ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Self-evaluation of leadership styles, communication styles, and organizational cultures among top managers

Bon Eric A. BESONIA
ORCID: 0000-0002-8709-8359
Northern Iloilo State University, Iloilo City, Philippines

Abstract. *Purpose*. This descriptive study aimed to determine the leadership styles, communication styles, and organizational cultures and their relationship among the top managers. *Methodology*. A combination of the adopted and researcher-made questionnaires was utilized to gather the data among 115 department heads, deans, associate directors, directors, campus administrators, and vice presidents of one of the colleges in the Philippines. It was interpreted using frequency counts, percentage, mean, median, standard deviation, and Pearson correlation. *Findings*. Results revealed that most top managers "observed" authoritarian and laissez-faire leadership styles while "rarely observed" democratic. They "often observed" all communication styles, such as activist, pragmatist, theorist, and reflector. Also, they "mostly observed" accommodating organizational culture while often observed headstrong, precise, animated, introverted, convincing, and down-to-earth. There was a statistically significant relationship found between the following: laissez-faire leadership style and activist communication style; authoritarian leadership style and down-to-earth organizational culture; democratic leadership style and down-to-earth organizational culture; laissez-faire leadership style and animated and convincing organizational cultures; activist communication style and headstrong, precise, animated, introverted, and convincing organizational cultures; reflector communication style and precise, animated, down-to-earth, introverted, convincing, and accommodating organizational cultures; theorist communication style and headstrong, precise, animated, introverted, and convincing organizational cultures; and, pragmatist communication style and all organizational cultures. *Implications for practice*. Top managers were embedded with various personalities and cultures. These differences did not constrain the connection to work harmoniously and effectively. Instead, it brought an opportunity to create a relationship that would link towards attaining the organizational goals. *Value of the results*. This paper used different leadership styles, communication styles, and organizational cultures that were excluded from the previous studies. The results will augment the existing literature on self-evaluation and leadership and management.

Keywords: leadership styles, communication styles, organizational cultures, top managers.

Introduction

In recent years, research has highlighted the importance of leadership styles (Sethuraman, Suresh, 2014; Sfantou et al., 2017), communication styles (Hicks, 2011; Niess, Diefenbach, 2016), and organizational cultures (Chatman, O'Reilly, 2016; Wong, 2016) among top managers in various industries. These factors have also gained attention in higher education institutions as they are crucial in achieving institutional effectiveness and success (Macasinag, 2019; Zheng et al., 2010). Hence,

Address: F43W+GW7, Bayan ng Estancia, Iloilo City, Philippines.   **E-mail**: bonericarceobesonia@gmail.com

understanding their significance is essential for academic leaders seeking to motivate and inspire faculty and staff, enhance job satisfaction, and ultimately achieve institutional success (Astuti et al., 2020; Maamari, Saheb, 2018).

Several studies have explored leadership styles (Jomah, 2016; Rosser, 2003), communication styles (Brown, Revilla, 2019; Ibrahim, Mahmoud, 2017), and organizational cultures (Ponnuswamy, Manohar, 2016; Taye et al., 2019) in higher education institutions through employees' perceptions. However, potential problems also need to be considered, which can have significant implications for the accuracy and effectiveness of leadership assessments (Hsieh, Liou, 2016). One major issue is the potential for bias and subjectivity in academic personnel perceptions (Carless, 2006). They may have personal biases and interpretations of leadership behaviors that can impact their perceptions of effectiveness (Griffith, 2004). Another issue is the potential for a lack of transparency in the assessment process (Aguinis et al., 2018). Employees may not fully understand the criteria used to assess leadership effectiveness, which can lead to confusion and mistrust (Hogan, Hogan, 2001). Additionally, employees may not feel comfortable sharing their perceptions due to fear of retaliation or a lack of anonymity (Kim, Scott, 2019), thus this study.

The ability of academic leaders to self-evaluate their leadership (Jones et al., 2017) and communication styles (Kallioinen, 2010), as well as the organizational culture (Desselle et al., 2017) can have a significant impact on the quality of education, student achievement, and staff satisfaction (Roberts, Sampson, 2011; Shafait et al., 2021). Self-evaluation can help academic leaders assess their effectiveness and identify areas for improvement, ultimately leading to developing strategies to enhance leadership and communication skills (Bubb, Earley, 2009). Research has highlighted the importance of self-evaluation in leadership development (Sarfraz, 2017). G. Devos and J. C. Verhoeven emphasized that self-evaluation can be helpful for academic leaders to assess their leadership and communication styles and organizational culture (Devos, Verhoeven, 2003). By reflecting on these, academic leaders can improve their leadership practices and contribute to their institution's success (Geesa et al., 2020). They can also gain insights into the needs and expectations of the stakeholders and develop strategies to meet those needs (Crum, Sherman, 2008).

This study utilized Self-Determination Theory (SDT) which emphasizes that individuals have an inherent tendency towards personal growth and development, and this can be facilitated by satisfying their psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ryan, Deci, 2000). In educational institutions, the application of SDT can be particularly relevant to the self-evaluation of leadership styles, communication styles, and organizational cultures among top managers (Aktaş, Çiçek, Kiyak, 2011). For example, leadership styles play a crucial role in shaping the culture and performance of educational institutions (Somprach et al., 2017). SDT proposes that top managers who adopt a specific leadership style can enhance intrinsic motivation and personal growth among subordinates (Manganelli et al., 2018). They provide a supportive environment that allows subordinates to express their ideas and opinions, make decisions, and take responsibility for their actions (Amabile et al., 2004).

Communication style is another critical factor that influences the performance of educational institutions (Dhillon, Kaur, 2021). SDT proposes that leaders who use a communication style that supports autonomy and relatedness can promote intrinsic motivation among subordinates (Shu, 2015). Leaders who actively listen to their subordinates' needs and give helpful and nonjudgmental feedback may promote a growth-promoting environment (Stone et al., 2009). Effective communication can enhance trust and mutual respect among subordinates, leading to a more collaborative and supportive organizational culture (Lam et al., 2021). Meanwhile, the performance of educational institutions is significantly affected by their organizational culture (Khasawneh, Bates, 2005). SDT

proposes that culture can enhance subordinates' intrinsic motivation and personal growth (Shu, 2015). It allows subordinates to express their ideas and opinions freely, take the initiative, and make decisions that contribute to the institution's success (Gonos, Gallo, 2013). This approach can promote a positive and supportive organizational culture that enhances the well-being and engagement of subordinates (Caesens et al., 2014).

Self-Determination Theory can be used as a tool for top managers in higher education institutions to assess their leadership, communication, and organizational cultures (Rigby, Ryan, 2018). The theory suggests that individuals are more motivated and engaged when they feel autonomous, competent, and related to others (Kilpatrick et al., 2002). By evaluating their leadership and communication styles using this framework, top managers can identify areas for improvement and make changes that align with the principles of Self-Determination Theory (Forner et al., 2020). Ultimately, this approach can lead to a more positive work environment and better outcomes for the educational institution and its stakeholders (Nazir et al., 2021).

Objectives of the study

In today's fast-paced and complex higher education environment, effective leadership, communication, and organizational culture are crucial determinants that can determine the success or failure of an institution (Nold, Michel, 2016). They have a crucial role in determining the course and objectives of their institutions (Aktaş, Çiçek, Kıyak, 2011). In contrast, numerous studies have examined these factors in various industries and sectors (Ogbonna, Harris, 2000). However, there is a dearth of research exploring the relationship between these three variables in the context of higher education institutions.

This research aimed to investigate the following:
- leadership styles, communication styles, and organizational cultures among top managers in one of the higher education institutions (HEIs) in the Philippines;
- significant relationship among top managers' leadership styles, communication styles, and organizational cultures.

The specific hypotheses were formulated by identifying the broad objectives of the research. They were centered on the relationships between top managers' leadership styles, communication styles, and organizational cultures in higher education institutions. They were the following:

$H0_1$: There is no statistically significant relationship between leadership styles (authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire) and communication styles (activist, reflector, theorist, and pragmatist).

Ha_1: There is a statistically significant relationship between leadership styles (authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire) and communication styles (activist, reflector, theorist, and pragmatist).

$H0_2$: There is no statistically significant relationship between leadership styles (authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire) and organizational cultures (headstrong, precise, animated, down-to-earth, introverted, convincing, and accommodating).

Ha_2: There is a statistically significant relationship between leadership styles (authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire) and organizational cultures (headstrong, precise, animated, down-to-earth, introverted, convincing, and accommodating).

$H0_3$: There is no statistically significant relationship between communication styles (activist, reflector, theorist, and pragmatist) and organizational cultures (headstrong, precise, animated, down-to-earth, introverted, convincing, and accommodating).

Ha_3: There is a statistically significant relationship between communication styles (activist, reflector, theorist, and pragmatist) and organizational cultures (headstrong, precise, animated, down-to-earth, introverted, convincing, and accommodating).

Literature review

Leadership styles

Leadership is vital to the success of every educational institution (Hassan et al., 2018). Effective leadership can inspire and motivate teachers and students, promote a positive school culture, and improve academic outcomes (Smith, 2016). Leadership styles, or the approaches leaders use to guide and manage their teams, have been a topic of interest for researchers and practitioners in education (Muijs, Harris, 2007). The most widely studied leadership styles in education are authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire.

Authoritarian leadership is a type of leadership style that emphasizes control and hierarchy, with the leader being the ultimate authority and decision-maker (de Luque et al., 2008). This leadership style is associated with strict adherence to rules and procedures and little input or feedback from subordinates (Kiazad et al., 2010). In education, authoritarian leadership has been widely studied and debated due to its potential impact on teacher job satisfaction, student outcomes, and school culture (Evans, 2001). Several studies have suggested that authoritarian leadership in education can lead to adverse outcomes (Ahmad Bodla et al., 2019). Lower teacher job satisfaction and higher teacher turnover are among the negative impacts of this leadership style in education (Alonderiene, Majauskaite, 2016). When working under an authoritarian leader, teachers may feel frustrated and dissatisfied, leading to higher teacher turnover rates and school instability (Swars et al., 2009).

Similarly, students may feel constrained and restricted in their learning environment, leading to lower student engagement and academic achievement (Zyngier, 2008). However, some studies have found that authoritarian leadership may positively affect certain situations (Zhang et al., 2021). For example, it may be associated with higher levels of student motivation in a competitive academic setting (Hollembeak, Amorose, 2005). Additionally, some researchers have argued that authoritarian leadership can be effective in crises or when immediate action is necessary (Harms et al., 2018).

