven with 3.51. The top issues in each of the management style of school heads explored in the study are: in decentralized, it is unclear school objective; in collaborative, it is lack of training on new pedagogical approaches and in transformational, it is conflicting standards in observation. The top issue in data-driven management style is weak technological skills of school heads and in participatory, it is weak leadership skills. A management action plan was developed by the researcher to address the issues on management styles of school heads.

Keywords: Management styles, Decentralized, Collaborative, Transformational, Data-driven and participatory

Date Submitted: May 15, 2025

Date Accepted: May 19, 2025

Date Published: May 30, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Educational institutions throughout the world are managed differently. This is because schools follow different systems and procedures as well as the context in which they are situated. The effective management of schools also depends on government agenda and national policies that determine the direction of educational programs. Likewise, the diverse nature of learners and teachers influence the dynamics in the teaching and learning process in the classroom. All educational reforms and initiatives can never come into fruition without the significant role of school heads. As agents of change in the school system, they contribute a major role on the educational milieu since they are responsible in the operation and management of their own

schools be it academic, administrative and both. They are involved in sharing information, creating supportive social connections, participating in mentoring programs and fostering school progress. Productive and successful schools have school heads who dedicate a significant amount of their time to commit to their management functions. Sustainable governance of schools largely depends on school heads who are passionate and committed in serving the society by providing quality education. The way school heads perform requires certain skills and style. There are many classifications of management styles of school heads. These are decentralized, collaborative, transformational, data-driven and participatory. These management styles are based on the focus and purpose of management of the school heads. This study fills the need to provide recent data on the management styles of school heads in secondary schools. More so, knowing the great importance of the responsibilities of school heads, this study generates new perspectives in school management of secondary schools in particular in Bacacay Districts.

Research Objectives

The objectives of the study are:

1. Identify the management styles of school heads in secondary schools of Bacacay Districts?
2. Determine the level of usage of the management styles along decentralized, collaborative, transformational, data-driven and participatory?
3. Assess the extent of effectiveness of the management styles;
4. Ascertain the issues in the management styles of the school heads; and
5. Propose a management action plan that address the issues.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed the quantitative research design. Specifically, it followed the descriptive-survey method wherein a questionnaire was the main research tool.

Respondents and Locale of the Study

The respondents of the study were 276 secondary teachers and seven (7) school heads of Bacacay Districts. Baris Integrated School has two (2) secondary teachers; Bonga National High School has forty-five (45) teacher-respondents; Cabasan National High School with forty-two (42) teachers; Cawayan National High School with thirty-eight (38) teachers; Namantao Integrated School with two (2) teachers; Pili National High School with forty-one (41) teachers; San Pablo National High School and Sogod National High School with the same number of teachers which is twenty (20) and lastly, Vinisitahan National High School with sixty-six (66) teachers.

Research Instrument

A validated questionnaire served as the research instrument. The first part of the tool determined the management styles of the school heads. The respondents were provided with options which

are the pre-identified management styles. The management styles covered in this study were decentralized, collaborative, transformational, data-driven and participatory. Multiple responses were allowed.

The second part of the tool explored the level of usage of the management styles. The respondents were guided by a five-point Likert scale. The third part of the questionnaire explored the extent of effectiveness of the management style. The respondents were also guided by a five-point Likert scale. The last part of the questionnaire identified the issues in management styles. The respondents checked if the issues in the management styles are met in their respective schools.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were utilized to quantify the data. Frequency count and weighted mean were used to identify the management styles of the school heads in secondary schools of Bacacay Districts. Frequency count and weighted mean were employed to determine the level of usage of the management styles along decentralized, collaborative, transformational, data-driven and participatory. Likewise, the writer the extent of effectiveness of the management styles was assessed using frequency count and weighted mean. The issues in the management styles of the school heads were ascertained using frequency count and ranking.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The management styles of school heads of secondary schools in Bacacay districts

There were 276 secondary teachers and seven (7) school heads in Bacacay Districts who responded to the research instrument with a total of 285 respondents. The highest number of secondary teachers who answered *decentralized* as the management style has a value of 225 or 81.52 %; followed by *participatory* with 216 or 78.26 %; *collaborative* (199) or 72.10 %; *transformational* with 180 or 65.22 % and lastly, *data-driven* with 175 or 63.41%. There were seven (7) school heads who opted for two (2) management styles which are *decentralized* and *participatory* with 100.00 %. The rest of the management styles which are *collaborative*, *transformational* and *data-driven* have a frequency of six (6) or 85.71 %.

