



COMMUNICATION STYLES TOWARDS EFFECTIVE SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

JOSELYN LAO VILORIA Master Teacher-II Senior High School Coordinator Baggao National High School Poblacion, Baggao, Cagayan, Philippines

ABSTRACT: *Communication has its many aspects where leaders need to be mindful of like giving well-defined instruction and resounding exchange of interaction; transmitting of genuine and authentic information; sharing, transferring, and apprehending with meaning; attaining of set goals; encouraging, guiding and directing subordinates in the organization. The study sought to identify the communication styles of school heads and teachers in a school setting. The researcher made use of the descriptive method. It is meant to measure the general communication styles of principals and teachers in a school setting. The descriptive method was utilized as a process of gathering, analyzing, classifying and tabulating data about prevailing conditions, practices and existing communication styles in a school setting. The respondents of the study were the principals and teachers of the general public secondary schools in Baggao. In this study, the researcher employed total enumeration in choosing the respondents. Survey questionnaires were the instruments in gathering data pertinent to the study consisting of the background demographic profile of the respondents and the main part of the tool consisted of two sets. The first set had twenty-five questions intended to measure the general communication style of the respondents and the second set had twenty-seven questions which measured the communication styles of the respondents when given several situations in the workplace. Simple frequency counts and percentage distribution were used to treat the collected data on demographic profile and the respondents' answers on the given questionnaires. The Chi-Square Test Results and Pearson-r Tests were also used in identifying the significant difference in the communication styles when grouped according to profile variables. The National High Schools of the Baggao Districts are generally manned by young and developing faculty who are led by more experienced and educationally advanced principals. The position, length of service and the educational background of principals and teachers do not affect their general communication styles. However, differences in communication styles occur in situations where psychological mindset and personal challenges are involved like viewing time frame, viewing environment and setting preferences, when motivated, when demotivated, communication patterns, and on how others view them. The results of this study could be*



given as a baseline data for principals to familiarize them with the communication styles of teachers accorded to their leadership and to have better understanding and interpersonal relationship in the school they are in.

Keywords: communication styles, principals, effective school management, communication patterns, leadership, demographic profile, communication, descriptive method

INTRODUCTION

The school organizations serve as strong pillars of education in the Philippines. Such organizations are the channels of the social order to attain its specific and general goals. The school's management competence and adeptness must be at its highest order to handle such organization. Management in its real sense is rooted in the smooth interpersonal relationship among employees and other members of the system commencing from productive and efficient communication.

Several managerial duties such as formulating decisions, imparting a vision, coordinating individuals, working groups within the organization's structure, motivating employees and hiring, directing teams and the like require communication appurtenant to their functions as leaders.

Communication has its many aspects where leaders need to be mindful of like giving well-defined instruction and resounding exchange of interaction; transmitting of genuine and authentic information; sharing, transferring, and apprehending with meaning; attaining of set goals; encouraging, guiding and directing subordinates in the organization. Moreover, communication plays a vital role in the success of any organization and is affected by both the culture and level of interpersonal communication skills within the organization. Good communication skills are increasingly important to a manager's success which serves as lifeblood of a successful organization.

Shockley-Zalabak (2006) stressed that inefficiency in communication within the organization is symptomatic of a faulty chain. On the other hand, effective communication promotes good working relationship between the management and the organizational workers. It



enhances good rapport between the superior and the subordinates and all those working in it. It must be noted that the organizational efficiency depends on the effective communication patterns adopted by the organization. This is being enhanced through the application of different types of communication that exists inside and outside the system.

School managers play a significant role in the institutional repertoire. They are basically the drivers of the schools who are most importantly exercising the four functions of management such as planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. With all those functions, communication thrives as the core of an organization's vital tasks as this is indispensable in all transactions and activities that we do in our own workplace.

The vitality of tasks is associated with performance and this would always redound to intercultural encounter to people who want to reinforce strong group identification. Indeed, there is a need for interactive, assertive and mutual partnership in order to meet this goal. In an organization, people accommodated their communication while interacting with others and the characteristics that people exhibit are based on their experiences and their cultural backgrounds. University of Virginia, Darden School of Business (2015) on Faculty and Research Management Communication emphasized that leaders who make a difference in the world of practical affairs depend on excellence in communication. Communication is central to both the daily lives of managers as well as the differentiator that makes for exceptional leaders.

Martin (2014) underscored that having diversity of personalities and communication styles in the workplace can make things interesting and exciting. Allowing for differences in the workplace can help one minimize productivity. However, according to Holmes (2013) one needs to deal with all differing personality types just as others need to deal with personality shortcomings. Understanding what causes people to behave the way they do and having strategies to better influence these people would definitely make life easier and more successful.



In the school organization to be specific, it was observed that conflicts usually arise due to miscommunication between specific entities like the principal and some of the teachers; teachers with their fellow teachers; teachers with their students; students with their peers; students with the administrators; administrators with the stakeholders and the like. This is also due to members' diverse cultural backgrounds or personality traits which are associated with their communication styles. Some of these players can be so difficult to talk with while others are the opposite. The inability of the members to understand each other creates an alarming result and may simply be construed as inefficiency of the whole organization in general.

Furthermore, Resource.mccneb.edu identifies possible reasons for the problem on miscommunication like individual differences; individual style differences that every person develops a primary communication style that remains quite stable throughout life ; limited number of style that people tend to fall into one of several behavior patterns when relating to the world around them; differences between people can be a source of friction unless they develop the ability to recognize and respond to the other person's style.

According to Skillsyouneed.com (2015) communication is something that helps form the basis of a successful and growing community. Even as the media and channels of communication change and advance, the basic premise remains unvaried. Pattanaik, B.K. and Mishra (2014) contend that organizations cannot exist without communication. Communication serves four major functions within a group or organization: control, motivation, emotional, expression and information. Communication acts to control members in several ways.

Communication also fosters motivation like in clarifying for what is to be done, how well they are doing and what could be done to improve performance or to excel. It can provide an avenue for the expression of emotions like during meetings and personal encounter with the school heads. It also serves to relay information especially when projects are done, meetings are taking place and to have other social interactions. In addition, smallbiztrends.com (2013) defined communication as the flow of information between



people which is a very important part of the workplace. It discussed the two main types of communication namely: verbal communication which requires the spoken word and nonverbal which involves communicating without speaking such as writing or body language.

According to Leslie (2011), communication is everywhere and encompasses everything. He asserted that effective communication is an essential skill that is used daily and is related to success in all facets of life. When communication is ineffective, the organization suffers. Whether oral or auditory, electronic or written, non-verbal or verbal, some forms of communication is involved in every task, activity, or process performed every day. Moreover, he contends that the world is completely reliant on communication to perform even the most basic of all daily tasks. Without communication as it is known today would grind to a halt. On any given day, one participates numerous times in communication process. He emphasized that being able to appreciate and use generational differences to enhance the work environment will help bridge the generation gap and enhance communication in the workplace.

On the other hand, learning how to communicate with the different generations is very important and can eliminate many major confrontations and misunderstandings in the workplace. Root,III (2015) emphasized that communication is essential for maintaining a productive workplace. He reiterated that members of the organization must have to understand the effects of negative communication in the workplace, so they can develop policies to help the organization decrease the problem and encourage positive communication. Tober (2014) stressed the first rule of effective communication: the success of the communication is the responsibility of the communicator. Thus, collaboration, creativity, and communication are necessary ingredients in a highly productive and harmonious work environment.(foster.target.maine.edu,2015). In addition, the effective communication and teachers' job performance can only be achieved if the necessary machineries are put in place to enhance efficiency within the school system. Effective communication can be enhanced through the application of different types of communication that exists in the school settings.Furthermore, communication plays a vital



role in the success of any organization and is affected by both the culture and level of interpersonal communication skills within the organization.

Da Silva H., et. al. (2014) stressed more that communication not only conveys information and expresses emotions, it is also characterized by a particular relational style (i.e. communication style). They underscored that everyone has a relational style that from time to time may be more or less dominant or passive, sociable or withdrawn, aggressive or friendly, welcoming or rejecting.

Health field (2015) emphasized that since communication has so many components, failing to effectively communicate in the workplace is commonplace. Drynan (2011) added that learning how to communicate with the different generations is very important and can eliminate many major confrontations and misunderstandings in the workplace and the world of business; however, he asserted more that it is important not to make assumptions and to understand as best as one can for each individual's comfortable level of communication styles within the workplace.

Reyes (2014) reiterated that successful communication requires that someone (the sender) shares information and that someone else (the receiver) gets the message and correctly interprets it. The full communication loop is only successful when the sender can confirm that the receiver understood the message as intended.

Employee-Motivation-Skills.com (2009-2013) likewise highlighted that effective communication plays a prominent role in developing long lasting employee motivation, improve time management and open many doors to improve productivity. Furthermore, fmlink.com (2015) discussed the essential role of communication for effective functioning in every part of an organization and explained further that communication links personnel together and facilitates organizational success. It is needed to increase efficiency, satisfy customers, improve quality and create innovative products. Keteyian (2014) added that effective communication is essential to a high functioning-team, with all voices present, strong and clear and deepens working relationships. Along with this, Manker (2015) emphasized that open communication gives everyone equal participation in the success of



the business. She pointed out that creating an atmosphere of open communication allows for the flow of energy and creativity. It establishes an environment where all employees have a good understanding of the goals and what needs to be done to accomplish those goals. She added that managers must be able to communicate with employees and employees must be able to communicate with managers in order to have a profitable business just as this can also be applicable to administrators and teachers; teachers and students in a school. Sabol (2011) contends that communication challenges or behavioral problems must be sought for by organizational managers and create an environment conducive for effective communication.