Democratic leadership is a style in which the leader encourages collaboration, participation, and shared decision-making among the group members (Gastil, 1994). In education, democratic leadership is often seen as a more practical approach than authoritarian leadership, as it allows for greater teacher and student autonomy and promotes a positive school culture (Dörnyei, Muir, 2019). Research has shown that democratic educational leadership can have several positive effects (Bhatti et al., 2012). For example, democratic leadership was positively associated with teacher job satisfaction, commitment to the school, and student academic achievement (Baptiste, 2019). Similarly, a study by D. García Torresits found that democratic leadership was associated with higher levels of teacher job satisfaction and lower levels of teacher turnover (García Torres, 2018). Other studies have highlighted the importance of teacher and student participation in decision-making in promoting a positive school culture (Whitty, Wisby, 2007). For example, a study by Da'as (2021) found that teacher and student participation in decision-making was positively associated with a positive school culture and higher levels of teacher job satisfaction and student academic achievement. However, some researchers have noted that democratic leadership may not be effective in all situations (Choi, 2007). For example, while democratic leadership was associated with higher levels of teacher job satisfaction, it was not always associated with higher student academic achievement (Haruni, Mafwimbo, 2014).

The laissez-faire leadership style in education is characterized by minimal involvement and guidance from the leader, allowing subordinates to make decisions and manage their work (Zareen et al., 2015). This style is often associated with a hands-off approach to leadership, where the leader delegates tasks and responsibilities without providing much direction or oversight (Abiodun et al.,

2013). The potential impact of laissez-faire leadership on teacher job satisfaction, student outcomes, and school culture has been the subject of several studies (Ali, Dahie, 2015). It was found that laissez-faire leadership was associated with lower teacher job satisfaction and higher teacher turnover (Bateh, Heyliger, 2014). This suggests that teachers may feel unsupported and undervalued when leaders fail to provide sufficient guidance and support, leading to higher turnover rates (Peist et al., 2020). Another study found that laissez-faire leadership was associated with lower organizational health and negative school culture (Robert, Vandenberghe, 2022). This suggests that when leaders fail to provide direction and oversight, it can lead to a lack of cohesion and purpose among staff, which can negatively impact the overall health and culture of the school (Bottery, 2003). However, some studies have also suggested that laissez-faire leadership can be effective in certain situations (Yang, 2015). For example, laissez-faire leadership was associated with higher levels of creativity and innovation in school staff (Pihie et al., 2011). This suggests that when leaders give subordinates more freedom to explore and experiment, it can lead to more creative solutions and approaches (De Jong, Den Hartog, 2007).

Communication styles

Effective communication is crucial for success in any organization, and educational institutions are no exception (Bass, 2000). Educational leaders must possess strong communication skills to establish and maintain positive relationships with their stakeholders, including teachers, students, parents, and community members (Dinham, 2005). The communication styles of educational leaders can vary depending on their personalities, leadership styles, and situational context (Amanchukwu et al., 2015). How educational leaders communicate can impact school climate, teacher job satisfaction, and student outcomes (Demond, 2009). Effective communication can improve collaboration, enhance trust and respect, increase motivation, and boost morale among stakeholders (Tran, 2014). On the other hand, poor communication can lead to misunderstandings, conflicts, and negative emotions, which can harm school culture and academic performance (Good et al., 2010). This study used activist, reflector, theorist, and pragmatist to describe the communication styles of the top managers in higher education institutions.

Activist communication styles of educational leaders involve engaging in active dialogue and advocating for social justice issues within and outside the school community (Theoharis, 2007). This communication style has gained increasing attention recently as educational leaders strive to create more equitable and inclusive school environments (Furman, 2012). Research suggests activist communication styles can positively impact school climate and student outcomes (Kilinç, 2014). For example, a study found that educational leaders who utilized an activist communication style were likelier to create inclusive school environments and address social justice issues (Ezzani, 2021). Similarly, when educational leaders engaged in activist communication with students, it helped them feel more empowered and engaged in their learning (Rubin, Jones, 2007). In addition, activist communication styles can also positively impact teacher job satisfaction (Xia et al., 2016) we offer a new account, based upon a communication perspective, to explain why and when participation in decision-making can influence job satisfaction. Drawing from social capital theory, we examine whether communication openness mediates the relationship between participation in decision-making and job satisfaction. We also investigate how information adequacy moderates this mediated process. Results from a sample of 184 employees in China showed that the four-factor model was the best fitting solution (CFI = .91, GFI = .90, RMSEA = .09. When school principals utilized an activist communication style, it led to higher levels of teacher job satisfaction and a more positive school climate (Kilinç, 2014). Despite the potential benefits of activist communication styles, some researchers have raised concerns about the potential for these communication styles to be polarizing

or divisive (Block, Negrine, 2017). For example, a study found that when educational leaders engaged in activist communication around controversial issues, it could lead to polarization and division within the school community (Marshall, Ward, 2004).

Reflector communication style is characterized by a tendency to take a more thoughtful and introspective approach (Lee, 2005). Reflectors prefer to listen and observe before expressing their opinions and ideas (Peng, 2002). They often take the time to reflect on what they have heard or seen and consider multiple perspectives before making a decision (Raber Hedberg, 2008). This communication style is essential for educational leaders, as it allows them to gather and consider a range of viewpoints before making decisions that impact the school community (Weiss, Weiss, 2001). Research suggests that reflector communication styles can benefit educational leaders in certain situations (Pultorak, 1993). For example, reflector communication styles were positively associated with job satisfaction and organizational commitment among teachers (Valaei, Rezaei, 2016). This suggested that reflector communication styles allowed leaders to build trust with their staff and foster collaboration and shared decision-making (Orchard et al., 2005).

Theorist communication styles refer to those who are driven by ideas and theories in their communication with stakeholders (Bolden et al., 2003). Theorist leaders value critical thinking and analysis, often using logic and reason to persuade others to their viewpoints (Paul, 1990). Some studies have suggested that a theorist communication style can positively affect teacher job satisfaction and school climate (Jackson, 2022). For example, a study found that principals who exhibited a theorist communication style were likelier to promote a positive school climate and were perceived as more transformational leaders (Sims et al., 2005). Theorist communication styles have also been linked to student outcomes. School principals who used a theorist communication style had higher student achievement levels than those who used other communication styles (de Vries et al., 2010). School principals who exhibited a theorist communication style were more likely to use evidence-based practices and had higher levels of student achievement (Paolini, 2015). However, some researchers have also suggested that a theorist communication style may not always be effective in certain situations. It may be perceived as too academic or theoretical, which can alienate some stakeholders (Bengs, 2005).

Pragmatist communication style is often characterized by its straightforward and concise communication, emphasizing the importance of data and evidence-based decision-making (de Villiers, Molinari, 2022). Several studies have examined the impact of the pragmatist communication style on educational leadership (Bryman, 2007). Principals who adopted a pragmatic communication style were more effective in implementing school-wide policies and achieving positive student outcomes (Kim, Axelrod, 2015). Studies found that a pragmatist communication style was positively associated with teacher job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001), student engagement (Reeve, 2012), and academic achievement (Wentzel, 2002). However, some researchers have noted potential drawbacks of the pragmatist communication style (Hicks, 2011). For instance, some teachers perceived pragmatist leaders as overly focused on outcomes at the expense of teacher creativity and autonomy (Jabal, 2006). Additionally, pragmatist leaders may be seen as lacking in empathy or understanding for the concerns of teachers or students, which can lead to an adverse school climate (Wesley et al., 2017).

Organizational cultures

The culture of an educational institution is a vital aspect of its functioning, influencing its effectiveness, success, and overall outcomes (Pongton, Suntrayuth, 2019). It includes values, norms, beliefs, and practices that shape operations and interactions (De Long, Fahey, 2000). Top managers, including educational leaders, play a significant role in creating and maintaining a positive organizational culture that promotes student success and faculty engagement (Day et al., 2016).

Understanding the organizational culture of educational institutions and the role of top managers in shaping it is crucial to improving educational outcomes and fostering a positive learning environment (Kezar, Eckel, 2002). This study aimed to explore and analyze top managers' personal values and attitudes in educational institutions by utilizing the dimensions of headstrong, precise, animated, down-to-earth, introverted, convincing, and accommodating cultures. These dimensions provide a framework to describe top managers' specific personal values and attitudes that are shaped by the organization's culture.

A head strong culture is characterized by independence, creativity, fearlessness, and outspokenness. These qualities can enable leaders to pursue innovative solutions and succeed in facing obstacles (Denton, Vloeberghs, 2003). A headstrong culture can promote risk-taking and experimentation, which can be essential for advancing the mission of a higher education institution (Bass, 2000). However, it can lead to conflicts, difficulty collaborating with others, and a lack of inclusivity, limiting diversity (Uline et al., 2003). A more collaborative and inclusive approach may be effective, fostering innovation and inclusivity while minimizing potential drawbacks (George et al., 2012). Studies found a lack of collaboration in higher education institutions with headstrong cultures, while inclusive leadership practices positively affect faculty members' well-being and job satisfaction (Oh et al., 2023). Balancing headstrong qualities with a collaborative and inclusive approach can achieve better outcomes (Fanelli et al., 2020).

The precise culture type has been described as methodical and disciplined, valuing technology and seeking perfection in everything it does. This culture type emphasizes rules and regulations in a cold and businesslike manner, prioritizing logic over creativity and paying close attention to the smallest details (Lubienski, 2009). Although this culture type may not be the most influential, it is highly regarded for its technical sophistication, resilience, and superior quality (Walker, 2006). Higher education institutions often utilize the precise culture type to ensure conformity with regulations and standards and exceed them whenever possible (Deem, 1998). Studies have shown that the precise culture type is well-suited to industries that require strict adherence to regulations and standards (Kaplan, 2001). However, it may not be as effective in industries that require more creativity and innovation (Miron et al., 2004). The precise culture type offers a valuable approach to achieving technical sophistication and superior quality in higher education institutions (Kis, 2005). However, balancing this approach with other culture types is important to ensure a well-rounded and competitive institution (Kanapathy et al., 2017).

Animated culture is known for being outgoing, adventurous, sporty, and youthful. Top managers with this culture constantly seek new experiences and challenges, and their impulsiveness and restlessness often lead them to take risks (Goleman, 2004). While this culture type may not be the most common among top managers in higher education institutions, some leaders embody this culture and are characterized by their love for adventure and excitement (Yeomans, 2014). Their infectious enthusiasm can inspire others, but they may also make risky decisions without considering potential negative consequences (Collinson, 2012). The groups with an animated culture tend to be more creative and innovative because they are more likely to pursue high-energy activities and take risks (Kerr, McKay, 2013). However, this culture type is also associated with a lack of longevity, as the managers who embody it may burn out quickly without constant stimulation (Davidson, 2014). Despite this weakness, their lightheartedness and youthful attitude can bring vibrancy to any environment and promote a carefree and adventurous approach to leadership (Sax, 2017).