The level of usage of the management styles of the school heads

The management styles of the school heads in Bacacay Districts covered in this study were decentralized, collaborative, transformational, data-driven and participatory. The level of usage of the management styles was determined using five (5) indicators.

Along decentralized management style

The combined averages of the two (2) groups of respondents who were secondary teachers and school heads revealed the following results: the indicator that obtained the highest weighted mean with a value of 4.32 is allows some degree of autonomy to staff and teachers to handle and implement program, projects and activities; followed by distributes minor decision making to master teachers and in charge of activities with 4. 29. These numerical ratings have an adjectival description of always. The indicator ensures clarity of responsibilities among teachers obtained a

weighed mean of 4.15 which is immediately followed by encourages teachers to attend professional development to achieve school goals with 4.10. These numerical ratings have an adjectival description of often. Lastly, the indicator delegates responsibilities whenever necessary with a weighted mean of 3.19 with an adjectival description of sometimes. The over-all average has a value of 4.01 with an adjectival description of often.

Along collaborative management style

The ratings of the secondary teachers and school heads were as follows: works with a variety of people to brainstorm new ideas and work on projects together with 4.39; followed by shares school information to stakeholders (4.31); seeks strategies and best practices from all members of the school community with 4.24. These have an adjectival description of always. The last two (2) indicators with an adjectival description of often are creates inclusive environment for everybody with 4.07 and solicits diversity of opinions and ideas among teachers with 3.57. The over-all average has a value of 4.11 and an adjectival description of often.

Along transformational management style

The ratings of the secondary teachers and school heads were combined and the averages were computed. The following were the results: understands individual teachers and helps them focus on the mission and vision of the school with the highest weighted mean of 4.34; encourages teacher to innovate in the performing their duties and responsibilities (4.29); offers support to teachers on new teaching approaches (4.27); trusts teachers the independence to make decisions in the classrooms with 4.26 and lastly, inspires stakeholders to develop new ways of providing quality education to learners with 4.21. These numerical ratings have an adjectival description of always. The over-all average has a value of 4.27 which is always.

Along data driven management style

The combined weighted averages of the two (2) groups of respondents showed that there were two (2) indicators with adjectival description of always. These are employs technology either mechanical tools or innovative process in school management with 4.23; and provides necessary funds for the application of technology in schools with 4.20. The rest of the indicators have an adjectival description of often. These are: involves people with expertise and technological appreciation as well as skills in school administration with 4.00; connects teachers, students and stakeholders with facts and data-based process knowledge to implement decisions with 3.73; and uses documents and available data in planning and in management of schools with 3.28. The over-all rating has a value of 3.92 with an adjectival description of often.

Along participatory management style

The computed averages of the indicators based from the responses of the two (2) groups of respondents indicated the following: acknowledges individual performance with the highest weighted mean of 4.66; provides constant group dynamics and activities for building strong and resilient schools (4.52); develops initiatives from within and outside the school system with 4.46; and strengthens team work by constantly involving others with 4.29. These ratings have an

adjectival description of always. Lastly, the indicator with the lowest combined weighted mean is in builds commitment among school stakeholders by involving them in the process with 4.19 with an adjectival description of often. The over-all average has a value of 4.42 with a description of always.

The extent of effectiveness of the management styles

The management style with the highest average weighted mean on the extent of effectiveness as rated by the secondary teachers is participatory with 4.38 with an adjectival description of extremely effective. Three (3) management styles which are collaborative with 4.19 average weighed mean, transformational (4.14); and decentralized with 4.04 have an adjectival description of highly effective and lastly, data-driven with 3.22 with an adjectival description of moderately effective. The school heads, on the other hand, three (3) indicators with extremely effective. These are participatory with 4.39; transformational with 4.33 and collaborative with 4.27. Two (2) of the areas have the adjectival description of highly effective. These are decentralized with 3.97 and data-driven with 3.81. The combined averages showed that there are three (3) areas with adjectival description of extremely effective. These areas are participatory with 4.39; transformational with 4.24 and collaborative with 4.23. The last two (2) indicators with effective adjectival description are decentralized with 4.00 and data-driven with 3.51. The over-all average has a value of 4.07 which is highly effective.