Ali, H. (2015) introduced the communication accommodation theory by Howard Giles, a Welsch social psychologist. Communication Accommodation Theory is a communication theory which emphasizes the adjustments that people do while communicating. Howard Giles, the professor of communication at the University of California, developed the theory. People try to emphasize or minimize the social difference between others whom they interact with. The factors that lead to the accommodation activity are adjustments which can be through verbal communication or through gestures. The theory was evolved from speech adjustment theory, which demonstrates the value of psychological concepts to understand the dynamics of speech. But the theory encompasses more fields such as non-verbal and gestures. In this theory, people in intercultural encounter who see themselves as unique individuals will adjust their speech style and content to mesh with others whose approval they seek. People who want to reinforce a strong group identification will interact with those outside the group in a way that accentuates their differences.

Effective communication was a cornerstone of the human behavior perspective, so theorists emphasized interactive communication among employees to improve mutual trust. They also recognized the importance of both formal and informal communication. Moreover, communication accommodation theory elaborates the human tendency to adjust behavior while interacting. The reason behind this behavior is to control the social differences between the interactants. People accommodate their communication activities to get



approval and to set a positive image in front of the interactant. The environment in which they are interacting also affects the communication behavior.

There are two types of accommodation process explained in this theory: the first is convergence which is the process where people tend to adapt the other person's communication characteristics to reduce the social differences. Second is the divergence. It is the process contradicts the method of adaptation and in this context the individual's emphasis is on the social difference and nonverbal differences between the interactants. The two processes usually are dependent on the characteristics of the interactant. People accommodated their communication while interacting with a person who has higher standards and other characteristics which they believe are better than them. The divergent exhibits an opposite characteristic as it emphasizes the difference among the close relations with each other. Communication accommodation theory is influenced by social psychology and is guided by four major assumptions.

- a.) While communicating there will be similarity and difference in the speech and behavior. The characteristics that people exhibit are based on their experiences and their cultural backgrounds.
- b.) A conversation is evaluated by understanding the perception of the speech and behavior of the other. Through evaluation people decide to accommodate and fit in.
- c.) The social status and belonging is determined by language and behaviors. While people communicate they tend to accommodate the behaviors of those who are in the higher social status than they are.
- d.) Norms guide the accommodation process which varies in the degree of appropriateness. Norms define the behaviors of people and they are expected to act accordingly.

Griffin (2015) discussed the Standpoint Theory of Sandra Harding and Julia T. Wood who stressed that "the best ways to discover how the world works is to start the inquiry from the standpoint of women and other groups on the margins of society". A standpoint is defined as "a place from which to critically view the world around us"; it explains that people of different locations and times have separate viewpoints and outlooks on the world. According to standpoint theorists, gender, race, sexual orientation, and class inequalities



create different world perspectives. Different locations within the social hierarchy affect what is seen. The standpoints of marginalized people provide less false views of the people of the world and do the privilege perspectives of the powerful.

Good communication skills require a high level of self-awareness. Understanding one's personal style of communicating will go a long way toward helping others to create good and lasting impressions. By becoming more aware of how others perceive an individual person is more likely adaptable they are to their styles of communicating. Definitely, one can make another person more comfortable with another by selecting and emphasizing certain behaviors that fit within ones personality and resonate with another.(<http://www.au.af.mil/>)

Resource.mccneb.edu discussed the five fundamental concepts supporting communication styles and they are as follows:

1.) Individual differences exist and are important; 2.) Individual style differences tend to be stable. The basics of communication style theory were established by Swiss psychiatrist Carl Jung. In his classic book *Psychological Types*, he states that every individual develops a primary communication style that remains quite stable throughout life. Each person has a relatively distinctive way of responding to people and events. Many psychologists now believe that people are born with a predisposition to prefer some behaviors (actions) over others. Because these preferred behaviors are easily and naturally used, they are exercised and developed further over least preferred preferences;3.) There is a limited number of styles. Jung observed that people tend to fall into one of several behavior patterns when relating to the world around them. He describes four behavior styles: intuitor, thinker, feeler, and sensor. Those in the same behavior category tend to display similar traits. The thinker, for example, places a high value on facts, figures, and reason.

4. A communication style is a way of thinking and behaving. It is not an ability but instead a preferred way of using the abilities one has. This distinction is very important. An ability refers to how well someone can do something. A style refers to how someone likes to do something. 5.) To create the most productive working relationships, it is necessary to get in sync with the behavior patterns (communication style) of the people you work with.



Differences between people can be a source of friction unless you develop the ability to recognize and respond to the other person's style. The ability to identify another person's communication style, and to know how and when to adapt your own preferred style to it, can give you an important advantage in dealing with people. Learning to adapt your style to fit the needs of another person is called "style flexing."

Moreover, according to Wolfe (2012), a communication style defines both how an individual prefers to communicate with others and how they interpret or perceive communications from others. When individuals have conflicting communication styles, they hold different ideas about what "normal" conversation should sound and be like. They have different perceptions of what is productive or unproductive communication and different standards for judging what is polite, rude, or outright dismissive behavior. She likewise emphasized that communication styles, like clothing styles, are situational. How an individual communicates is in part a function of the context.

In addition, rapidcourse.com (2015) stressed that understanding the different communication styles and know how to accommodate each would help one build trust, have more productive meetings and communicate more effectively.

Furthermore, understanding other people's communication styles improves working relationships by increasing our acceptance of other people and their way of doing things. Knowledge of the various communication styles helps us communicate more effectively with people who differ from us. Job satisfaction and productivity increase when employees feel that their leaders understand their personal needs and take these into considerations. (resource.mccneb.edu/)

However, Martin (2014) argued that having diversity of personalities and communication styles in the workplace can make things interesting and exciting. In order to learn to work together despite differences, there's no limit to how far one career can go. Allowing for differences in the workplace can help one minimize productivity while minimizing drama. On the other hand, Blahnik (2012) contends that understanding one's own communication styles as well as the communication styles of a teammate would better allow everyone to interact more efficiently.



Transactional Analysis as developed by Eric Berne and cited by Holmes (2013) stressed that interacting with others can be done from one to three communication styles: talk as a parent would; speak and interact as a child would; or communicate as an adult would. He contended that this could make one understand personality traits easier and gives a common language which helps improve interaction with others and have less conflict in the workplace. One of the biggest differences in co-worker communication styles is about how directly or indirectly colleagues communicate. Allowing for and appreciating different ways of communicating will help up one's tolerance level and improve the way one listens to, interact and work together.

According to Merrill and Reid as cited by Farrington (2013), there are four social styles, namely: Analyticals, Drivers, Expressives and Amiables. Farrington highlighted these social styles and discussed them in detail as these have been recognized as personality traits and whoever would be dealing with them may adapt the approaches and communication styles accordingly. The breakdown of the four styles is given below:

1. The Driver . Drivers are action- and goal-oriented, strive for results and react quickly. They are decisive, independent, disciplined, practical and efficient. They typically use facts and data, speak and act quickly, lean forward, point and make direct eye contact. Their body posture is often rigid and they have controlled facial expressions. They rarely want to waste time on personal talk or trivialities and can be perceived by other styles as dominating, harsh or severe. They are comfortable in positions of power and control and they have business like offices with certificates and commendations on the walls. In times of stress, Drivers may become autocratic.

2. The Analytical. Analyticals are concerned with being organized, having all the facts and being careful before taking action. They need to be accurate, precise, orderly and methodical. They conform to standard operating procedures, organizational rules and historical ways of doing things. They typically have slower reaction times and work more carefully than Drivers. They are perceived as serious, industrious, persistent and exacting.

Levit (2013) stressed that the manner a person relates with others may absolutely affect a person's ability to get things done. With this, Robert Bolton and Dorothy Grover Bolton in



their classical book, “People Styles at Work” cited by Levit herself helped others understand the behavioral styles that determine how co-workers think, make decisions, communicate, manage time and stress and deal with conflict. She underscored that understanding one’s own style and the people’s style one is dealing with can be a great way to establish rapport with someone more easily, become more persuasive, and become more resistant to miscommunication.

According to the book, industrial psychologist David Merrill found that two dimensions of behavior could explain and predict how people behave: assertiveness and responsiveness are the degree to which people’s behavior is seen as forceful and directive. Assertive people are more energetic and quick to action than less assertive people. Responsiveness is the degree to which people are seen as showing emotions or demonstrating sensitivity. Responsive people express feelings more openly, enjoy working with people, and are concerned about the human aspect of issues. Both of these dimensions should be seen as a continuum.

He stressed that there are no good or bad styles; there are only differences among people, and success or failure is unrelated to any style. All styles when used effectively are good ones. Along with this, such styles would be adapted by any member of the organization like in schools. It is at this point that there is a need of thorough understanding the details of these styles as follows:

- 1.) Analyticals are people who are less assertive and less responsive. Emotionally restrained, they rarely compliment others or get excited. They are organized and systematic. They crave data — the more the better. They are slow decision makers because they want to make sure they have carefully weighed all the facts.
- 2.) Amiable are, like analytical, less assertive, but more responsive. Friendly and generous with their time, they are excellent team players. They aren’t flamboyant creators, but rather diligent, quiet workers who do what’s asked of them.
- 3.) Expressive are, like amiable, more responsive. But they are also more assertive. They’re friendly and empathetic like amiable but aren’t as low-key about it. Flamboyant, energetic, and impulsive, they are the most outgoing of the People Styles.
- 4.) Drivers are, like expressive, more assertive.



But they are less responsive. Decisive and task-oriented, they focus intently on the job at hand. In conversations, they get right to the point. They are purposeful and energetic, just as expressive. But expressive are concerned about people as human beings. For drivers, there's no time for such concerns.