A down-to-earth culture is characterized by honesty, helpfulness, dependability, and a family-oriented approach. This type of culture is viewed as a trusted member of the institution, always available and providing a sense of security to students, faculty, and staff (Đurišić, Bunijevac, 2017). A down-to-earth culture in higher education institutions is associated with positive outcomes such

as increased student satisfaction, faculty retention, and institutional reputation (Gagliardi, Panari, Siletti, 2021; Osterman, 2000; Sax, 2017). This culture fosters strong connections with those who trust it by being friendly, calm, and sincere (Đurišić, Bunijevac, 2017). It operates at a consistent pace, providing a sense of reliability and peace of mind (Suliman, Al-Shaikh, 2007). Cultural factors influence group decision-making, and the down-to-earth culture type is likely to prioritize the well-being of its members over taking risks (Rajiani, Pypłacz, 2018). However, this culture may struggle to adapt to new situations or change its pace, which can be challenging in a rapidly changing higher education environment. It is important to recognize and appreciate this culture's strengths while addressing potential challenges in adapting to change (Pont et al., 2008).

An introverted culture can be described as thoughtful, reserved, diligent, reflective, rational, and serious. This culture values introspection and takes a cautious and restrained approach to life (Pont et al., 2008). It may appear detached or isolated, but it is likely to be accomplished in its endeavors (Walt, 2000). Introverted leaders tend to be rated more positively by their subordinates regarding their humility, ethical behavior, and strategic thinking (Grijalva et al., 2015; Klenke, 2005). However, they may be less effective in situations that require them to be more charismatic or persuasive (Kiarie et al., 2017). Introverted culture's strengths lie in its thoroughness and attention to detail (Emanuelsson, Lindqvist, 2014). It approaches service comprehensively, carefully assessing and probing all angles (Hotz, 2021). Introverted leaders tend to be more effective in complex and uncertain situations that require careful analysis and decision-making (Bradley, Hebert, 1997). Hence, recognizing and leveraging an introverted culture's strengths while addressing its potential challenges can lead to more effective and successful educational institutions (Spreitzer, 2006).

The convincing culture is characterized by a strong focus on promotion and salesmanship, with top managers who are outgoing, confident, and influential possess charismatic personality that attracts attention. This culture is known for being trendsetting and lively and is perceived as trustworthy and reliable (Pollack, 2012). Academic leader with convincing culture is characterized by a focus on promoting and selling the institution's image, reputation, and products (Arbo, Benneworth, 2007). However, other studies have suggested that a convincing culture may not always be the most effective or sustainable approach to organizational success (Fink, Brayman, 2006). E. R. Kahu argues that building strong relationships and community within the institution may be more effective in the long term than relying solely on marketing and sales strategies (Kahu, 2013). Convincing culture is a dynamic and influential force in higher education, capable of driving change and achieving success through its charismatic and persuasive approach (Gardner, 1998).

The accommodating culture is characterized by its friendly, sincere, and helpful nature when serving customers or students. It has a conservative and modest approach to seeking direction clearly and soberly. One study by D. W. D. Long and L. Fahey found that accommodating culture can be particularly effective in managing change, as it promotes collaboration and consultation (Long, Fahey, 2000). However, this culture can sometimes struggle to assert itself and be noticed and may appear mild and hesitant in expressing its true feelings (Spreitzer, 2006). Despite these challenges, the accommodating culture remains highly valued for its traditional values and customer focus. Its focus on routine procedures and respectfulness make it an ideal fit for educational institutions (Blackmore, 2002). This culture is an important contributor to student satisfaction, which is a critical factor in the success of an educational institution (Weerasinghe et al., 2017). Furthermore, its customer-focused approach aligns with the current trend toward personalized and student-centered learning in higher education (Kallio, Halverson, 2020).

Methodology

The descriptive design explored the relationship between leadership styles, communication styles, and organizational cultures of the top managers in one of the higher education institutions in the Philippines. This design provides information about conditions, situations, and events that occur in the present (Amaratunga et al., 2002). In addition, it systematically describes the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest factually and accurately (Hyejin Kim et al., 2016).

The respondents were the purposively selected 115 designated department chairpersons, deans, associate directors, directors, campus administrators, and vice presidents with managerial and supervisorial positions. When they were classified according to age, there were 22 (19.10%) aged 31–40 years old, 47 (40.90%) aged 41–50 years old, 37 (32.20%) aged 51–60 years old, and 9 (7.80%) 61 years old and above. As to civil status, 13 (11.30%) management personnel were single, and 102 (88.70%) were married. As to educational attainment, there were 5 (4.30%) bachelor's degree holders, 64 (55.70&) master's degree holders, and 46 (40.00%) doctorate holders. As to academic rank, there were 9 (7.80%) Instructors, 64 (55.70%) Assistant Professors, 37 (32.20%) Associate Professors, and 5 (4.30%) Professors.

A combination of researcher-made and adopted questionnaires was used to gather the data. A checklist for leadership styles was adopted from Pace University (2021), while the communication styles' was from Dawn et al. (2020). Permission from the authors was established. On the other hand, the questionnaire for organizational cultures was constructed and submitted to three experts in research and management for validation. Then, reliability testing was conducted on 40 teachers in one of the public high schools. It was tallied and interpreted with a Cronbach alpha result of 0.745. The questionnaire consisted of four parts. Part I was the respondent's profile asking the basic and personal information. Part II was the checklist for communication styles used by the top managers in conversing. The styles were categorized as activist, reflector, theorist, and pragmatist. Part III was the checklist for organizational cultures in determining their personal values and attitudes in running the academic institution. Its taxonomy included headstrong, precise, animated, down-to-earth, introverted, convincing, and accommodating. Moreover, Part IV was the checklist for leadership styles classified as authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire.

The checklist for leadership styles, communication styles, and organizational cultures used a five-point Likert scale illustrated below: "1" – "Strongly agree"; "2" – "Agree"; "3" – "Undecided"; "4" – "Disagree"; "5" – "Strongly disagree".

Results and discussion

Leadership styles of the top managers

Table 1 indicates that the top managers "observed" an authoritarian leadership style (M = 3.17, SD = 0.46), indicating that they tend to have control over their subordinates and prefer upward communication. In addition, they also "observed" a laissez-faire leadership style (M = 3.03, SD = 0.56), indicating their minimal involvement and guidance, allowing subordinates to make their own decisions and manage their work. On the other hand, the democratic leadership style was "rarely observed" (M = 3.71, SD = 0.48), suggesting that the top managers perceive their subordinates as incapable and do not work collaboratively, resulting in unfair treatment of individuals.

Table 1. Leadership styles of the top managers

Category	Mean	SD	Description
Authoritarian	3.17	.46	Observed
Democratic	3.71	.48	Rarely Observed
Laissez-faire	3.03	.56	Observed

Note: 1.00–1.80, Mostly observed; 1.81–2.60, Often observed; 2.61–3.40, Observed; 3.41–4.20, Rarely observed; 4.21–5.00, Not observed.

The predominantly authoritarian and laissez-faire leadership styles observed by top managers may affect employee motivation, engagement, and innovation. The lack of guidance and support provided by these styles may lead to disengagement and a lack of creativity among employees, potentially hindering the institution's ability to adapt to changing circumstances and improve its offerings (Oyetunji, 2006). On the other hand, the minimal influence provided by the laissez-faire style may be suitable in some contexts, particularly those that require a high degree of autonomy and creativity from employees (Zakeer Ahmed et al., 2016). However, this style may also lack direction and accountability (Skogstad et al., 2007), ultimately impacting the institution's overall effectiveness. It is worth noting that these leadership styles may be influenced by the cultural traits of top managers, as discussed in the previous research finding. For instance, the conservative and modest approach to service observed among top managers in the education sector may contribute to their preference for authoritarian leadership styles, prioritizing hierarchical structures and clear lines of authority (Kennedy, 2002). Therefore, understanding the cultural factors that shape top managers' leadership styles is crucial in promoting positive outcomes for their institutions and the wider community. It may also benefit top managers to adopt a more democratic leadership style involving their subordinates in decision-making processes and valuing their input, promoting innovation and creativity in the workplace (Iqbal et al., 2015).

Communication styles of the top managers

Table 2 shows that top managers "often observed" activist communication style (M = 2.41, SD = 0.48). This suggests that they are likely to be outgoing and sociable, enjoying social interactions and being in the spotlight. They may also be persuasive and use their charm to influence others. Pragmatist communication style (M = 2.21, SD = 0.34) was also "often observed" by top managers. This suggests that they may prefer to focus on tangible results and avoid getting bogged down in lengthy discussions without a clear direction. They are likely to be straightforward, action-oriented, and may not have much patience for abstract or theoretical conversations. Also, top managers "often observed" theorist communication style (M = 2.17, SD = 0.33). This manifests that they are precise, formal, and objective. They may not be as comfortable with casual or informal communication and may tend to focus on facts and figures rather than emotions or personal anecdotes. Top managers "often observed" reflector communication style (M = 1.97, SD = 0.32). This means they are analytical and deliberate in their decision-making process. They have a calm and collected demeanor and consider the opinions and perspectives of others before deciding.

These findings suggest that the communication styles used by top managers can vary based on different factors such as context, purpose, audience, and culture. The four communication styles identified — activist, reflector, theorist, and pragmatist — provide top managers with a framework to understand their communication style and how it may impact their interactions with others. Additionally, cultural diversity is becoming increasingly important, and communicating effectively across cultural boundaries is essential (Okoro, 2012; Okoro, Washington, 2012). Top managers who adjust their communication style to suit different cultural contexts can build stronger relationships and promote positive outcomes for their institutions (Mannix, Neale, 2005). Hence, effective communication is critical to successful leadership in the education sector (O'Toole et al., 2021).

Table 2. Communication styles of the top managers

Category	Mean	SD	Description
Activist	2.41	.48	Often Observed
Reflector	1.97	.32	Often Observed
Theorist	2.17	.33	Often Observed
Pragmatist	2.21	.34	Often Observed

Note: 1.00–1.80, Mostly observed; 1.81–2.60, Often observed; 2.61–3.40; Observed; 3.41–4.20, Rarely observed; 4.21–5.00, Not observed.