The issues on the management styles of the school heads

Along the decentralized management style, the sum of ranks indicated the following: unclear school objective with two (2) thus, with a final rank of first; unaware of the over-all goals of the school with four (4) with a final rank of second; and biased selection of teachers for professional development with five (5) and a final rank of third. Along collaborative management style, the sum of ranks manifested the following: lack of training on new pedagogical approaches with a sum of rank of two (2) and final rank of first; followed by favors traditional approaches in pedagogy with a sum of ranks of four (4) and final rank of second; lastly, weak support to instruction with a sum of rank of six (6) and a final rank third. In transformational management style, the issue which is conflicting standards in observation had a sum of ranks of two (2) with a final rank of first; inconsiderate superior with 4 and a final rank of second; and lastly, irregular supervision to classroom activities with 6 and a final rank of third. Along data-driven management style, the sum of ranks reflected the following: weak technological skills of school heads (2.5) with a final rank of first; high cost of technology (4.5) with second in final rank and negative attitude towards technology with 5 and a final rank of third. The last management style is participatory management style. The sum of ranks indicated the following: weak leadership skills with two (2) and final rank of first; very strict personality of school heads with four (4) and final rank of second; and I don't care attitude of school heads with a sum of rank of six (6) and 3rd in final rank.

Management action plan

The researcher developed a management action plan to address the top issues of the management style covered in this study. The format of the plan is lifted from the Management Action Plan of the Department of Education. The plan consists of seven (7) columns or sub-parts. These are

objectives, activities, performance indicators, time frame, budget, persons involved/in charge, and success indicators. To address unclear school objective, the researcher proposed discussion of school objective in meeting every semester.

This also include posting of school objective in conspicuous places in the school which could be done after the planning session. The school heads and the teachers as well as school utility as the persons involved. At least 90 to 95 % of the invited participants should attend the school meetings and are informed of the school objective. The researcher also proposed a training on collaborative management and teaching to both school heads and teachers. This will enhance their skills and understanding on how to apply collaborative management style in school. This maybe a one-time training but can be included in the in-service training in the secondary schools. Management session as well evaluation of standards in classroom observation may answer the issue on conflicting standards in observation. Since there are different standard used. The school heads may agree to harmonize the standards used by school heads into a unified document. Since agreement must be made as well as thorough evaluation of the current standards, at least three (3) management sessions may be conducted. The conduct of the training on technology may be incorporated with the training on collaborative management style. This will provide the participants with the use of cloud technology in school administration and in teaching. Lastly, a leadership camp is proposed to improve the leadership skills of the school heads in the use of participatory management. The training camp, training on technology and collaborative management style may be incorporated in one schedule.

CONCLUSION

Based from the gathered findings, the following are the conclusions drawn:

1. There are a lot of school heads and secondary teachers in Bacacay Districts that indicate decentralized as the management style of most secondary school heads and few respondents in data-driven management style.

2. Transformational and participatory styles are always used while the collaborative, decentralized and data-driven are often used management styles of school heads in Bacacay Districts.

3. Participatory, transformational and collaborative are very effective while decentralized and data-driven are effective management styles of school heads in Bacacay District.

4. The top issues in each of the management style of school heads explored in the study are: in decentralized, it is unclear school objective; in collaborative, it is lack of training on new pedagogical approaches and in transformational, it is conflicting standards in observation. The top issue in data-driven management style is weak technological skills of school heads and in participatory, it is weak leadership skills.

5. The management action plan may address the issues of the management styles of school heads.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The researcher offers the following recommendations:

Management styles of secondary school heads in Bacacay districts

1. Schools Division Office of Albay may provide available technology and modern gadgets to encourage school heads in the use of data-driven management style.

2. The Public Schools District Supervisors of Bacacay Albay may conduct semestral inventory of information technology resources that include software and hardware as well as needs assessment in terms of technology appreciation and use.

3. The school heads may request from the Schools Division Office of technical support and additional professional development trainings for school heads on the use of data-driven and decentralized management styles.

4. The researcher may provide the list of the issues identified in this paper to the Public Schools District Supervisor for possible discussion in the management committee meeting.