According to Robert Bolton and Dorothy Grover Bolton as cited by Levit (2013), "When two people of different styles live or work together, one or both must adjust. If neither adapts to the other, communication will deteriorate, cooperation will decline, the relationship will be stressed, and in work situations productivity will inevitably slump."

The Boltons advocate a four step process to improving relationships with co-workers who may have different styles than others. They call this "style flex" and he presented how one can use it: first, identify one's style and the style of the other person. To identify one's own style, he/she has to ask the opinions of others. Only then they can appropriately categorize one's external behavior (i.e. assertiveness and responsiveness) without being influenced by internal motivations or feelings.

Furthermore, he indicated that in order to identify the other person's style, observe others carefully for clues like a loud voice or flamboyant gestures.

The second step being presented is to plan ahead, select the specific behaviors one will adapt and how others will adapt them. The third step is to implement changes and monitor the other person's reactions. Make mid-course corrections if necessary. After a next meeting with the person in question comes the last step: reviewing the process and drawing lessons for future interactions.

There are three communication styles according to Sherman (2013) which are somewhat similar with those presented by the proponents above. They are passive, aggressive, assertive. She contends that one needs to discover the style that fits in the number of ways including personality tests such as the Myer's-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) instrument, psychological assessments, and self-assessments. She presented these styles according to their elements and these are associated to person's characteristics. Aggressive believe in



not doing wrong. They are close minded, poor listener, monopolizing and have difficulty seeing the other person's point of view. They achieve their goals often at other's expense, domineering, bullying, patronizing, condescending and sarcastic. They put others down and they don't show appreciation. They move into people's space, squint eyes critically, have loud yelling tone of voice. When faced with problems, they threaten, and attack and they usually have the feeling of anger, hostility, frustration and impatience which result to counter aggression, alienation from others. They waste time and energy over supervising others. They pay high price in human relationships. They foster resistance, defiance, sabotaging, striking back, forming alliances, lying, and covering up. Elements of the passive style are as follows: Passive don't express their true feelings, they don't make waves, don't disagree and believe that others have more rights than they do. Their communication style is indirect, always amenable of things. They are apologetic, self-conscious, trust others but not self. They allow others to make decisions for self. They sigh a lot, try to sit on both sides of the fence to avoid conflict. They clam up when feeling treated unfairly. They use to complain instead of taking action. They have difficulty implementing plans. They ask permission unnecessarily. They often nod head, fidget, smile, come across as pleading, downcast eyes, fast when anxious but slow and hesitant when doubtful. When confronted with perplexities, they use to ignore, leave, postpone. They are sullen and silent, agree externally while disagreeing internally.

They expend energy to avoid conflicts that are anxiety provoking. They spend too much time asking for advice and supervision. They felt powerlessness and often wonder why they don't receive credit for good work, they chalk recognition to other's inabilities, as a result; they build dependency relationships and they don't know where they take a stand. They slowly lose self-esteem. Assertive style is associated with assertive people whose beliefs and mottos swirl around believing self and others. They know that assertiveness doesn't mean they always win but that they could handle situation as effectively as possible. They have the strong belief to have asserted their rights and so do others.

Their style of communication is effective; they are active listeners. They state limit and expectations, state observations, express self directly, honestly, and as soon as possible



about feelings and wants. They check on other's feelings. However, they are non-judgmental, observe behavior rather than labeling it. They are open, confident, flexible, versatile, playful, decisive, have sense of humor, proactive and initiating. They use to operate from choice, know what is needed and develop a plan to get it. They are action-oriented, firm, realistic in her expectations, fair, just and consistent. They take appropriate action toward getting what they want without denying rights of others. They have natural gestures, attentive, interested facial expression, have appropriate vocal volume and expressive.

On the other hand, when faced with a dilemma, they make negotiations, bargains, and make necessary compromise and don't allow negative feeling to build up. They have the feeling of enthusiasm, even-tempered which result to increase their self-esteem and self-confidence, increase self-esteem of others, feel motivated and understood and others know where they stand.

Baumgardner (2013) likewise presented four the same communication styles however characterized them differently. He further emphasized that people may have all characteristics in more than one area where they can have a default style in each and according to him these are tendencies and should not make one feel limited in the way he/she communicates. Moreover, he stressed that no style is better than another; any style can be effective depending on the circumstances and that a strong team leverages the strengths of each type so that one can work the most effectively; and to be a powerful and effective communicator, he said that it is important to understand each style and figure out how to adapt default style to the circumstances at hand.

He described the four styles as follows:

Drivers are hard-working and ambitious. They tend to be the group leaders who value getting the job done with excellent results. They are apt to be decisive, competitive, hard driving and good at delegating to others. They like to be where the action is and are likely to enjoy taking risks. Their focus is on winning, being successful and making things happen. They need options and prefer it when others are direct. On the downside, they can be pushy, demanding, dominating, tough and exclude others from decision-making. Under stress, they become autocratic and order others around.



Analytical quick to think and slow to speak. They value accuracy in the details and like to be right. They plan thoroughly before deciding to act, is persistent and highly organized, cautious and logical. They prefer to work alone and have tendency to be introverted. They focused on process, tasks and doing things the right way. They prefer a rational approach, logical thinking, solid documentation and careful planning. The downside is that they can be critical, picky, perfectionist and stubborn, as well as indecisive. Their tendency under stress is to avoid others.

Expressive love to have and enjoy helping others. They have full of ideas and can't wait to share them with others. They are talkative and open, ask other's opinions and love to brainstorm. They are flexible and easily bored with routine. They are optimistic, intuitive, creative and spontaneous and may have a tendency to be flamboyant. Expressive focus on the big picture. They love ideas and concepts and thrive on bringing visions into reality. They need innovation and look to others to handle the details. On the downside, they can be overly dramatic, impulsive, and tad flaky and undisciplined.

Amiable is the relationship style. Amiable focus on the feelings of other people and effective collaboration. People with this style are intuitive and care about how situations "feel". They like consensus, avoid confrontation, and tend to be timid about voicing contrary opinions. Amiable people are good listeners, friendly and sensitive and build networks of friends to help them. They are likely to be slow with big decisions and need a lot of input. They thrive on involvement, participation and inclusion. On the downside, the Amiable can be hesitant, unsure of themselves and dependent on others. Under stress, they acquiesce or yield to the decision of others.

Baumgardner (2013) affirms that knowing one's own communication styles is helpful in two ways: first, when one spots the best opportunities to use one's default style to build up his/her strengths. Second, once a person knows about his/her own style, one can also spot someone else's style and adapt the way he/she communicates in order to get that person on board with him/her. Eventually, when one can learn how to use each style comfortably



and maximize the chances that others suggested to follow, then that is the heart of great leadership.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study sought to identify the communication styles of school heads and teachers in a school setting.

Specifically, this study endeavors to provide answers to the following:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1 position
 - 1.2 Length of service
 - 1.3 Educational attainment
2. What are the respondents' communication styles in general?
3. Is there a significant difference in the general communication styles of the respondents when grouped according to profile variables?
4. What are the communication styles of the respondents in the workplace situations when grouped according to profile variables?
5. Is there a significant difference in the communication styles of the respondents in the different situations when grouped into profile variables?
6. What are some communication problems experienced by the schools?
7. What action plan can be proposed for an effective communication management in schools?

HYPOTHESES

Based from the literature reviewed in preparation for this study, hypotheses have been formulated regarding the expected relationship of the research variables:

HO1: There is no significant difference in the general communication styles of the respondents when grouped according to profile variables.

HO2: There is no significant difference in the general communication styles in the workplace of the respondents when grouped according to profile variables.



RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The researcher made use of the descriptive method. It is meant to measure the general communication styles of principals and teachers in a school setting. The descriptive method was used as a process of gathering, analyzing, classifying and tabulating data about prevailing conditions, practices and existing communication styles in a school setting. The respondents of the study were the principals and teachers of the general public secondary schools in Baggao. In this study, the researcher employed total enumeration in choosing the respondents.

Table 1: Respondents of the Study

Respondents	ANHS	INHS	BNSAT	HINHS	BNHS	BNAS	TOTAL
Principals	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Teachers	10	19	23	28	49	25	154
Total	11	20	24	29	50	26	160

Survey questionnaires were the instruments in gathering data pertinent to the study consisting of the background demographic profile of the respondents and the main part of the tool consisted of two sets. The first set had twenty-five questions which were used to measure the general communication style of the respondents and the second set had twenty-seven questions which measured the communication styles of the respondents when given several situations in the workplace. An additional question is given to the second set marked as letter C to know the actual problems on communications in schools. In summary, the survey questionnaires focused on how a person deals with others, himself and the relationships that exist between his products or outputs and other people in the school organization in order to move towards effective and efficient school management. Scoring is done through frequency count where one item is equal to one score.

Simple frequency counts and percentage distribution were used to treat the collected data on demographic profile and the respondents' answers on the given questionnaires. The Chi-



Square Test Results and Pearson-r Tests were also used in identifying the significant difference in the communication styles when grouped according to profile variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Principals Grouped According to Position

Position	Frequency	Percentage
Head Teacher	1	16.67
Principal 1	1	16.67
Principal 2	2	33.33
Principal 3	2	33.33
Total	6	100.00

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of principals grouped according to position. 33.33% of the principals belonged to the Principal 2 and Principal 3 position.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Teachers Grouped According to Position

Position	Frequency	Percentage
Teacher 1	80	51.94
Teacher 2	4	2.60
Teacher 3	62	40.26
Master 1	5	3.25
Master 2	2	1.30
Head Teacher	1	.65
Total	154	100.00

Majority of the teachers belonged to the entry level or Teacher 1 with 51.94% while 40.26% are Teacher 3 and only .65% belonged to the Head Teacher 1 position.