Preferred organizational cultures of the top managers

Table 3 shows that top managers "mostly observed" accommodating culture (M = 1.73, SD = 0.46) who are sincere, easy-going, and customer-oriented, taking a conservative and modest approach to service. While mild and routine, they are always respectful and unassuming, making them the ultimate traditional customer servant. However, they "often observed" headstrong culture (M = 2.33, SD = 0.61), marked by unwavering perseverance and an uncompromising focus, resulting in a distinct level of creativity. They prioritize achieving their goals and disregard conventional norms, making it appealing to those seeking nonconformity. Also, top managers "often observed" precise culture (M = 1.91, SD = 0.42) that values order, rules compliance, and a meticulous approach toward perfection. They prioritize logic over creativity and are known for their precision and technical sophistication. Top managers "often observed" animated culture (M = 2.35, SD = 0.53) who enjoy a fast-paced lifestyle that seeks excitement and adrenaline rush. They are highly impulsive and easily bored, requiring constant variety in their activities to maintain their high-energy lifestyle. Top managers "often observed" introverted culture (M = 2.04, SD = 0.43) who are independent, reserved, and thoughtful with a reflective nature. They take life seriously and are cautious, appearing detached due to their distrust of superficiality. Despite being introverted, they are accomplished, with a rational and deep-thinking perspective that can be misunderstood as pessimism. Top managers "often observed" convincing culture (M = 2.05, SD = 0.47) who are outgoing, optimistic, and sales-oriented, exuding confidence and seeking attention. While appearing trustworthy and positive, they may also be perceived as superficial and trendy. Top managers "often observed" down-to-earth culture (M = 1.86, SD = 0.49) because they have sincerity, helpfulness, and reliability, making them trusted. Their predictable and easy-going nature provides a sense of security, but they may struggle to adjust to new situations or paces outside their natural rhythm.

The finding suggests that top managers in the education sector have diverse cultural traits that shape their leadership approach. These traits are influenced by their backgrounds, experiences, and the unique culture of the education sector (Belford, 2017). Leaders in this sector need to understand the cultural factors that impact their role and be aware of how their cultural background affects their leadership style, communication style, and decision-making approach (Kavanagh, Ashkanasy, 2006). For instance, a top manager who grew up in a culture that values direct communication and assertiveness may struggle to adapt to the more collaborative and indirect communication style common in the education sector. Similarly, a top manager who is used to making decisions independently may find it challenging to work within the consensus-driven decision-making culture of the education sector.

Furthermore, the unique culture of the education sector emphasizes service, respect, and a focus on the needs of students and the wider community (Shields, 2010). Top managers who embody these values and are sincere, easy-going, and customer-oriented will likely be more successful. These cultural traits can help them build strong relationships with their colleagues, students, and the wider community, fostering collaboration, inspiring action, and promoting the institution's mission and values. Moreover, the broader societal and regional culture in which top managers operate can

also impact their cultural traits and leadership approach. For instance, a top manager working in a culture that values hierarchy and respect for authority may adopt a more leadership style (Akanji et al., 2020; Lok, Crawford, 2004). On the other hand, a top manager working in a diverse and multicultural community may need to adopt a more inclusive and culturally sensitive approach to leadership (Pless, Maak, 2004).

Table 3. Preferred organizational cultures of the top managers

Category	Mean	SD	Description
Headstrong	2.33	.61	Often observed
Precise	1.91	.42	Often observed
Animated	2.35	.53	Often observed
Down-to-Earth	1.86	.49	Often observed
Introverted	2.04	.43	Often observed
Convincing	2.05	.47	Often observed
Accommodating	1.73	.46	Mostly observed

Note: 1.00–1.80, Mostly observed; 1.81–2.60, Often observed; 2.61–3.40, Observed; 3.41–4.20, Rarely observed; 4.21–5.00, Not observed.

Relationship between leadership styles and communication styles

Pearson's r was used to explore the relationship between leadership styles and communication styles of the top managers. Table 4 revealed no statistically significant relationship between authoritarian and activist ($r = 0.03$, $p = 0.70$), reflector ($r = 0.06$, $p = 0.51$), theorist ($r = 0.00$, $p = 0.99$), and pragmatist ($r = 0.00$, p = 0.99). Hence, the null hypotheses were accepted. Further, no significant relationship was recorded between democratic and activist ($r = –0.08$, $p = 0.37$), reflector ($r = –0.02$, $p = 0.81$), theorist ($r = –0.06$, $p = 0.52$), and pragmatist ($r = 0.83$, $p = 0.79$). Therefore, the null hypotheses were accepted. However, a statistically significant relationship between laissez-faire and activist ($r = –0.20$, $p = 0.02$); thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. On the other hand, reflector ($r = –0.080$, $p = 0.395$), theorist ($r = –0.118$, $p = 0.211$), and pragmatist ($r = –0.096$, $p = 0.308$) were not significant. Therefore, the null hypotheses were accepted.

Table 4. Relationship between leadership styles and communication styles

Communication styles	Leadership styles					
	Authoritarian		Democratic		Laissez-faire	
	r	p	r	p	r	p
Activist	.03	.70	−.08	.37	−.20	.02*
Reflector	.06	.51	−.02	.81	.01	.90
Theorist	.00	.99	−.06	.52	−.06	.47
Pragmatist	.00	.99	.83	.79	.00	.98

Note: * — $p < 0.05$, significant at 0.05 alpha level.

The findings suggest that top managers' laissez-faire leadership style is statistically significant to activist communication style. This implies that their approach to different stakeholders is expected to be dynamic, sociable, and persuasive. They are typically the face of the institution, and their ability to influence and encourage others greatly impacts the institution's success. These leaders tend to adopt a hands-off approach to their subordinates' decision-making and work management, fostering a sense of empowerment and accountability among employees. However, leaders must balance their outgoing and sociable nature with their responsibility to guide and support their subordinates. Neglecting their needs can lead to low morale and job dissatisfaction (Alvesson, 2000). Also, rejecting the null hypothesis of the relationship between some leadership and communication styles indicates that top managers may have preferred leadership styles but still adapt their communication styles depending on the situation and audience. Other factors, such as personal values and organizational

culture, may influence their communication style (Syakur et al., 2020). Therefore, the relationship between leadership and communication styles is complex and context-dependent (Abramson, 2012; Fragale, 2005).

Relationship between leadership styles and preferred organizational cultures

Pearson's r was used to explore the relationship between leadership styles and organizational cultures of the top managers. Table 5 revealed a statistically significant relationship between authoritarian and down-to-earth ($r = 0.18$, $p = 0.04$), thus rejecting the null hypothesis. This finding implies that leaders tend to foster a culture that is more grounded, practical, and focused on the bottom line. However, headstrong ($r = -0.02$, $p = 0.83$), precise ($r = 0.12$, $p = 0.17$), animated ($r = 0.11$, $p = 0.23$), introverted ($r = -0.03$, $p = 0.74$), convincing ($r = -0.08$, $p = 0.37$), and accommodating ($r = 0.09$, $p = 0.31$) were not significant. Therefore, the null hypotheses were accepted. This means that authoritarian leaders may be equally effective regardless of the types of organizational cultures they have.

A statistically significant relationship was found between democratic and down-to-earth ($r = -0.22$, $p = 0.01$), thus rejecting the null hypothesis. The finding suggests that top managers foster collaboration, participation, and shared decision-making while being trusted for their sincerity, helpfulness, and reliability. Their predictable and unflappable nature provides a sense of security. However, it may also hinder their ability to adjust to new situations or work at different paces. However, headstrong ($r = -0.03$, $p = 0.69$), precise ($r = -0.05$, $p = 0.57$), animated ($r = -0.14$, $p = 0.11$), introverted ($r = -0.01$, $p = 0.87$), convincing ($r = -0.07$, $p = 0.45$), and accommodating ($r = 0.01$, p = 0.90) were not significant. Therefore, the null hypotheses were accepted. This suggests that top managers who adopt a democratic leadership style can be effective in different organizational cultures. In other words, a democratic leader can be successful irrespective of their organizational cultures.

A statistically significant relationship was found between laissez-faire and animated ($r = -0.21$, $p = 0.02$) and convincing ($r = -0.19$, $p = 0.04$), thus rejecting the null hypothesis. This result suggests that top managers offer minimal guidance, allowing for decision-making autonomy. Their culture prizes speed, excitement, and novelty, with members often impulsive and bored. They have a sales-oriented and outgoing attitude, projecting confidence and seeking attention. Although trustworthy and positive, their focus on trends can appear shallow. However, their focus on trends and surface-level appeal may be seen as shallow. However, headstrong ($r = 0.00$, $p = 0.97$), precise ($r = -0.08$, $p = 0.35$), down-to-earth ($r = 0.09$, $p = 0.32$), introverted ($r = -0.10$, $p = 0.24$), and accommodating ($r = -0.05$, $p = 0.57$) were not significant. Therefore, the null hypotheses were accepted. This means that laissez-faire leaders can be successful in different types of organizational cultures, indicating that their approach is not dependent on the specific culture they have. In other words, a laissez-faire leader can achieve the same effect across various organizational cultures.

The findings emphasize that authoritarian top managers tend to have a hierarchical structure, with a certain degree of control over their subordinates, and prefer upward communication (Renani et al., 2017). While this approach can provide a stable and consistent leadership style, their culture may also lead to resistance to change and difficulties in adapting to new situations (Yılmaz, Kılıçoğlu, 2013). On the other hand, managers who are democratic foster collaboration, participation, and shared decision-making, which can lead to more informed and effective decision-making. This approach is essential in academic institutions that require input from various stakeholders, and it can positively impact morale, motivation, and overall institutional performance (Smith, Benavot, 2019). Furthermore, trustworthiness and sincerity are crucial cultural traits for top managers, as they significantly impact the institution's success (Salahuddin, 2010). Also, top managers who adopt a laissez-faire leadership style can provide teachers and staff with more decision-making autonomy, enhancing creativity and innovation (Jamali et al., 2022). However, such administrators

must remember that focusing on current trends and surface-level appeal cultures may not lead to long-term success. The different leadership styles can still be effective in different educational institutions, indicating that they can be valuable in various school cultures (MacNeil et al., 2009).

Table 5. Relationship between leadership styles and preferred organizational cultures

Organizational cultures	Leadership styles					
	Authoritarian		Democratic		Laissez-faire	
	r	p	r	p	r	p
Headstrong	−.02	.83	−.03	.69	.00	.97
Precise	.12	.17	−.05	.57	−.08	.35
Animated	.11	.23	−.14	.11	−.21	.02*
Down-to-earth	.18	.04*	−.22	.01*	.09	.32
Introverted	−.03	.74	−.01	.87	−.10	.24
Convincing	−.08	.37	−.07	.45	−.19	.04*
Accommodating	.09	.31	.01	.90	−.05	.57

Note: * — p < 0.05, significant at 0.05 alpha level.