5. The researcher may solicit the assistance from the School District Supervisors and the Schools Division Office to actualize this management action plan.

REFERENCES

Adie, L., L. Harris, & C. Wyatt-Smith (2020). Examining research into the use of data wall for teaching and learning: How are they being implemented within data use cycles? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 89.

Angeles, E. P., (2020). Leadership key element in organizational management. *The Modern Teacher*, Vol. 59.

Astiz, F. A. Wiseman & D. Baker, (2002). Slouching toward decentralization: consequences of globalisation for curricular control in national education systems. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 46, No.1.

Bautista, M. J. A., M. L.S. Reyes & M. T. V. Santos, (2021). School management. *Philippine Journal of Education*, Vol. 54, No. 1.

Boyatzis, R. & R. E. Boyatzis, (2009). Competencies as a behavioral approach to emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 28, No. 9.

Bryk, A. S., P. B. Sebring, E. Allensworth, S. Luppescu & J. Q. Easton, (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*, Chicago, IL. University of Chicago Press.

Caldwell, B. J. & J. M. Spinks, (1992). *Leading the self-managing school*. London: The Falmer Press.

Can, E. & C. Ozan, (2020). Investigation of classroom teachers' participation in school management. *National Education*, Vol. 49, No. 225.

Chawla, A. & E. K. Kelloway, (2004). Predicting openness and commitment to change. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*. Vol. 24, No. 6.

Cheng, Y. C. (2010). Kenya review and appraisal of the final report on the implementation of the Beijing platform of action. Nairobi: Government Printer.

Cheng, Y. C. & W. M. Cheung, (2003). Profiles of multi-level self-management in schools. *The International Journal of Educational Management*. Vol. 17, No. 3.

Clemente, Alejandro, (2006). *Management of school heads in the modern times*. Quezon City: Pag-asa Publishing.

Clifford, M. M., (1990). Students need a challenge, not an easy success. *Educational Leadership*, New York: Academic Press.

Covey, S. R., (2004). *The 7 habits of highly effective people: Powerful lessons in personal change*. New York: Free Press.

Cowan, D., S. Joyner & S. Beckwith, (2012). *Getting serious about the system: A field book for district and school leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Crow, G., (2006). Complexity and the beginning principal in the United States: Perspectives on socialization. *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 44, No. 4.

Cuban, L., (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Datnow, A., J. C. Greene & N. Gannon-Slater, (2017). Data use for equity: Implications for teaching, leadership and policy. *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 5, No. 4.

Day, C., A. Harris & M. Hadfield, (2001). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, Vol. 4.

De Silva, M., J. Howells & M. Meyer, (2018). Innovation intermediaries and collaboration: Knowledge-based practices and internal value creation. *Research Policy*, Vol. 47, No. 1.

Glickman, C. D., P. S. Gordon & J. M. Ross-Gordon, (2009). *The basic guide to supervision and instructional leadership*, Second Edition. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

Gurley, K., L. Anast-May & H. Lee, (2013). Developing instructional leaders through assistant principals' academy: A partnership for success. *Education and Urban Society*, Vo. 47.

Hallinger, P., (2003). The emergence of school leadership development in an era of globalization, In P. Hallinger (Editor) *Reshaping the landscape of school leadership development: A global perspective*. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Hallinger, P. & R. Heck, (2009). Distributed leadership in schools: Does system policy make a difference? In A. Harris (Ed.), *Distributed leadership: Different perspectives*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Halverson, R., (2010). School formative feedback systems. *Peabody Journal of Education*, Vol. 85, No. 2.

Hannah, S. T. & P. B. Lester, (2009). A multilevel approach to building and leading learning organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 1.

Harber, C. & L. Davies, (2007). *School management and effectiveness in developing countries*. London: Cassell.

Hoer, T. R. Collegiality: A new way to define instructional leadership, (1996). *Educational Research and Administration*, Vol. 77, No. 5.

Hoy, W. K. & S. R. Sweetland. Designing better schools: The meaning and measure of enabling school structures, (2001). *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 3.