Table 4. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Principals Grouped According to Length of Service

Length of Service as School Heads	Frequency	Percentage
26-30 years	2	33.30
35-40 years	4	66.70
Total	6	100.00

Majority of the principal belonged to the 35-40 years' length of service in the government while 33.30% have 26-30 years' length of service. This implies that most of the principals of the six national high schools in Baggao have served the Department of Education for a long period of time.

Table 5. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Teachers Grouped According to Length of Service

Length of Service as Teachers	Frequency	Percentage
0-5	82	53.25
6-10	24	15.58
11-15	13	8.45
16-20	13	8.45
21-25	12	7.79
26-30	4	2.59
31-35	6	3.89
Total	154	100.00

Majority of the teachers belonged to the 0-5 years' length of service with 82 or 53.25%. This is followed by 24 or 15.58% who have 6-10 years' length of service. Only 4 or 2.59% and 6 or 3.89% belonged to the 25-30 and 31-35 years respectively. The data imply that generally, the teachers of the National High Schools of Baggao are still new in the service and only a few have taught for a longer time.



Table 6. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Principals Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Master's Graduate	3	50.00
Doctorate Units	1	16.70
Doctorate Degree	2	33.30
Total	6	100.0

The table shows the frequency and percentage distribution of principals grouped according to educational attainment. It can be inferred from the data that most of the principals finished Master's Degree while 33.30% have finished Doctorate Degree. This implies that all of the principals have attained the minimum educational requirement for principalship.

Table 7. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Teachers Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's Degree	68	44.16
Master's Units	22	14.29
Master's Degree	62	40.26
Doctorate Units	2	1.29
Total	154	100.00

The table presents the frequency and percentage distribution of teachers grouped according to educational attainment. As gleaned from the data, 44.16 % finished Bachelor's Degree and only 1.29% has reached the Doctorate level. These imply that the teachers from the six general high schools in Baggao still need professional growth and development since most of them finished the Bachelor's Degree only.



GENERAL COMMUNICATION STYLE

Table 8. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Principals and Teachers Grouped According to General Communication Style

Communication Style	Principals		Teachers		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Expressive	1	16.67	28	18.18	29	18.13
Amiable	1	16.67	56	36.36	57	35.63
Driver			3	1.95	3	1.88
Analytical			47	30.52	49	30.63
Expressive/ Amiable	2	33.33	3	1.95	3	1.88
Expressive/Driver			1	0.65	1	0.63
Expressive/ Analytical	2	33.33	5	3.25	7	4.38
Amiable/ Driver			2	1.30	2	1.25
Amiable/ Analytical			5	3.25	5	3.13
Driver/ Analytical			2	1.30	2	1.25
Expressive/Amiable/Analytical			2	1.30	2	1.25
Total	6	100.0	15	100.0	16	100.0
		0	4	0	0	0

The table presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents grouped according to General Communication Styles. In broader sense, the most dominant communication style among principals is the expressive style. Nevertheless, it is also shown in the data that among the six (6) principals, there are four (4) who have two dominant communication styles namely: expressive and amiable; expressive and analytical. These results imply that the principals dominantly communicate with their teachers in an expressive manner.

Aligning their communication styles in their function as a school leader, being expressive according to Baumgardner (2013), are those who love to have and enjoy helping others, full of ideas, talkative and open. They ask others for opinions and love to brainstorm. They are flexible and easily bored with routine. They are optimistic, intuitive, creative and



spontaneous and may have the tendency to be flamboyant. Sherman (2013) supports that since the principals are the managers of the schools, they tend to be assertive, decisive and task-oriented. For teacher-respondents, the first two highest dominant communication styles are amiable [36.36%] and analytical [30.52%] respectively. These imply that the teachers are generally obedient as subordinates and at the same time being careful before taking an action. Supporting this finding, Farrington (2013) contends that teachers as amiable tend to value personal relationships, helping others and being liked. They prefer to work with other people in a team effort, rather than to work individually. They are typically friendly, supportive, respectful, willing, dependable, agreeable and people-oriented. In addition, teachers as analytical are concerned with being organized, precise, orderly and methodical.

Table 9. Significant Differences Between the Principals and Teachers' General Communication Style

Communication Style	Principals		Teachers		Compute d Value	Probabi- lity Value	Decision
	f	%	f	%			
Expressive	1	16.67	28	18.18	7.32	0.69	Accept H ₀
Amiable	1	16.67	56	36.36			
Driver			3	1.95			
Analytical			47	30.52			
Expressive/Amiable	2	33.33	3	1.95			
Expressive/Driver			1	0.65			
Expressive/ Analytical	2	33.33	5	3.25			
Amiable/Driver			2	1.30			
Amiable/ Analytical			5	3.25			
Driver/ Analytical			2	1.30			
Expressive/Amiable/Analytical			2	1.30			
Total	6	100.00	154	100.00			

As gleaned on the table, the probability value with respect to the general communication styles of the principals and teachers is more than 0.05, thus the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that there is no significant difference between the communication styles of the



principals and the teachers. Furthermore, it implies that the communication styles of the principals and teachers are generally the same. Despite of the administrative functions of the principals, it can be inferred that they tend to be expressive, amiable, and analytical. Perhaps, they are expressive in the sense that they communicate well with their subordinates through explicit ideas to direct and guide them with the school's vision and at the same time update them with the necessary guidelines, procedures and memorandum pertaining the school system and the like. In the same manner, they tend to be amiable as leaders so as to win the heart of their subordinates and the people around them. And as school managers, they need to be analytical, logical and methodical as it is required of them. Conversely, the teachers are generally amiable, analytical, and also expressive. Though the order of the communication styles of the teachers explicitly identified as opposites of the communication styles of the principals in terms of frequency and percentage, they are all but the same kind. As teachers, they tend to be generally amiable as in its real sense, they really are because they are subordinates in school. They manifest dynamism and like analytical they tend to be less assertive but more responsive. They are considered slow decision makers because they want to make sure they have carefully weighed all the facts. (Levit , 2013)

Table 10. Significant Differences on the General Communication Styles of the Principals and Teachers When Grouped According to Profile Variables

Grouping Variable	Principals			Teachers		
	Computed Value	Probability Value	Interpretation	Computed Value	Probability Value	Interpretation
Position	10.41	0.32	Not significant	35.21	0.94	Not significant
Length of Service	4.87	0.18	Not significant	45.77	0.91	Not significant
Educational Attainment	6.59	0.36	Not significant	22.22	0.85	Not significant



DECISION: Accept

As inferred from the table, the probability values with respect to the communication styles of the principals and the teachers are more than 0.05 levels of significance; hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. This implies that there is no significant differences between the communication styles of the principals and teachers with respect to their position, length of service, and educational attainment. It further means that despite of their positions and functions in the school, the principals and teachers tend to have the same communication styles. In like manner, despite of their length of service, whether the principals nor teachers are serving the government in just a short while or in a longer time their communication styles are still similar with each other. Furthermore, it does not even matter what educational attainment the principals or the teachers finished because they utilized common communication styles.

COMMUNICATION STYLES IN THE WORKPLACE

Table 11. Communication Styles in the Workplace of Principals and Teachers Grouped According to Position

Communication Style	Principals						Teachers							
	HT3	P1	P2	P3	T	%	T1	T2	T3	MT1	MT2	HT1	T	%
Expressive				1	1	17.00	12	1	13	2			28	18.18
Amiable				1	1	17.00	31	2	19	2	2		56	36.36
Driver							3	0	0	0			3	1.95
Analytical		1	1		2	33.00	21	1	24	1			47	30
Expressive / Amiable							1	0	1	0		1	3	1.95
Expressive / Driver							0	0	1	0			1	.65
Expressive /Analytical	1		1		2	33.00	4	0	1	0			5	3.25



Amiable / Driver							0	0	2	0			2	1.30
Amiable/ Analytical							4	0	1	0			5	3.25
Driver/An alytical							2	0	0	0			2	1.30
Expressive / Amiable/ Analytical							2	0	0	0			2	1.30
Total	1	1	2	2	6	100.0	80	4	62	5	2	1	154	100.0
%	16.67	16.67	33.33	33.33	10		51.94	2.6	40.26	3.2	1.3	.65	100	
					0			0		5	0			

The table presents the communication styles in the workplace of principals and teachers grouped according to position. It can be gleaned from the data that 33.33% of the Principal 2 positions have different communication styles, one is analytical and the other one is expressive-analytical while 33.33% of the Principal 3 positions have communication styles that differ from each other. The first one is expressive and the other one is amiable. Generally, the Principal 2 and the Principal 3 positions are expressive-analytical in the manner they communicate.

On the other hand, the highest number of teachers belongs to Teacher 1 position with 80 or 51.94%. Among these teachers, 38.75% used the amiable communication style; 26.25% are analytical and 15% are expressive. Conversely, looking into the Teacher 3 position, it can be inferred that 38.71% who are analytical and 30.65% who are amiable. The data imply that those who are still new in the service like the Teacher 1 tend to be submissive while those Teacher 3 tend to be logical. These are the dominant features of analytical and amiable styles respectively.(Baumgardner, 2013)



Table 12. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in the Workplace Grouped According to Length of Service.