Relationship between communication styles and preferred organizational cultures

Pearson's r was used to explore the relationship between leadership styles and communication styles of the top managers. Table 6 revealed a statistically significant relationship between activist and headstrong ($r = 0.45$, $p = 0.00$), precise ($r = 0.29$, $p = 0.00$), animated ($r = 0.56$, $p = 0.00$), introverted ($r = 0.47$, $p = 0.00$), and convincing ($r = 0.31$, p = 0.00). Therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected. While down-to-earth ($r = 0.10$, $p = 0.24$) and accommodating ($r = 0.10$, $p = 0.27$) were found not significant. This indicates that top managers have a charismatic and outgoing communication style prioritizing goals and nonconformity. In contrast, others prioritize order, compliance, and precision cultures. Some are introverted and thoughtful, while others are outgoing, optimistic, and sales-oriented.

A statistically significant relationship was found between reflector and precise ($r = 0.46$, $p = 0.00$), animated ($r = 0.28$, $p = 0.00$), down-to-earth ($r = 0.41$, $p = 0.00$), introverted ($r = 0.22$, $p = 0.01$), convincing ($r = 0.24$, $p = 0.00$), and accommodating ($r = 0.35$, $p = 0.00$) cultures. Thus, the null hypotheses were rejected. However, headstrong ($r = 0.13$, $p = 0.14$) was not significant; hence, the null hypothesis was accepted. The result means that a reflective leader in education would prioritize order, compliance, and technical sophistication over creativity and may enjoy a fast-paced lifestyle. They value sincerity, helpfulness, and reliability but may struggle to adapt to new situations. Outgoing and sales-oriented leaders may appear trustworthy and positive but can be perceived as superficial and trendy. Their culture takes a conservative and modest approach to service.

A statistically significant relationship was found between theorist and headstrong ($r = 0.38$, $p = 0.00$), precise ($r = 0.31$, $p = 0.00$), animated ($r = 0.39$, $p = 0.00$), introverted ($r = 0.45$, $p = 0.00$), and convincing ($r = 0.23$, p = 0.01). The null hypotheses were rejected. On the other hand, down-to-earth ($r = 0.08$, $p = 0.35$) and accommodating ($r = 0.16$, $p = 0.08$) were found not significant. The null hypotheses were accepted. Top managers with this theorist communication style will likely prefer precise and formal written communication with detailed explanations and data to support their arguments. Their culture values order, compliance, and a meticulous approach toward perfection. They enjoy a fast-paced lifestyle that requires constant variety. They have an independent, reserved, and thoughtful nature and take life seriously, with a rational and deep-thinking perspective that can be mistaken for pessimism.

A statistically significant relationship was found between pragmatist and headstrong ($r = 0.43$, $p = 0.00$), precise ($r = 0.37$, $p = 0.00$), animated ($r = 0.35$, $p = 0.00$), down-to-earth ($r = 0.18$, $p = 0.04$), introverted ($r = 0.38$, $p = 0.00$), convincing ($r = 0.25$, $p = 0.00$), and accommodating ($r = 0.26$,

p = 0.00) cultures. Thus, the null hypotheses were rejected. This suggests that a pragmatist top manager prioritizes practical discussions and tangible results, valuing order, compliance, technical sophistication, and achieving goals. They have a fast-paced lifestyle but may struggle to adapt to new situations. They are outgoing and optimistic but may also be perceived as superficial and trendy while maintaining sincerity, helpfulness, and reliability.

The results found that activist top managers who prioritize goals and nonconformity can inspire and motivate their team members to think outside the box and innovate. However, they may struggle with maintaining order and compliance in the educational environment, which requires following established policies and procedures (Noguera, 2003). On the other hand, top managers who prioritize order, compliance, and precision cultures may excel at ensuring that educational institutions run smoothly and adhere to regulations. However, they may struggle with promoting creativity and adapting to new situations (Bassett-Jones, 2005). Reflective leaders in education prioritize order, compliance, and technical sophistication over creativity. This approach can benefit academic institutions that require accuracy and attention to detail, such as research-based institutions (Brew, Jewell, 2012). However, they may struggle with adapting to changes in the educational landscape and implementing new ideas. Top managers with a theorist communication style tend to value precise and formal written communication, which can be useful in the academic context where documentation is essential (Shachaf, 2008). They also prioritize order, compliance, and a meticulous approach toward perfection, which can be valuable in educational institutions. However, their tendency towards perfectionism and deep thinking may cause them to struggle with making quick decisions (Kelly, 2015). Pragmatist top managers prioritize practical discussions and tangible results, which can benefit educational institutions focusing on outcomes. However, they may struggle with adapting to new situations and be perceived as superficial and trendy, which can cause challenges in educational institutions requiring consistency and reliability (Zhu, Engels, 2013). Ultimately, each leadership style has its strengths and weaknesses, and choosing the appropriate culture depends on the context and goals of the educational institution (Griffith et al., 2016).

Table 6. Relationship between communication styles and organizational cultures

Organizational cultures	Communication styles							
	Activist		Reflector		Theorist		Pragmatist	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Headstrong	.45	.00*	.13	.14	.38	.00*	.43	.00*
Precise	.29	.00*	.46	.00*	.31	.00*	.37	.00*
Animated	.56	.00*	.28	.00*	.39	.00*	.35	.00*
Down-to-earth	.10	.24	.41	.00*	.08	.35	.18	.04*
Introverted	.47	.00*	.22	.01*	.45	.00*	.38	.00*
Convincing	.31	.00*	.24	.00*	.23	.01*	.25	.00*
Accommodating	.10	.27	.35	.00*	.16	.08	.26	.00*

Note: * — $p < 0.05$, significant at 0.05 alpha level.

Conclusions

Top managers had individual leadership styles that described their personality, character, tradition, and beliefs in managing their institution and their subordinates, whatever their personal and professional backgrounds. These styles might be visible in the environment of the workplace, the system of administration, and the organization's success rate.

Also, it was found that top managers were not only using or relying on one approach in communicating with other personnel in the organization but a combination of different perspectives. Therefore, the communication styles depend on the transaction, the audience, and the speaker's purpose or intention. Thus, there is a need to know and identify the styles used by top managers to avoid or minimize misunderstanding.

In addition, the findings and results of the study shed light on the diverse cultural influences that top managers uphold in their organizational leadership. It became evident that their actions and strategic plans were strongly influenced by their personal values, attitudes, traditions, and self-perceptions. These cultural references became pivotal factors that top managers could leverage to drive substantial changes toward sustainability and development within the organization.

Moreover, this study measured the significant relationship between leadership and some communication styles. Therefore, it was comprehended that the leadership styles portrayed by the top managers were directly associated with their communication styles. This meant that if they were authoritative, their manner of conversing was expected to be strict and definitive. However, some top managers were not represented by the leadership styles in conversing.

Also, it was concluded that top managers' leadership styles were linked to their organizational culture. The image they showed was affected by personal values, attitudes, traditions, and self-perceptions. However, some believed their leadership styles indirectly related to their organizational culture.

Lastly, the communication styles could be attributed to the organizational culture of the top managers. This meant that the beliefs and traditions of the top managers had significance and contribution to how they conveyed their ideas.

Therefore, top managers' leadership styles, communication styles, and organizational cultures were directly and indirectly related. They were the key elements to identify for it needs attention because it might bring positive or negative effects to the organization's success.

References

Abiodun, A. O., Peter, O. K., Chiedu, A. A. (2013). Management style as a correlate of job performance of employees of selected Nigerian brewing industries. *African Journal of Business Management, 7*(36), 3714–3722. https://doi.org/10.5897/ajbm2013.7165

Abramson, C. M. (2012). From "Either-Or" to "When and How": A Context-Dependent Model of Culture in Action. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 42*(2), 155–180. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.2011.00484.x

Aguinis, H., Ramani, R. S., Alabduljader, N. (2018). What you see is what you get? Enhancing methodological transparency in management research. *Academy of Management Annals, 12*(1), 83–110. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0011

Ahmad Bodla, A., Tang, N., Dick van, R., Mir, U. R. (2019). Authoritarian leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational deviance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 40*(5), 583–599. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-08-2018-0313

Akanji, B., Mordi, C., Ituma, A., Adisa, T. A., Ajonbadi, H. (2020). The influence of organisational culture on leadership style in higher education institutions. *Personnel Review, 49*(3), 709–732. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2018-0280

Aktaş, E., Çiçek, I., Kiyak, M. (2011). The effect of organizational culture on organizational efficiency: The moderating role of organizational environment and CEO values. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences, 24*, 1560–1573. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.092

Aktaş, E., Çiçek, I., Kıyak, M. (2011). The effect of organizational culture on organizational efficiency: The moderating role of organizational environment and CEO values. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences, 24*, 1560–1573. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.092

Ali, Y., Dahie, A. M. (2015). Leadership style and teacher job satisfaction: Empirical survey from secondary schools in Somalia. *Online, 5*(8), 484–2225. http://www.iiste.org

Alonderiene, R., Majauskaite, M. (2016). Leadership style and job satisfaction in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management, 30*(1), 140–164. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2014-0106

Alvesson, M. (2000). Social indentity and the problem of loyalty in knowledge-intensive companies. *Journal of Management Studies, 37*(December), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00218

Amabile, T. M., Schatzel, E. A., Moneta, G. B., Kramer, S. J. (2004). Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*(1), 5–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.003

Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, G. J., Ololube, N. P. (2015). A review of leadership theories, principles and styles and their relevance to educational management. *Management, 5*(1), 6–14. https://doi.org/10.5923/j.mm.20150501.02

Amaratunga, D., Baldry, D., Sarshar, M., Newton, R. (2002). Quantitative and qualitative research in the built environment: application of "mixed" research approach. *Work Study, 51*(1), 17–31. https://doi.org/10.1108/00438020210415488

Arbo, P., Benneworth, P. (2007). *Understanding the regional contribution of higher education institutions: A literature review, 9*. https://doi.org/10.1787/161208155312

Astuti, S. D., Shodikin, A., Ud-Din, M. (2020). Islamic leadership, islamic work culture, and employee performance: The mediating role of work motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 7*(11), 1059–1068. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no11.1059

Baptiste, M. (2019). No teacher left behind: the impact of principal leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction and student success. *Journal of International Education & Leadership, 9*(1), 1–11. http://search.ebscohost.com/

Bass, B. M. (2000). The F*uture of Leadership in Learning Organizations. Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(3), 18–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190000700302

Bassett-Jones, N. (2005). The paradox of diversity management, creativity and innovation. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 14*(2), 169–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.00337.x

Bateh, J., Heyliger, W. (2014). Academic administrator leadership styles and the impact on faculty job satisfaction. *Journal of Leadership Education, 13*(3), 34–49. https://doi.org/10.12806/v13/i3/r3

Belford, N. (2017). International students from Melbourne describing their cross-cultural transitions experiences: Culture shock, social interaction, and friendship development. *Journal of International Students, 7*(3), 499–521. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.569941

Bengs, C. (2005). Planning Theory for the naive? *European Journal of Spatial Development,* 1–12.