Huber, S, (2004). *Preparing school leaders for the 21st century: An international comparison of development programs in developed countries*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Management styles of secondary school heads in Bacacay districts

- Ilac, E. D., (2011). What makes a Filipino leader? Leadership in the Philippines. Manila: Rex Publishing.
- Kampylis, P., Y Punie & J. Devine, (2015). A European framework for digitally-competent educational organizations. Sevilla: JRC, 2015.
- Kerr, K. A., J. A. Marsh, G. S. Ikemoto, H. Darilek, & H. Barney, (2006). Strategies to promote data use for instructional improvement: Actions, outcomes, and lessons from three urban districts. American Journal of Education, Vol. 112, No. 4.
- Khadwalla, P., (1995). Management styles. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Co, Ltd.
- King, E., (1998). What's decentralization got to do with learning? The case of Nicaragua's school autonomy reform. Working Paper Series on Impact Evaluation of Education Reforms. Paper No. 9. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Kouzes, J. M. & B. Z. Posner. The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations. New York: Jossey-Bass, 2012.
- Kubra, A. C. & S. Guney. (2019). The effect of organizational culture on teacher motivation: An application in Bahceliev High Schools. Section Academic Journal, Vol. 19.
- Leithwood, K., D. Jantzi & R. Steinbach, (1999). Changing leadership for changing times. Buckingham, PA Open United Press.
- Lindelov, L. & S. Bentley. Team management, (2009). In S.C. Stuart & P.K. Piele, School leadership. Handbook for excellence. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
- Mandinach, E. B., (2012). A perfect time for data use: Using data-driven decision making to inform practice. Educational Psychologist, Vol. 47, No. 2.
- Marks, H. M. & S. M. Printy, (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 39, No. 3.
- Mitgang, R. & M. Gill, (2012). Modeling the influence of school leaders on student achievement: How can school leaders make a difference? Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 48.
- Mosadeghrad, A. (2003). M. Principles of health care administration. Dibagaran, Tehran: Jossey-Bass.
- Murnane, R. J., Sharkey, N. S., & Boudett, K. P., (2005). Using student-assessment results to improve instruction: Lessons from a workshop. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), Vol. 10, No. 3.
- Newton, Robert R., (1979). MBO: A system of managerial leadership. Belmont, CA: Fearon Pitman Publishers.
- Norris, Jessey J., (2014). Rethinking accountability in new governance. The European Journal of Social Science Research, Vol. 27, No. 3.
- Obondoh, A., M. Nandago & E. Otiende., (2005). Managing our schools today. A Practical Guide to Participatory School Governance. Kampala: Real Press.
- Padilla, F., (2009). Collaborative educational leadership in times of education renewal: What every new teacher should know. Planning and Changing, Vol. 40, No. 3.

Paler-Calmorin, Laurentina & Melchor Calmorin, (2002). *Methods of Research and Thesis Writing*, Quezon City: Rex Printing Company, Inc.

Pounder, D. G., (1999). Teacher teams: Exploring job characteristics and work-related outcomes of work group enhancement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 35.

Sanchez, Custodiosa Ancheta, (1998). *Methods and techniques of research*, Third edition. Quezon City: Rex Printing Company, Inc.

Shen, J. & V. E. Colley, (2008). Critical issues in using data for decision-making leadership in education, Vol. 11, No. 3.

Siegel, Sidney et al., (1998). *Non-parametric Statistics for behavioral sciences*, New York, McGraw-Hill Company.

Somech, A., (2002). Explicating the complexity of participative management: An investigation of multiple dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Vol. 38, No. 3.

Spillane, J. P., (2012). Data in practice: Conceptualizing the data-based decision-making phenomena. *American Journal of Education*, Vol. 118, No. 2.

Stewart-Banks, B., M. Kuofie, A. Hakim, & R. Branch., (2015). Education leadership styles impact on work performance and morale of staff. *Journal of Marketing & Management*, Vol 6.

Villanueva, M. A. & M. R. Amante, (2021). Teaching in Digital Age. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. Vol. 18, No. 1.

Vizcarra, Florante O., (2003). *Introduction to educational research*, Quezon City: Great Books Trading, 2003.

Walker, A. & C. Dimmock., (2000). Mapping the way ahead: Leading educational leadership into globalized world. *School Leadership and Management*, Vol. 20, No. 2.

White, S. H., (2011). *Beyond the numbers: Making data work for teachers and school leaders*, Second Edition. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Zimmerman, J., (2006). Why some teachers resist change and what principals can do about it. *NASSP Bulletin*, Vol. 90, No. 3.