	Expre s sive	Amia ble	Driv er	Ana lyti cal	Exp res sive / Ami able	Exp ress ive/ Dri- ver	Exp ress ive/ Ana lytic al	Ami able / Dri- ver	Amia ble/ Analy tical	Drive / Analy tical	Expre ssive/ Amia ble/A nalyti cal	Total
PRINCI- PALS												
0-5												
6-10												
11-15												
16-20												
21-25	1											1
26-30							1					1
31-35		1		2			1					4
Total	1	1		2			2					6
Percentage	16.67	16.67		33. 33			33. 33					100.00
Teachers												
0-5	14	33		26	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	82
6-10	4	6	2	6			2	1	2		1	24
11-15	3	3		5	1		1					13
16-20	3	7	1	1						1		13
21-25	1	5		4	1				1			12
26-30		1		3								4
31-35	3	1		2								6
Total	28	56	3	47	3	1	5	2	5	2	2	154
Percentage	18.18	36.35	1.9 5	30. 52	1.9 5	.65	3.2 5	1.3 0	3.25	1.30	1.30	100.00

The table reveals the communication styles of principals and teachers in the workplace when grouped according to length of service. It can be inferred from the data that 66.67% of the principals have length of service ranging from 31-35 years and whose communication styles fall under analytical while the teachers have 53.25% on zero to five years in service



who are amiable in the manner they communicate. The results show that the longer the principals served their schools, the more logical they would become and this may be due to their various experiences in the field as well as in leading their subordinates. On the other hand, the teachers as new in the service tend to be submissive, however; they can all work for the success of the organization whether new or old in the service as Ekaterini (2010) stressed.

Table 13. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Communication Style	Principals					Teachers						
	MST/MAED Graduate	Ph.D. units	Ph.D. Graduate	Total	%	Bachelor's Degree	MST/MAED units	MST/MAED Graduate	Ph.D. units	Ph.D. Graduate	Total	%
Expressive			1	1	16.67	10	7	11			28	18.18
Amiable	1			1	16.67	25	6	24	1		56	36.36
Driver								3			3	1.95
Analytical	1		1	2	33.33	23	7	16	1		47	30.52
Expressive/Amiable						2		1			3	1.95
Expressive/Driver						1					1	0.65
Expressive/Analytical	1	1		2	33.33	3		2			5	3.25
Amiable/Driver								2			2	1.30
Amiable/Analytical						2	1	2			5	2.25
Driver/						1		1			2	1.30



Analytical												
Expressive/ Amiable/ Analytical						1	1				2	1.30
Total	3	1	2	6	100.00	68	22	62	2		154	100.00
%	50.00	16.67	33.33	100.00		44.16	14.29	40.26	1.30		100.00	

The table conveys the communication styles of principals and teachers in the workplace grouped according to educational attainment. It can be gleaned on the table that 50% of the principals finished Master’s Degree and whose communication styles vary, 16.67% from them is amiable, the other 16.67% is analytical and also the other 16.67% is the combination of expressive-analytical.

On the contrary, the teachers who are Bachelor’s Degree holders comprised 44.16% and from them, 36.76% is amiable and 33.82% is analytical. Generally, these imply that in spite of differences in the educational attainment, the principals and teachers matched with respect to their communication style. De Vries, Baker & Oostenveld (2009) confirm this finding and further stressed the importance of leaders’ supportiveness, assuredness and preciseness when communicating with others.

Table 14. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in Viewing Themselves When Grouped According to Position

Communication Style	Principals						Teachers							
	HT3	P1	P2	P3	Total	%	T1	T2	T3	MT1	MT2	HT1	Total	%
Expressive							1						1	0.65
Amiable	1	1		2	4	66.67	44		35	2	1		82	53.25



Driver							2		1				3	1.95
Analytical							4		6				10	6.49
Expressive/ Analytical			2		2	33.33	29	4	20	3	1	1	58	37.66
Total	1	1	2	2	6	100	80	4	62	5	2	1	154	100.00
%	16.67	16.67	33.33	33.33	100.00		51.95	2.60	40.26	3.25	1.30	.65	100.00	

The table indicates the communication styles of principals and teachers in viewing themselves when grouped according to position. It can be inferred from the data that 33.33% of the Principal 2 are amiable and 33.33% of the Principal 3 are expressive-analytical in viewing themselves. On the other hand, the most number of teacher-respondents belonged to the Teacher 1 position with 51.95% who used the amiable communication style. It is worthy to note; however, that the Teacher 3 position with 40.26% also used the amiable style of communication. Generally, the principals and teachers matched in their communication styles in this particular situation and they have the tendency to work better as supported by Da Silva, et. al. (2014) who stressed that communication not only conveys information and expresses emotions, it is also characterized by a particular relational style (i.e. communication style).

Table 15. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in Viewing Themselves When Grouped According to Length of Service

Communication Style	Principals				Teachers								
	26-30	31-35	Total	%	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	Total	%
Expressive		1	1	16.67	1							1	.65
Amiable					49	13	7	7	5	1		82	53.25



Driver	1		1	16. 67	3							3	1.9 5
Analytical		2	2	33. 33	3	3	1	2	1			10	6.4 9
Expressive/Ana lytical	1	1	2	33. 33	28	12	5	4	6	3		58	37. 66
Total	2	4	6	100 .00	84	28	13	13	12	4		15	10 0.0 0
5	33. 33	66. 67	100 .00		54. 55	18. 18	8.4 4	8.4 4	7.7 9	2.6 0		10	0.0 0

The communication styles of principals and teachers in viewing themselves when grouped according to length of service are shown in the table above. It can be gleaned on the data that 66.67% of the principals whose length of service ranged from 31-35 years vary in communication styles in viewing themselves. This implies that as they get longer in the service they tend to be more logical and may have the tendency to vary their communication styles depending on the situation and this is supported by Drynan (2011) who added that learning how to communicate with the different generations is very important and can eliminate many major confrontations and misunderstandings in the workplace. Likewise, the teachers whose length of service ranged from zero to five have 54.55% whose communication style is amiable. This implies that since the teachers are still new in the service, they tend to be submissive and according to Farrington (2013) typically, they are friendly, supportive, respectful, willing, dependable and agreeable. They are also people-oriented.



Table 16. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in Viewing Themselves When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Communication Style	Principals					Teachers						
	MS T/MAE D Graduate	Ph.D. UNITS	Ph.D Graduate	Total	%	Bachelor's Degree	MS T/MAED units	MS T/MAED Graduate	Ph.D. units	Ph.D. Graduate	Total	%
Expressive						1					1	.65
Amiable	1	1	2	4	66.67	34	14	33	1		82	53.25
Driver						2	1				3	1.95
Analytical						5	2	3			10	6.49
Expressive/Analytical	2			2	33.33	26	5	26	1		58	37.66
Total	3	1	2	6	100.00	68	22	62	2		154	100.00
%	50.00	16.67	33.33	100.00		44.16	14.29	40.26	1.30		100.00	

The data from the table revealed that 50% of the principals finished Master's Degree and whose communication styles are amiable and expressive-analytical.

Farrington (2013) believed that when they are amiable, they tend to value relationships and would avoid conflicts; as they are expressive-analytical, they enjoy involvement, excitement and interpersonal interaction. Also, 34 out of 68 or 50% from the Bachelor's Degree holders



of the teacher-respondents are amiable in viewing themselves. This implies that those who have not acquired Master's units tend to be submissive and willing to follow their school heads. Moreover, faculty tend to be amiable persons being more easygoing, trusting members of an organization. (eric.ed.gov)

**Table 17. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers
in Viewing Time Frame Grouped According to Position**

Communication Style	Principals						Teachers							
	HT 3	P1	P2	P3	To tal	%	T1	T 2	T3	M T1	M T 2	H T 1	Tot al	%
Expressive				1	1	16.67	4		10				14	9.09
Amiable			1		1	16.67	27	2	15		1		45	29.22
Driver							2		4				6	3.90
Analytical	1	1			2	33.33	18		12	1			31	20.13
Expressive/Analytical			1	1	2	33.33	29	2	21	4	1	1	58	37.66
Total	1	1	2	2	6	100.00	80	4	62	5	2	1	154	100.00
%	16.67	16.67	33.33	33.33	100.00		51.95	2.60	40.26	3.25	1.30	.65	100.00	

The table concedes the communication style of principals and teachers in viewing time frame when grouped according to position. It is worthy to note that 33.33% of the Principal 2 made use of two different communication styles such as amiable and expressive-



analytical while 33.33% of the Principal 3 utilized expressive and expressive-analytical in viewing time frame. The results of the findings reveal that the principals play a great role as managers who delved on the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of a vision or set goals. (Munda, 2014). The teachers under Teacher 1 position with 51.95% comprised the greatest number of teacher-respondents whose communication style is also expressive-analytical in viewing time frame. This implies that teachers are aware of their function. According to Farrington (2013) as these people are expressive-analytical, they are task-oriented. They are focused on the future and have quick reaction times. Comparing the principals and teachers, it could be seen that the expressive/analytical style has the most number with 33.33% for principals and 37.66% for teachers. In other words, these mean that understanding could be possibly achieved since their styles are quite similar. (Reyes, 2014)

Table 18. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in Viewing Time Frame Grouped According to Length of Service

Communication Style	Principals			Teachers							
	26-30	31-35	Total	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	Total
Expressive		1	1	7	2	2	2	1			14
Amiable				22	8	2	6	5	2		45
Driver	1		1	4		1				1	6
Analytical		2	2	17	6	4	3			1	31
Expressive/Analytical	1	1	2	32	8	4	2	6	2	4	58
Total	2	4	6	82	24	13	13	12	4	6	154
%	33.33	66.67	100.00	53.25	15.52	8.44	8.44	7.79	2.60	3.90	100.00

The data revealed that 66.67% of the principals or 4 out of 6 whose services ranged from 31-35 vary in communication styles in perceiving time frame. They are expressive, analytical, expressive-analytical. This implies that as the principals get longer in the government service, according to Farrington (2013) the more focused they are on people rather than on-task. They prefer to work with other people in a team effort, rather than individually, and



have unhurried reaction times. They are unconcerned with effecting change. The teacher-respondents whose services ranged from 0-5 comprised 53.25% or 82 out of 154 in viewing time frame. However, generally speaking, the teacher-respondents are expressive-analytical with 37.66% or 58 out of 154 which implies that being new in the service, according to Levit (2013), they tend to be slow decision makers because they want to make sure they have carefully weighed all the facts but more assertive and more responsive.