Bhatti, N., Maitlo, G. M., Shaikh, N., Hashmi, M. A., Shaikh, F. M. (2012). The Impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style on job satisfaction. *International Business Research, 5*(2), 192–201. https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v5n2p192

Blackmore, J. (2002). Leadership for socially just schooling: more substance and less style in high-risk, low-trust times? *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(2), 198–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268460201200206

Block, E., Negrine, R. (2017). The populist communication style: Toward a critical framework. *International Journal of Communication, 11*(1), 178–197.

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(5), 662–683. https://doi.org/10.1177/00131610121969460

Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, Dennison, A. (2003). Centre for leadership studies: A review of leadership theory and competency frameworks. In *Centre for Leadership studies*. http://www.leadership-studies.com

Bottery, M. (2003). The leadership of learning communities in a culture of unhappiness. *School Leadership & Management, 23*(2), 187–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/1363243032000091959

Bradley, J. H., Hebert, F. J. (1997). The effect of personality type on team performance. *Journal of Management Development, 16*(5), 337–353. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621719710174525

Brew, A., Jewell, E. (2012). Enhancing quality learning through experiences of research-based learning: implications for academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development, 17*(1), 47–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2011.586461

Brown, O., Revilla, A. J. (2019). ResearchSPAce. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 40*(2), 230–258. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-03-2018-0129

Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*(6), 693–710. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114

Bubb, S., Earley, P. (2009). Leading staff development for school improvement. *School Leadership & Management, 29*(1), 23–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430802646370

Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., Luypaert, G. (2014). The impact of work engagement and workaholism on well-being-the role of work-related social support. *Career Development International, 19*(7), 813–835. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-09-2013-0114

Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 219–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572132

Chatman, J. A., O'Reilly, C. A. (2016). Paradigm lost: Reinvigorating the study of organizational culture. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 36*, 199–224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.11.004

Choi, S. (2007). Democratic Leadership : The Lessons of Exemplary Models for Democratic Governance. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 2*, 243–262.

Collinson, D. (2012). *Prozac leadership and the limits of positive thinking*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715011434738

Crum, K. S., Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating high achievement. *Journal of Educational Administration, 46*(5), 562–580. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230810895492

Da'as, R. (2021). School principals' skills and teacher absenteeism during Israeli educational reform: Exploring the mediating role of participation in decision-making, trust and job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Change, 22*(1), 53–84. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-020-09385-0

Davidson, B. A. (2014). Examining the relationship between non-cognitive skills and leadership: The influence of hope and grit on transformational leadership behavior. In *University of Kansas.*

Dawn, T., Harkin, J., Turner, G. (2020). The communication styles questionnaire. *Teaching Young Adults*, 143–148. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203132524-17

Day, C., Gu, Q., Sammons, P. (2016). The Impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52*(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863

Jong de, J. P. J., Hartog den, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovativ behaviour. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 10*(1), 41–64. https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060710720546

Long de, D. W., Fahey, L. (2000). Diagnosing cultural barriers to knowledge management. *Academy of Management Executive, 14*(4), 113–127. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2000.3979820

Luque de, M. S., Washburn, N. T., Waldman, D. A., House, R. J. (2008). Unrequited profit: How stakeholder and economic values relate to subordinates' perceptions of leadership and firm performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 53*(4), 626–654. https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.53.4.626

Villiers de, C., Molinari, M. (2022). How to communicate and use accounting to ensure buy-in from stakeholders: lessons for organizations from governments' COVID-19 strategies. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal, 35*(1), 20–34. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-08-2020-4791

Vries de, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., Oostenveld, W. (2010). Leadership = Communication? The relations of leaders' communication styles with leadership styles, knowledge sharing and leadership outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(3), 367–380. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9140-2

Deem, R. (1998). "New managerialism" and higher education: The management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 8*(1), 47–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/0962021980020014

Demond, M. (2009). *The relationship of principal leadership behaviors with school* … https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations

Denton, M., Vloeberghs, D. (2003). Leadership challenges for organisations in the New South Africa. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24*(2), 84–95. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730310463279

Desselle, S., Rosenthal, M., Holmes, E. R., Andrews, B., Lui, J., Raja, L. (2017). Components of a measure to describe organizational culture in academic pharmacy. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 81*(10), 6–19. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe6022

Devos, G., Verhoeven, J. C. (2003). School self-evaluation — conditions and caveats: The case of secondary schools. *Educational Management & Administration, 31*(4), 403–420. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263211X030314005

Dhillon, N., Kaur, G. (2021). Self-assessment of teachers' communication style and its impact on their communication effectiveness: A study of indian higher educational institutions. *SAGE Open, 11*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211023173

Dinham, S. (2005). Principal leadership for outstanding educational outcomes. Journal of Educational Administration, 43(4), 338–356. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230510605405

Dörnyei, Z., Muir, C. (2019). Creating a motivating classroom environment BT. In X. Gao (ed.). *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching* (719–736). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02899-2_36

Đurišić, M., Bunijevac, M. (2017). Parental involvement as a important factor for successful education. *Vključevanje staršev kot pomemben dejavnik uspešnega izobraževanja, 7*, 137–153.

Emanuelsson, A., Lindqvist, S. (2014). *Leadership of Introverts* (Issue May).

Evans, L. (2001). Delving deeper into morale, job satisfaction and motivation among education professionals: Re-examining the leadership dimension. *Educational Management & Administration, 29*(3), 291–306. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263211X010293004

Ezzani, M. (2021). A principal's approach to leadership for social justice: Advancing reflective and anti-oppressive practices. *Journal of School Leadership, 31*(3), 227–247. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052684620908347

Fanelli, S., Donelli, C. C., Zangrandi, A., Mozzoni, I. (2020). Balancing artistic and financial performance: is collaborative governance the answer? *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 33*(1), 78–93. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-05-2019-0138

Fink, D., Brayman, C. (2006). School leadership succession and the challenges of change. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*(1), 62–89. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X05278186

Forner, V. W., Jones, M., Berry, Y., Eidenfalk, J. (2020). Motivating workers: how leaders apply self-determination theory in organizations. *Organization Management Journal, 18*(2), 76–94. https://doi.org/10.1108/OMJ-03-2020-0891

Fragale, A. R. (2005). To be smart or to be social? The context-dependent effects of communication styles on status conferral in task groups. In M. C. Thomas-Hunt (ed.), *Status and Groups, Vol. 7* (93–119). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1534-0856(05)07005-2

Furman, G. (2012). Social justice leadership as praxis: developing capacities through preparation programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 48*(2), 191–229. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11427394

García Torres, D. (2018). Distributed leadership and teacher job satisfaction in Singapore. *Journal of Educational Administration, 56*(1), 127–142. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-12-2016-0140

Gardner, W. L. (1998). *The Charismatic Relationship: A Dramaturgical Perspective. 23*(1), 32–58.

Gastil, J. (1994). A definition and illustration of democratic leadership. *Human Relations, 47*(8), 953–975. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679404700805

Geesa, R. L., Stith, K. M., Rose, M. A. (2020). Preparing school and district leaders for success in developing and facilitating integrative STEM in higher education. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 17*(2), 139–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775120962148

George, G., Mcgahan, A. M., Prabhu, J. (2012). Innovation for inclusive growth: towards a theoretical framework and a research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies, 49*(4), 661–683. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01048.x

Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader? *Nature Human Behaviour, 2*(10), 718. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0446-9

Gonos, J., Gallo, P. (2013). Model for leadership style evaluation. *Management, 18*(2), 157–168. http://medcontent.metapress.com/index/A65RM03P4874243N.pdf

Good, M. E., Masewicz, S., Vogel, L. (2010). Latino english language learners: bridging achievement and cultural gaps between schools and families. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 9*(4), 321–339. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2010.491048

Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(3), 333–356. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230410534667

Griffith, R. L., Wolfeld, L., Armon, B. K., Rios, J., Liu, O. L. (2016). Assessing intercultural competence in higher education: existing research and future directions. In *ETS Research Report Series, Issue 2*. https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12112

Harms, P. D., Wood, D., Landay, K., Lester, P. B., Vogelgesang Lester, G. (2018). Autocratic leaders and authoritarian followers revisited: A review and agenda for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly, 29*(1), 105–122. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.007

Haruni, J. M., Mafwimbo, M. K. (2014). Influence of leadership styles on teachers job satisfaction: a case of selected primary schools in Songea and Morogoro Districts, Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, 6*(4), 53–61. https://doi.org/10.5897/ijeaps12.036

Hassan, A., Gallear, D., Sivarajah, U. (2018). Critical factors affecting leadership: a higher education context. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy, 12*(1), 110–130. https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-12-2017-0075

Hicks, J. M. (2011). Leader Communication styles and organizational health. *The Health Care Manager, 30*(1). https://journals.lww.com/healthcaremanagerjournal/

Hogan, R., Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: a view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*(1–2), 40–51. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00162

Hollembeak, J., Amorose, A. J. (2005). Perceived coaching behaviors and college athletes' intrinsic motivation: a test of self-determination theory. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 17*(1), 20–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200590907540

Hotz, J. R. (2021). A case study of introverted leadership in a suburban high school in central Texas doctor of education in organizational leadership. In *Digital Commons @ ACU, Electronic Theses and Dissertations*.