Table 19. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in Viewing Time Frame When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Communication Style	Principals					Teachers						
	MS T/MAE D Graduate	Ph. D. UNITS	Ph.D Graduate	Total	%	Bachelor's Degree	MS T/MAED units	MS T/MAED Graduate	Ph. D. units	Ph. D. Graduate	Total	%
Expressive	1			1	16.67	5	3	5	1		14	9.09
Amiable	1			1	16.67	21	8	15	1		45	29.22
Driver		1	1	2	33.33	3		3			6	3.90
Analytical	1		1	2	33.33	13	4	14			31	20.13
Varied Communication Style						26	7	25			58	37.66
Total	3	1	2	6	100	68	22	62	2		15	100.



					.00						4	00
%	50.00	16.67	33.33	100.00		44.16	14.29	40.26	1.30		10	0.00

The table declares the communication styles of the principals and teachers in viewing time frame when grouped according to educational attainment. It can be gleaned on the data that 33.33% of the principals tend to use the communication style as driver and also 33.33% of them are analytical. Nonetheless, 50% of the principals finished Master's Degree and who use the expressive, amiable, and analytical communication style in viewing time frame. This implies that most of the principals tend to be flexible on time where principals spent on different types of activities and school outcomes including student achievement, teacher, and parent assessments of the school and teacher satisfaction. (Horng,E.;Kasik,D.;&Loeb,S.,2009). On the other hand, 44.16% or 68 out of 154 of the teachers finished Bachelor's Degree and whose dominant communication style is varied. 40.26% or 62 out of 154 are also Master's Degree and who likewise use varied communication style in viewing time frame. These imply that teachers are good followers to their principals. They generally tend to adjust to the organizational leaders as they found time spent on organizational management activities is associated with positive school outcomes. (Horng, E.;Kasik,D.;&Loeb,S.,2009)

Table 20. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in Viewing Environment and Setting Preferences When Grouped According to Position

Communication Style	Principals						Teachers							
	T3	P1	P2	P3	Total	%	T1	T2	T3	M T1	M T2	HT 1	Total	%
Expressive				1	1	16.67	1		1				2	.65
Amiable	1		2	1	4	66.67	3		4				7	4.55
Driver		1			1	16.67	14	1	14	2	1		32	20.78



Analytical							35	1	27	1	1		65	42.21
Expressive/Analytical							27	2	16	2		1	48	31.17
Total	1	1	2	2	6	10	80	4	62	5	2	1	15	10
%	16.67	16.67	33.33	33.33	10.00		51.95	2.60	40.26	3.25	1.30	.65	10.00	

The table revealed the communication styles of principals and teachers in viewing environment and setting preferences when grouped according to position. It further conveyed that both the Principal 2 and Principal 3 position comprised the 33.33% of the principal respondents. The highest number of principals with 66.67% used the communication style which is amiable. This implies that being a leader means being a good communicator (Munda,2014). Villenes (2013) supports the results and believes that an amiable leader usually shares values that make the school work better.

On the other hand, 42.81% or 65 out of 154 of teacher-respondents used the analytical style. This implies that these teachers who are still new tend to adjust themselves with the new environment, thus becoming more critical and logical. (Free-Management-eBooks,2014)

Table 21. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in Viewing Environment and Setting Preferences When Grouped According to Length of Service

Communication Style	Principals				Teachers									
	26-30	31-35	Total	%	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	Total	%	
Expressive					2							2	1.30	
Amiable	1		1	16.67	3	3		1				7	4.55	



Driver	1	3	4	66. 67	17	5	4	4	1		1	32	20. 78
Analytical		1	1	16. 67	31	8	7	3	10	2	4	65	42. 20
Varied Communication Style					29	8	2	5	1	2	1	48	31. 17
Total	2	4	6	100	82	24	13	13	12	4	6	154	100 .00
%	33. 33	66. 67	100 .00		53. 25	15. 58	8.4 4	8.4 4	7.7 9	2.6 0	3.9 0	100 .00	

The table shows the communication styles of principals and teachers in viewing environment and setting preferences. It can be gleaned on the data that generally, majority of the principals are drivers with 67.67% and most of the principals whose length of service ranged from 31-35 years are also drivers; whereas, the dominant style for teachers with 42.20% or 65 out of 154 is analytical. Moreover, 37.80% or 31 out of 82 of the teachers whose services ranged from zero to five years are also analytical. These imply that the principals despite of getting older in the service tend to be action-and goal-oriented, strive for results and react quickly. (Farrington, 2013)

On the other hand, the teachers who are still new in the service tend to be analytical which suggests being organized and systematic (Farrington, 2013).

Table 22. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in Viewing Environment and Setting Preferences When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Communication Style	Principals					Teachers						
	MS T/ MA ED Gra -	Ph. D. UN ITS	Ph. D. Gra dua te	Tot al	%	Bac he- lor' s Deg ree	MS T/ MA ED unit s	MST / MAE D Gra- duat	Ph. D. uni ts	Ph. D. Gr a- du ate	Tot al	%



	dua							e				
Expressive			1	1	16.67		2				2	1.30
Amiable						1		5	1		7	4.55
Driver	3	1		4	66.67	15	3	14			32	20.78
Analytical			1	1	16.67	28	7	29	1		65	42.21
Varied Communication Style						24	10	14			48	31.17
Total	3	1	2	6	100.00	68	22	62	2		154	100.00
%	50.00	16.67	33.33	100.00		44.16	14.29	40.26	1.30		100.00	

The table presents the communication styles of principals and teachers in viewing environment and setting preferences when grouped according to educational attainment. It can be delineated from the data that 50% of the principals finished Master's Degree and who possessed communication style as drivers. This implies that their educational attainment affects the manner they make decisions as leaders, thus their focus is on being successful and making things happen (Baumgardner, 2013). 44.16% or 68 out of 154 of the teacher-respondents finished Bachelor's Degree, however; next to highest are Master's graduates with 40.26% or 62 out of 154. Obviously, there was a slim gap in the number of Bachelor's Degree holders and Master's graduates among the teacher-respondents. It is worthy to note that a common communication style is used by the teachers who are Bachelor's Degree and MST or MAED Graduates. This is the analytical style. It is the highest number of communication style for teachers 65 out of 154 or 42.21%. This means that these teachers love to gather details and organize things, tend to be deep, thoughtful, serious and



purposeful. They hesitate to make decision when they do not have enough facts.
(info@maximum advantage.com)

For the principals, in viewing environment and setting preferences they used the driver style. This means that they are comfortable in positions of power and control and they have business like offices with certificates and commendations on the walls. (Farrington, 2013)

The results further affirm one of the functions of managers which is leading. Successful managers are also successful leaders because they influence employees to help accomplish organizational goals. (Naile&Selesho, 2014). Results also clarify the teachers' role as a follower and supporter to the principal but not as a blind follower because these teachers tend to be logical.

Table 23. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers When Motivated and Grouped According to Position

Communication Style	Principals						Teachers							
	HT 3	P1	P2	P3	Tot al	%	T1	T2	T3	M T 1	M T 2	H T 1	Tot al	%
Expressive	1	1	1	1	4	66.67	41	2	35	4	1		83	53.90
Amiable							2		1				3	1.95
Driver				1	1	16.67	6	1	6	1			14	9.09
Analytical							13	1	5		1		20	12.99
Varied Communication Style			1		1	16.67	18		15			1	34	2.60
Total	1	1	2	2	6	100.0	80	4	62	5	2	1	154	100.0



						0								0
%	16.	16.	33.	33.	10		51.	2.6	40.	3.	1.	.6	10	
	67	67	33	33	0.0		95	0	26	2	3	5	0.0	
					0					5	0		0	

Generally, 66.67% of the principals used the expressive style when motivated. This implies that motivation could lead a person to express himself and his thoughts better. (Barrett,2008). It is worthy to note that 33.33% of the principals who occupy the Principal 2 position used varied communication style and the expressive style while the 33.33% also of the Principal 3 are expressive-driver. These imply that as they acquire higher position, the more they tend to be flexible as they deal with teachers with various cultures and behaviors. Furthermore, this flexibility exhibits behavior that improve teacher motivation which results not only an increase in student achievement but also a more successful school overall. (Price, 2008)

For teachers, 53.90% or 83 out of 154 used the expressive communication style when motivated and grouped according to position. On the other hand, the Teacher 1 position comprised 51.95% of teacher-respondents whose communication style is also expressive especially when challenged, inspired and motivated. This implies that as teacher beginners, they tend to be open-minded and tend to share they ideas to enhance education and that students have better chance at being successful.(Price, 2008).

Table 24. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers When Motivated and Grouped According to Length of Service

Communi- cation Style	Principals				Teachers								
	26- 30	31- 35	Tot al	%	0-5	6- 10	11- 15	16- 20	21- 25	26- 30	31- 35	To tal	%
Expressive	1	3	4	66. 67	45	11	8	9	6	2	2	83	53. 90
Amiable					2						1	3	1.9 5



Driver	1		1	16. 67	7	3	1	2			1	14	9.0 9
Analytical					12	3	2		2	1		20	12. 98
Varied Communica- tion Style		1	1	16. 67	16	7	2	2	4	1	2	34	22. 08
Total	2	4	6	100 .00	82	24	13	13	12	4	6	15 4	10 0.0 0
%	33. 33	66. 67	100 .00		53. 25	15. 58	8.4 4	8.4 4	7.7 9	2.6 0	3.9 0	10 0.0 0	

It can be inferred from the table that in general, the principals used the expressive communication style with 66.67% and the same percentage for principals whose length of service ranged from 31-35 years are also expressive when motivated. According to Price (2008) if principals are exhibiting behaviors that improve teacher motivation, the result is not only an increase in student achievement, but a more successful school overall. DeMatthews(2014) added that research has highlighted the importance of principals establishing a school culture, mission and vision with the purpose of aligning action and motivating teachers toward common goals. On the other hand, the teacher-respondents are also generally expressive in their communication style with 53.90% or 83 out of 154 and most of them 82 out of 154 or 53.25% fall under zero to five years in service who are also expressive in their communication styles in dealing with challenges and inspiration in life. Price (2008) moreover emphasized that if a teacher is motivated to do his/her best at enhancing education, that students have a better chance at being successful. In summary, both the principals and the teachers use common communication style when motivated. With this, Reyes(2014) highlighted that communication can be most reliable and comfortable resulting to highly effective understanding and excellent communication.