Hsieh, J. Y., Liou, K. T. (2016). Collaborative leadership and organizational performance: assessing the structural relation in a public service agency. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 38*(1), 83–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X15623619

Ibrahim, A., Mahmoud, S. (2017). Principals' communication styles and school performance in Al Ain government schools, UAE. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2016.1421

Iqbal, N., Anwar, S., Haider, N. (2015). Arabian Journal of Business and. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 5*(5), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.4172/2223-5833.1000146

Jabal, E. (2006). Learning from Hong Kong alumni: Lessons for school leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 9*(1), 21–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120500483672

Jackson, K. D. (2022). Principal leadership, communication styles, and school climate: a multiple case study. In *Northcentral University ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, Issue 8.5.2017*. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/autism-spectrum-disorders

Jamali, A. R., Bhutto, A., Khaskhely, M., Sethar, W. (2022). Impact of leadership styles on faculty performance: Moderating role of organizational culture in higher education. *Management Science Letters, 12*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2021.8.005

Jomah, N. Bin. (2016). Perceptions of employees in the effects of decision-making and leadership styles on relationships and perceived effectiveness in King Saud university development context. I*nternational Education Studies, 10*(1), 197. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v10n1p197

Jones, S., Harvey, M., Hamilton, J., Bevacqua, J., Egea, K., McKenzie, J. (2017). Demonstrating the impact of a distributed leadership approach in higher education. J*ournal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 39*(2), 197–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2017.1276567

Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(5), 758–773. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.598505

Kallio, J. M., Halverson, R. (2020). Distributed leadership for personalized learning. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 52*(3), 371–390. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2020.1734508

Kallioinen, O. (2010). Defining and Comparing Generic. *European Educational Research Journal, 9*(1), 56–68. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.2304/eerj.2010.9.1.56

Kanapathy, K., Bin, C. S., Zailani, S., Aghapour, A. H. (2017). The impact of soft TQM and hard TQM on innovation performance: the moderating effect of organisational culture. *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management, 20*(4), 429–461. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPQM.2017.082831

Kaplan, B. (2001). Evaluating informatics applications — some alternative approaches: theory, social interactionism, and call for methodological pluralism. *International Journal of Medical Informatics, 64*(1), 39–56. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1386-5056(01)00184-8

Kavanagh, M. H., Ashkanasy, N. M. (2006). The impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger. *British Journal of Management, 17*(SUPPL. 1). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00480.x

Kelly, J. (2015). Your best life: perfectionism — the bane of happiness. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 473*(10), 3108–3111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-015-4279-9

Kennedy, J. C. (2002). Leadership in Malaysia: Traditional values, international outlook. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 16*(3), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2002.8540292

Kerr, B., McKay, R. (2013). Searching for Tomorrow's Innovators: Profiling Creative Adolescents. *Creativity Research Journal, 25*(1), 21–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2013.752180

Kezar, A., Eckel, P. D. (2002). The Effect of Institutional Culture on Change Strategies in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(4), 435–460. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2002.11777159

Khasawneh, S., Bates, R. (2005). Organizational learning culture, learning transfer climate and perceived innovation in Jordanian organizations. *International Journal of Training and Development, 9*(2), 96–109. https://ltsglobal.com/cms_img/org_learning_culture_and_transfer_climate_in_jordan.pdf

Kiarie, M. A. W., Maru, L. C., Cheruiyot, T. K. (2017). Leader personality traits and employee job satisfaction in the media sector, Kenya. *The TQM Journal, 29*(1), 133–146. https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-09-2015-0117

Kiazad, K., Restubog, S. L. D., Zagenczyk, T. J., Kiewitz, C., Tang, R. L. (2010). In pursuit of power: The role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*(4), 512–519. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.06.004

Kilinç, A. Ç. (2014). Examining the relationship between teacher leadership and school climate. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri, 14*(5), 1729–1742. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2014.5.2159

Kilpatrick, M., Hebert, E., Jacobsen, D. (2002). Physical Activity Motivation: A Practitioner's Guide to Self-Determination Theory. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 73*(4), 36–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2002.10607789

Kim, Heewon, Scott, C. (2019). Change communication and the use of anonymous social media at work. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 24*(3), 410–424. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-07-2018-0076

Kim, H., Sefcik, J. S., Bradway, C. (2016). *Characteristics of Qualitative Descriptive Studies: A Systematic Review*. https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.21768

Kim, T., Axelrod, S. (2015). Direct Instruction: An Educators' Guide. *Plea for Action. 6*, 111–120.

Kis, V. (2005). Quality assurance in tertiary education: current practices in oecd countries and a literature review on potential effects. Organisation for economic co-operation and development. directorate for education. *Education and Training Policy Division, August, 47*. https://www.oecd.org/education/

Klenke, K. (2005). Corporate values as multi-level, multi-domain antecedents of leader behaviors. *International Journal of Manpower, 26*(1), 50–66. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720510587271

Lam, L., Nguyen, P., Le, N., Tran, K. (2021). The relation among organizational culture, knowledge management, and innovation capability: its implication for open innovation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 7*(1), 66. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7010066

Lee, H.-J. (2005). Understanding and assessing preservice teachers' reflective thinking. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(6), 699–715. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.05.007

Lok, P., Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment. *Journal of Management Development, 23*(4), 321–338. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710410529785

Long, D. W. D., Fahey, L. (2000). Diagnosing cultural barriers to knowledge management. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 14*(4), 113–127.

Lubienski, C. (2009). Do Quasi-markets Foster Innovation in Education? In *OECD Education Working Papers (Issue 25)*. http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/do-quasi-markets-foster-innovation-in-education_221583463325

Maamari, B. E., Saheb, A. (2018). How organizational culture and leadership style affect employees' performance of genders. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 26*(4), 630–651. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-04-2017-1151

Macasinag, M. L. (2019). Decades of Educational Excellence: A Case Study of A Successful Family-Owned Higher Educational Institution. *JPAIR Institutional Research, 13*(1), 63–84. https://doi.org/10.7719/irj.v13i1.783

MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 12*(1), 73–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120701576241

Manganelli, L., Thibault-Landry, A., Forest, J., Carpentier, J. (2018). Self-determination theory can help you generate performance and well-being in the workplace: a review of the literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 20*(2), 227–240. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422318757210

Mannix, E., Neale, M. A. (2005). What differences make a difference? The promise and reality of diverse teams in organizations. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, Supplement, 6*(2), 31–55. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2005.00022.x

Marshall, C., Ward, M. (2004). "Yes, but …": Education leaders discuss social justice. *Journal of School Leadership, 14*(5), 530–563. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268460401400503

Miron, E., Erez, M., Naveh, E. (2004). Do personal characteristics and cultural values that promote innovation, quality, and efficiency compete or complement each other? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(2), 175–199. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.237

Muijs, D., Harris, A. (2007). Teacher Leadership in (In)action: three case studies of contrasting schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 35*(1), 111–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143207071387

Nazir, O., Islam, J. U., Rahman, Z. (2021). Effect of CSR participation on employee sense of purpose and experienced meaningfulness: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 46*, 123–133. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.12.002

Niess, J., Diefenbach, S. (2016). Communication Styles of Interactive Tools for Self-Improvement. *Psychology of Well-Being, 6*(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13612-016-0040-8

Noguera, P. A. (2003). Schools, Prisons, and Social Implications of Punishment: Rethinking Disciplinary Practices. *Theory Into Practice, 42*(4), 341–350. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4204_12

Nold, H., Michel, L. (2016). The performance triangle: a model for corporate agility. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 37*(3), 341–356. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2014-0123

O'Toole, J., Bamberry, L., Montague, A. (2021). Residential aged care leadership in Australia—Time for a compassionate approach: A qualitative analysis of key leader skills and attributes. *Journal of Nursing Management, 29*(7), 2018–2027. https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13335

Ogbonna, E., Harris, L. C. (2000). Leadership style, organizational culture and performance: empirical evidence from UK companies. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 11*(4), 766–788. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190050075114

Oh, J., Kim, D. H., Kim, D. (2023). The Impact of Inclusive Leadership and Autocratic Leadership on Employees’ Job Satisfaction and Commitment in Sport Organizations: The Mediating Role of Organizational Trust and The Moderating Role of Sport Involvement. In *Sustainability (Vol. 15, Issue 4).* https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043367

Okoro, E. (2012). Cross-Cultural Etiquette and Communication in Global Business: Toward a Strategic Framework for Managing Corporate Expansion. *International Journal of Business and Management, 7*(16), 130–138. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n16p130

Okoro, E. A., Washington, M. C. (2012). Workforce diversity and organizational communication: analysis of human capital performance and productivity. *Journal of Diversity Management (JDM), 7*(1), 57–62. https://doi.org/10.19030/jdm.v7i1.6936

Orchard, C. A., Curran, V., Kabene, S. (2005). Creating a culture for interdisciplinary collaborative professional practice. *Medical Education Online, 10*(1), 4387. https://doi.org/10.3402/meo.v10i.4387

Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' Need for Belonging in the School Community. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(3), 323–367. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543070003323

Oyetunji, C. (2006). The Relationship Between Leadership Style and School Climate in Botswana Secondary Schools. In *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (Issue June)*. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.954.2463&rep = rep1&type=pdf

Pace University. (2021). *Leadership Style Questionnaire*. Pace University. https://www.homeworkforyou.com/static_media/uploadedfiles/Peter_G__Northouse_Leadership__T.pdf

Paolini, A. (2015). Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness and Student Learning Outcomes. *Journal of Effective Teaching, 15*(1), 20–33. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=102152590&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Paul, R. W. (1990). Paul-Critical Thinking: What, Why, and How. In *Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World* (45–56). https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED338557

Peist, E., McMahon, S. D., Davis, J. O., Keys, C. B. (2020). Teacher Turnover in the Context of Teacher-Directed Violence: An Empowerment Lens. *Journal of School Violence, 19*(4), 553–565. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2020.1779081

Peng, L. L. (2002). Applying learning style in instructional strategies. *CDTL Brief, 5*(7), 1–3.

Pihie, Z. A. L., Sadeghi, A., Elias, H. (2011). Analysis of head of departments leadership styles: implication for improving research university management practices. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*, 1081–1090. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.341

Pless, N., Maak, T. (2004). Building an inclusive diversity culture: principles, processes and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics, 54*(2), 129–147. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-004-9465-8

Pollack, T. M. (2012). Unpacking everyday "teacher talk" about students and families of color: implications for teacher and school leader development. *Urban Education, 48*(6), 863–894. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085912457789

Pongton, P., Suntrayuth, S. (2019). Communication satisfaction, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and job performance in higher education instituti. *ABAC Journal, 39*(3), 90–110.

Ponnuswamy, I., Manohar, H. L. (2016). Impact of learning organization culture on performance in higher education institutions. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(1), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.914920

Pont, B., Nusche, D., Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving School Leadership* (Vol. 1).

Pultorak, E. G. (1993). Facilitating Reflective Thought in Novice Teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(4), 288–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487193044004007

Raber Hedberg, P. (2008). Learning Through Reflective Classroom Practice: Applications to Educate the Reflective Manager. *Journal of Management Education, 33*(1), 10–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562908316714

Rajiani, I., Pypłacz, P. (2018). *National Culture as Modality in Managing the Carbon Economy in Southeast Asia*. 18(1), 296–310. https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2018.18.1.22

Reeve, J. (2012). A Self-determination theory perspective on student engagement BT. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (149–172). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_7

Renani, G. A., Ghaderi, B., Mahmoudi, O. (2017). The impact of organizational structure on the effectiveness of communication from the perspective of employees in the department of education. *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics, 4*(10), 989–1001. www.ijmae.com115

Rigby, C. S., Ryan, R. M. (2018). Self-determination theory in human resource development: new directions and practical considerations. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 20*(2), 133–147. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422318756954

Robert, V., Vandenberghe, C. (2022). Laissez-faire leadership and employee well-being: the contribution of perceived supervisor organizational status. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 31*(6), 940–957. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2022.2081074

Roberts, K. L., Sampson, P. M. (2011). School board member professional development and effects on student achievement. *International Journal of Educational Management, 25*(7), 701–713. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541111172108

Rosser, V. J. (2003). Faculty and Staff Members' Perceptions of Effective Leadership: Are There Differences Between Women and Men Leaders? *Equity & Excellence in Education, 36*(1), 71–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680303501

Rubin, B. C., Jones, M. (2007). Student action research: reaping the benefits for students and school leaders. *NASSP Bulletin, 91*(4), 363–378. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636507310316

Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory. Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research. In *American Psychologist* (68–78).

Salahuddin, M. M. (2010). *Journal of Diversity Management, 5*(2), 1–6.

Sarfraz, H. (2017). Strategic leadership development: simplified with Bloom's taxonomy. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 49*(1), 40–47. https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-08-2016-0056

Sax, A. (2017). Leadership in Academic institutions; preparing students holistically for life. *Matters of the Heart and Mind. 13*(3), 71–78.

Sethuraman, K., Suresh, J. (2014). Effective leadership styles. *International Business Research, 7*(9), 165–172. https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v7n9p165

Sfantou, D. F., Laliotis, A., Patelarou, A. E., Sifaki-Pistolla, D., Matalliotakis, M., Patelarou, E. (2017). Importance of leadership style towards quality of care measures in healthcare settings: A systematic review. *Healthcare (Switzerland), 5*(4). https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare5040073

Shachaf, P. (2008). Cultural diversity and information and communication technology impacts on global virtual teams: An exploratory study. *Information & Management, 45*(2), 131–142. https://doi.org/ https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2007.12.003

Shafait, Z., Khan, M. A., Bilan, Y., Oláh, J. (2021). Modeling the mediating roles of self-directed learning and knowledge management processes between emotional intelligence and learning outcomes in higher education. *PLoS ONE, 16*(7 July), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255177

Shields, C. M. (2010). Transformative Leadership: Working for Equity in Diverse Contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(4), 558–589. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X10375609

Shu, C.-Y. (2015). The impact of intrinsic motivation on the effectiveness of leadership style towards on work engagement. *Contemporary Management Research, 11*(4), 327–350. https://doi.org/10.7903/cmr.14043

Sims, J., Powell, P., Vidgen, R. (2005). E-learning and the digital divide: Perpetuating cultural and socio-economic elitism in higher education. *Proceedings of the 13ᵗʰ European Conference on Information Systems, Information Systems in a Rapidly Changing Economy, ECIS 2005,* 22. https://doi.org/10.17705/1cais.02223

Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(1), 80–92. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80

Smith, B. S. (2016). The Role of Leadership Style in Creating a Great School. *TSELU Research Review Journal Editorial, 1*(1), 65–78. or by e-mail to selu.info@usask.ca

Smith, W. C., Benavot, A. (2019). Improving accountability in education: the importance of structured democratic voice. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 20*(2), 193–205. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-019-09599-9

Somprach, K., Tang, K. N., Popoonsak, P. (2017). The relationship between school leadership and professional learning communities in Thai basic education schools. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 16*(2), 157–175. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-016-9206-7

Spreitzer, G. M. (2006). Leadership development lessons from positive organizational studies. 35(4), 305–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2006.08.005

Stone, D. N., Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M. (2009). Beyond talk: creating autonomous motivation through self-determination theory. *Journal of General Management, 34*(3), 75–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/030630700903400305

Suliman, A. M., Al-Shaikh, F. N. (2007). Emotional intelligence at work: links to conflict and innovation. *Employee Relations, 29*(2), 208–220. https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450710720020

Swars, S. L., Meyers, B., Mays, L. C., Lack, B. (2009). A two-dimensional model of teacher retention and mobility: classroom teachers and their university partners take a closer look at a vexing problem. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(2), 168–183. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108329116

Syakur, A., Susilo, T. A. B., Wike, W., Ahmadi, R. (2020). Sustainability of Communication, Organizational Culture, Cooperation, Trust and Leadership Style for Lecturer Commitments in Higher Education. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences, 3*(2), 1325–1335. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v3i2.980

Taye, M., Sang, G., Muthanna, A. (2019). Organizational culture and its influence on the performance of higher education institutions: The case of a state university in Beijing. I*nternational Journal of Research Studies in Education, 8*(2). https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2019.3026

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social Justice Educational Leaders and Resistance: Toward a Theory of Social Justice Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X06293717

Tran, Y. (2014). Addressing reciprocity between families and schools: Why these bridges are instrumental for students' academic success. *Improving Schools, 17*(1), 18–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480213515296

Uline, C. L., Tschannen-Moran, M., Perez, L. (2003). Constructive Conflict: How Controversy Can Contribute to School Improvement. *Teachers College Record, 105*(5), 782–816. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9620.00268

Valaei, N., Rezaei, S. (2016). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Management Research Review, 39*(12), 1663–1694. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2015-0216

Walker, K. D. (2006). Fostering hope: a leader's first and last task. *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(6), 540–569. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230610704783

Walt, S. M. (2000). *John F. Kennedy School of Government Harvard University Faculty Research Working Papers Series Keeping the World Off Balance*: Self Restraint and U. S. Foreign Policy. This paper can be downloaded without charge from the Social Science Research Network.

Weerasinghe, I. M. S., Lalitha, R., Fernando, S. (2017). *Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education Literature Review, 5*(5), 533–539. https://doi.org/10.12691/education-5-5-9

Weiss, E. M., Weiss, S. (2001). Doing Reflective Supervision with Student Teachers in a Professional Development School Culture. *Reflective Practice, 2*(2), 125–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623940120071343

Wentzel, K. R. (2002). Are effective teachers like good parents? Teaching styles and student adjustment in early adolescence. *Child Development, 73*(1), 287–301. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00406

Wesley, S. C., Jackson, V. P., Lee, M. (2017). The perceived importance of core soft skills between retailing and tourism management students, faculty and businesses. *Employee Relations, 39*(1), 79–99. https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-03-2016-0051

Whitty, G., Wisby, E. (2007). Whose voice? An exploration of the current policy interest in pupil involvement in school decision-making. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 17*(3), 303–319. https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210701543957

Wong, W. H. (2016). The Importance of Organizational Structure. *Internal Affairs*, 53–83. https://doi.org/10.7591/cornell/9780801450792.003.0003

Xia, Y., Zhang, L., Zhao, N. (2016). Impact of Participation in Decision Making on Job Satisfaction: An Organizational Communication Perspective. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 19*, E58. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/sjp.2016.56

Yang, I. (2015). Positive effects of laissez-faire leadership: conceptual exploration. *Journal of Management Development, 34*(10), 1246–1261. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0016

Yeomans, R. (2014). The adventures of an Ustasha Youth leader in the Adriatic: transnational fascism and the travel polemics of Dragutin Gjurić. *Journal of Tourism History, 6*(2–3), 158–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/1755182X.2014.918662

Yılmaz, D., Kılıçoğlu, G. (2013). Resistance to change and ways of reducing resistance in educational organizations. *European Journal of Research on Education, 1*(c), 14–21.

Zakeer Ahmed, K., Allah, N., Irfanullah, K. (2016). Leadership theories and styles: A literature review. *Journal of Resources Development and Management, 16(January)*, 1–7. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/293885908

Zareen, M., Razzaq, K., Mujtaba, B. G. (2015). Impact of transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles on motivation: a quantitative study of banking employees in Pakistan. *Public Organization Review, 15*(4), 531–549. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-014-0287-6

Zhang, S., Liu, X., Du, Y. (2021). When and how authoritarian leadership influences employee innovation behavior in the context of Chinese culture. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 42*(5), 722–734. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-08-2020-0342

Zheng, W., Yang, B., McLean, G. N. (2010). Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: Mediating role of knowledge management. *Journal of Business Research, 63*(7), 763–771. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.06.005

Zhu, C., Engels, N. (2013). Organizational culture and instructional innovations in higher education: Perceptions and reactions of teachers and students. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(1), 136–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213499253

Zyngier, D. (2008). (Re)conceptualising student engagement: Doing education not doing time. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(7), 1765–1776. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.09.004

Самооценка стилей лидерства, стилей общения и организационной культуры у топ-менеджеров

БЕСОНИЯ Бон Эрик А.
ORCID: 0000-0002-8709-8359
Государственный университет Северного Илоило, город Илоило, Филиппины

Аннотация. *Цель*. Это описательное исследование было направлено на определение стилей руководства, стилей общения и типов воспринимаемой организационной культуры, а также их взаимосвязей среди топ-менеджеров. *Дизайн исследования*. Была использована комбинация адаптированных и разработанных автором анкет для сбора данных среди 115 руководителей отделов, деканов, заместителей директора, директоров, администраторов кампусов и вице-президентов одного из колледжей на Филиппинах. Собранные данные были обработаны на основе подсчёта частоты, процентного соотношения, среднего значения, медианы, стандартного отклонения и коэффициента корреляции Пирсона. *Выводы*. Результаты показали, что большинство топ-менеджеров «опознавали у себя» авторитарный и либеральный стили руководства, в то время как демократический стиль был «редко встречающимся». Они «часто отмечали у себя» все стили общения, а именно: «активист», «прагматик», «теоретик» и «рефлексирующий». Кроме того, они «в основном наблюдали» приспособительную организационную культуру, хотя часто также отмечали «упрямую», «точную», «оживлённую», «замкнутую», «убеждающую» и «прагматичную». Была обнаружена статистически значимая связь между: попустительским стилем руководства и активистским стилем общения; авторитарным стилем руководства и прагматичной организационной культурой; демократическим стилем руководства и прагматичной организационной культурой; попустительским стилем руководства и оживлённой и убеждающей организационной культурой; активным стилем общения и упрямой, точной, оживлённой, замкнутной и убеждающей организационной культурой; между рефлексирующим стилем общения и точной, оживлённой, прагматичной, замкнутой, убеждающей и приспособительной организационная культурой; теоретическим стилем общения и упрямой, точной, оживлённой, замкнутой и убеждающей организационной культурой; а также между прагматическим стилем общения и всеми типами организационной культуры. *Практическая значимость*. Топ-менеджеры были связаны с разными людьми и культурами. Эти различия не мешали работать слаженно и эффективно, напротив это дало возможность создать отношения, которые будут способствовать достижению целей организации. *Ценность результатов*. В этой статье использовались различные стили лидерства, стили общения и видами организационной культуры, которые не вошли в предыдущие исследований. Результаты исследования дополнят существующую литературу по самооценке, лидерству и менеджменту.

Ключевые слова: стили руководства, стили общения, организационная культура, топ-менеджеры.