Table 25. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers When Motivated and Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Communication Style	Principals					Teachers						
	MS T/MAE D Gr a-du ate	Ph. D UN ITS	Ph. D. Gra - dua te	Tot al	%	Bach e- lor's Degr ee	MS T/ MA ED unit s	MS T/ MAE D Gr ad	Ph. D. unit s	Ph. D. Gr a- du ate	Tot al	%
Expressive	2	1	1	4	66.67	35	12	35	1		83	53.90
Amiable						1	1	1			3	1.95
Driver			1	1	16.67	7	1	6			14	9.09
Analytical						11	1	8			20	12.98
Varied Communication Style	1			1	16.67	14	7	12	1		34	20.8
Total	3	1	2	6	100.00	68	22	62	2		154	100.00
%	50.00	16.67	33.33	100.00		44.16	14.29	40.26	1.30		100.00	

It can be gleaned on the table that most of the principals or 66.67% used the expressive communication style when motivated. Moreover, half of their total number or 50% finished Master's Degree and who used the expressive style and varied communication style when motivated. Along with the function of a principal, Moore (2010) emphasized that once



expressive, they thrive an open communication with others and as a key role of a leader, they tend to harness enthusiasm to help others toward the achievement of objectives. Ultimately, expressive live for recognition – preferably if it is shown publicly. As viewed on the table on the other hand, 53.90% or 83 out of 154 of the teacher-respondents utilized the expressive communication style. Furthermore, 44.16% or 68 out of 154 of them finished Bachelor’s Degree. It is followed by those who finished Master’s Degree with 40.26% or 62 out of 154; nevertheless, both degrees consist the same number 35 out of 154 or 22.73% in terms of their communication style. They tend to be expressive when motivated and according to Moore (2010) since they are teachers they are both responsive and assertive. They have no qualms about speaking out and are often viewed as upbeat and enthusiastic. In addition, expressive like to be noticed. They can be persuasive when they put their mind to it and often prefer talking over other forms of communication.

Table 26. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers When Demotivated and Grouped According to Position

CommunicationS tyle	Principals						Teachers							
	HT 3	P1	P2	P3	To tal	%	T1	T2	T3	M T1	M T2	H T 1	To tal	%
Expressive							3		3	1			7	4.5 5
Amiable							25	1	23	2	1		52	33. 77
Driver	1		2	2	5	83. 33	27	2	20			1	50	32. 47
Analytical		1			1	16. 67	3		3	1			7	4.5 5
Varied Communication Style							22	1	13	1	1		38	24. 68
Total	1	1	2	2	6	10	80	4	62	5	2	1	15	100



						0.0							4	.00
						0								
%	16.	16.	33.	33.	10		51.	2.6	40.	3.2	1.3	.6	10	
	67	67	33	33	0.0		95	0	26	5	0	5	0.0	
					0								0	

As a whole, 83.33% or 5 out of 6 from the principals used driver as their communication style. Moreover, the table reveals specifically that both principals who belonged to the Principal 2 and Principal 3 positions comprised 33.33% whose communication style is likewise driver when demotivated. It implies that these principals tend to be decisive as leaders whenever faced with challenges in the field. As Moore (2010) contends drivers are enthusiastic and listen to other's thoughts and ideas and after a while make favorable decisions. Also, it can be inferred that the highest number of the teacher-respondents used the amiable communication style with 52 or 33.77% and followed by 50 or 32.47% of them used the communication style as driver. To be specific, 51.95% or 80 out of 154 who is belonging to the Teacher 1 position used the driver as their communication style when demotivated. This implies that despite discouragement, drivers have the ability to deal with tough interactions without becoming upset by criticism or personal rejection. (www.softed.com)

For the teachers who belonged to Teacher 3, the most number with 37.10% or 23 out of 62 used the amiable communication style. This result affirms the contention on the study of differences between the administrators and faculty. On the basis of research, the social styles of administrators, deans, and department heads tend to be assertive i.e. analytical, and driving. Faculty; however, tend to be amiable or expressive. Continuing efforts to determine differences between administrators and faculty will result in better understanding and allow administrators to better serve their institutions' various constituencies. (eric.ed.gov)



Table 27. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers When Demotivated and Grouped According to Length of Service

Communication Style	Principals				Teachers								
	26-30	31-35	Total	%	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	Total	%
Expressive					5	1		1				7	4.55
Amiable	1		1	16.67	31	10	2	2	3	2	2	52	33.77
Driver					20	7	8	5	7	1	2	50	32.47
Analytical	1	1	2	33.33	4	2			1			7	4.55
Varied Communication Style		3	3	50	22	4	3	5	1	1	2	38	24.68
Total	2	4	6	100.00	82	24	13	13	12	4	6	154	100.00
%	33.33	66.67	100.00		53.25	15.58	8.44	8.44	7.79	2.60	3.90	100.00	

The table reveals that half the number of principals (3 out of 6 or 50%) used varied communication styles and 2 or 33.33% used the analytical style. In particular, the principals whose length of service ranged from 31-35 years (4 out of 6 or 66.67%) possessed varied communication styles. This implies that they can have their own way of handling discouragement and disappointments as leaders. It also shows flexibility on the part of the principals' communication style. resource.mccneb.edu suggests that the ability to identify another person's communication style, and to know how and when to adapt a preferred style to it, can give one an important advantage in dealing with people. Learning to adapt the style to fit the needs of another person is called "style flexing." Contrariwise, the teacher-respondents with 52 or 33.37% used the amiable communication style and also 50 or 32.47% are drivers. Also, 53.25% or 82 out of 154 teachers whose length of service ranged from zero to five years used the amiable communication style. Being amiable in situations like discouragement in the class means they avoid any conflict, lacking drive and becoming careless. (www.changingminds) This also shows that despite demotivation, they still tend to be amiable



Table 28. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers When Demotivated and Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Communication Style	Principals					Teachers						
	MS T/MA ED Graduate	Ph.D units	Ph.D Graduate	Total	%	Bachelor's Degree	MS T/MA ED units	MST /MAE D Grad	Ph.D. units	Ph.D. Graduate	Total	%
Expressive						4		3			7	4.55
Amiable						25	9	18			52	33.77
Driver	3	1	1	5	83.33	14	11	24	1		50	32.47
Analytical						4	1	2			7	4.55
Varied Communication Style			1	1	16.67	21	1	15	1		38	24.68
Total	3	1	2	6	100.00	68	22	62	2		154	100.00
%	33.33	16.67	33.33	100.00		44.16	14.29	40.26	1.30		100.00	

The table conveys that 50% or 3 out of 6 from the principals are Master's Degree holders. However, generally, 83.33% of them used driver as communication style in moments of discouragement. Based from the result of the findings, www.softed.com stressed that principals tend to be control specialists. They have the ability to deal with tough interaction without being upset by criticism or personal rejection. The table also reveals that the teachers who are Bachelor's Degree holders possessed the greatest number (68 of 154 or 44.16%) among the other teachers in terms of educational attainment and dominantly their communication style with 36.76% or 25 out of 68 or generally 52 of 154 or 33.77% is amiable when being discouraged. They tend to seek deep meaning in a relationship or experiences as www.softed.com contends. There is a contrasting type of communication styles used by principals and teachers when demotivated and grouped according to educational attainment. This generally means that the principals are more driven to be great



leaders despite challenges while the teachers tend to be meek and kind, accept criticisms despite disappointments.(eric.ed.gov)

Table 29. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in their Communication Patterns Used When Grouped According to Position

Communication Style	Principals						Teachers							
	HT 3	P1	P2	P3	Tota l	%	T1	T2	T3	MT 1	MT 2	HT 1	Tot al	%
Expressive				1	1	16.67	1	1	3				5	3.25
Amiable							23	3	16	3	1	1	47	30.52
Driver							1		3				4	2.60
Analytical	1		1		2	33.33	17		16				33	21.43
Varied Communication Style		1	1	1	3	50.00	38		24	2	1		65	42.21
Total	1	1	2	2	6	100.00	80	4	62	5	2	1	154	100.00
%	16.67	16.67	33.33	33.33	100.00		51.95	2.60	40.26	3.25	1.30	.65	100.00	

The data manifest that both the Principal 2 and Principal 3 positions comprised 33.33% who used varied communication styles in their communication patterns. On the other hand, among the teacher-respondents the Teacher 1 comprised the greatest number (80 out of 154 or 51.95%) and whose communication style is varied.

The data reveal that from the six principals, 33.33% or 2 out of 6 in the P2 position used the analytical and the varied communication styles; 33.33% or 2 out of 6 also used the expressive and the varied communication styles in the P3 position. Nonetheless, it is worthy to note that among the six, 50% of them utilized varied communications styles. These mean that the principals do not actually convey a specific communication style and do not establish a communication styles depending upon their interactant and the deferring situations they are in.



For the teachers, 51.95% or 80 out of 154 belong to the T1 position. 38.71% or 24 out of 62 teachers in the T3 position also used varied communication styles. The same holds true if you look at the overall communication styles used. Many (65 out of 154 or 42.21%) used varied styles. This may be true because teachers deal with different styles of students who have varied needs and styles.

Generally, these imply that both principals and teachers utilized different communication styles in different situations. Such varied communication styles also develop strong interactive communication patterns to gain understanding of how things are done. (Clement, 2008)

Table 30. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in their Communication Patterns Used When Grouped According to Length of Service

Communication Style	Principals				Teachers								
	26-30	31-35	Total	%	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	Total	%
Expressive						2			1	1	1	5	3.25
Amiable	1		1	16.67	27	7	3	4	2	2	2	47	30.52
Driver					2	1		1				4	2.60
Analytical	1	1	2	33.33	20	3	1	1	4	1	3	33	21.43
Varied Communication Style		3	3	50	33	11	9	7	5			65	42.21
Total	2	4	6	100.00	82	24	13	13	12	4	6	154	100.00
%	33.33	66.67	100.00		53.25	15.58	8.44	8.44	7.79	2.60	3.90	100.00	

Generally, it can be gleaned from the table that half the number of principals or 50% used varied communication styles; moreover, 66.67% of them or 4 out of 6 whose length of service ranged from 31-35 years also have varied style of communication. Contrary to the length of service of the principals, most or 53.25% of the teacher-respondents have the length of service that ranged from zero to five years. They are those who are still new in the



service and whose communication styles are likewise varied. Comparing the principals and teachers' communication styles, it could be gleaned that they have similarity in using varied communication styles when looking into their communication patterns. Furthermore, this means that the length of service does not affect the communication style they use whether they are already old or new in the service.

Table 31. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in their Communication Patterns Used When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Communication Style	Principals					Teachers						
	MST/MAE Graduate	Ph.D. units	Ph.D. Graduate	Total	%	Bachelor's Degree	MST/MAE units	MST/MAE Grad	Ph.D. units	Ph.D. Graduate	Total	%
Expressive						1	1	3			5	3.25
Amiable			1	1	16.67	17	7	22	1		47	30.52
Driver						1		3			4	2.60
Analytical	1	1		2	33.33	16	5	12			33	21.43
Varied Communication Style	2		1	3	33.33	33	9	22	1		65	42.21
Total	3	1	2	6	100.00	68	22	62	2		154	100.00
%	50.00	16.67	33.33	100.00		44.16	14.29	40.26	1.30		100.00	

It can be deciphered from the data that the principals who are Master's graduates comprised 50% or 3 out of 6 used varied communication patterns and 44.16% or 68 out of 154 of the Bachelor's Degree holders of the teacher-respondents are likewise varied in their communication styles. These imply that both principals and teachers vary in their communication styles depending on the situations. info@maximum advantage.com (2013) asserted that the more one communicates in a wide variety of situations, the greater one's ability to deal with any communications environment regardless of the context or



circumstances .According to Burley (2015)different companies and organizations identify them by many names, but these styles are all recognized as important for successful communication in the workplace. While everyone has a preferred method or style, effective leaders and employees use each style as needed and remain flexible in their approach, depending on the situation. The best results occur when people use a style that most clearly matches the needs of their group or organization. Considering the different profile variables in this situation, it is observed that generally the communication patterns of the respondents are varied as gleaned on Tables 29,30, and 31. It is understood that the respondents do not follow certain communication patterns

Table 32. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in their Decision Making When Grouped According to Position

Communication Style	Principals						Teachers							
	HT	P1	P2	P3	Total	%	T1	T2	T3	M T1	M T2	H T1	Total	%
Expressive							3		5				8	5.19
Amiable			1		1	16.67	22	3	21		1		47	30.52
Driver							1		2				3	1.95
Analytical	1	1	1	2	5	83.33	49		31	4	1	1	86	55.84
Varied Communication Style							5	1	3	1			10	.65
Total	1	1	2	2	6	100.00	80	4	62	5	2	1	154	100.00
%	16.67	16.67	33.33	33.33	100.00		51.95	2.60	40.26	3.25	1.30	.65	100.00	



Overall, the principals are analytical when faced with situations that need decision making with 83.33% or 5 out of 6 as inferred from the table. These imply that as managers of schools, they tend to focus on process, tasks and doing things the right way. They prefer a rational approach, logical thinking, solid documentation and careful planning and as Analytical, they focus on the feelings of other people and effective collaboration (Baumgardner, 2013). Also, the teacher 1 position comprised the highest number which is 51.92% or 80 out of 154 among teacher-respondents and 49 or 31.82% from them used the analytical communication style in making a decision. The result aligns with the findings of the study made by DE Matthews (2014) in shared decision-making where quality decisions are more likely when principals involved teachers and staff in decisions especially when they would be aware of strategies and how it be appropriately applied.

Table 33. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in Decision Making When Grouped According to Length of Service

Communication Style	Principals				Teachers								
	26-30	31-35	Total	%	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	Total	%
Expressive					2	2	2	1	1			8	5.19
Amiable	1		1	16.67	22	10	4	4	4	2	1	47	30.52
Driver					2			1				3	1.95
Analytical	1	4	5	83.33	49	11	7	6	7	2	4	86	55.84
Varied Communication Style					7	1		1			1	10	.65
Total	2	4	6	100.00	82	24	13	13	12	4	6	154	100.00
%	33.	66.	100		53.	15.	8.4	8.4	7.7	2.6	3.9	10	



	33	67	.00		25	58	4	4	9	0	0	0.0	0
--	----	----	-----	--	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	-----	---

The data show that most (83.33%) of the principals are analytical in terms of decision making. However, it is worthy to note that 66.67% of the principals whose length of service ranged from 31-35 years are analytical. This implies that the longer the length of service the principal has served, the greater is the tendency for him/her to be analytical. Simon (2015) in his research entitled, "Making Management and Decisions: The Role of Intuition and Emotion" contends that intuition and judgement rest on extensive experience and knowledge. In general, majority of the teachers tend to use the analytical style in decision making (86 or 55.84%) when grouped according to length of service. Among them, teachers who belong to 0-5 years are the highest user of the style (49 out of 82 or 60%) and among teachers belonging to the 31-35 comprised 67% who are also analytical. Based on the data, the younger the teacher is in service, the more analytical he/she is, and also; the longer the stay a teacher tends to be, the more analytical in making decisions he can be. (Simon, 2015).

Table 34. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in Decision Making When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Communication Style	Principals					Teachers						
	MS T/MA ED Graduate	Ph. D. uni ts	Ph. D. Graduate	Total	%	Bachelor's Degree	MS T/MA ED units	MS T/MA ED Graduate	Ph. D. units	Ph. D. Graduate	Total	%
Expressive						1	2	5			8	5.19
Amiable	1			1	16.67	23	4	20			47	30.52
Driver						2		1			3	1.9



												5
Analytical	2	1	2	5	83. 33	37	14	33	2		86	55. 84
Varied Communicatio n Style						5	2	3			10	.65
Total	3	1	2	6	100 .00	68	22	62	2		154	100 .00
%	50. 00	16. 67	33. 33	100 .00		44. 16	14. 29	40. 26	1.3 0		100 .00	

Obviously, the data present 50% of the principals or 3 out of 6 have graduated Master’s Degree and whose dominant communication style is analytical in making a decision. However, generally speaking, almost all of the principals (5 or 83.33%) are analytical in terms of decision making. On the other hand, the teachers are mostly (44.16%) Bachelor’s Degree holders as revealed on the table and they have the same communication style with that of the principals which is analytical. These mean that the principals and teachers match since they have commonality in communication styles when face with situations that needs decision making. When communication styles fit between the head and the subordinate, less friction can be expected since both would be able to understand each other’s ways. Besides, joint decisions include principals and teachers working together to develop a positive behavioral system that is universally applied across the school in every classroom and common space. Rather than simply engaging and not engaging in shared decision-making, both veteran and inexperienced should be aware of some strategies and reasons for shared decision-making and how it can be appropriately applied. Thus, teachers are analytical in all undertakings. (DeMatthews, 2014). Taking a look into all the tables (Table 32, 33, 34) under decision making situation, it can be gleaned that both principals and teachers tend to be analytical.

Table 35. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers When Under Stress and Grouped According to Position

	Principals	Teachers
--	------------	----------



Communication Style	HT	P1	P2	P3	Total	%	T1	T2	T3	MT	M	H	Total	%
Expressive							6		5	1			12	7.79
Amiable							2		3				5	3.25
Driver							5		43				8	5.18
Analytical	1	1	2	2	6	100.00	61	3	8	4	2	1	114	74.03
Varied Communication Style							6	1					15	9.74
Total	1	1	2	2	6	100.00	80	4	62	5	2	1	154	100.00
%	16.67	16.67	33.33	33.33	100.00		51.95	2.60	40.26	3.25	1.30	.65	100.00	

The data affirm that all the six principals (6 or 100%) are analytical when under stress. These imply that position does not affect the communication style when under stress. On the other hand, the most number of teachers (114 out of 154 or 74.03%) used the communication style as analytical when under stress and many of them are in Teacher 1 position. This implies that these teachers who are still new tend to be logical before they would act on a certain problem. Moreover, according to Baumgardner (2013), people tend to avoid others when under stress. This could possibly be the reason why they tend to be analytical for them to rest or to think better.



Table 36. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers When Under Stress and Grouped According to Length of Service

Communication Style	Principals				Teachers								
	26-30	31-35	Total	%	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	Total	%
Expressive					8	2	1		1			12	7.79
Amiable	2	4	6	100.00	2		1	2				5	3.25
Driver					7	1						8	5.18
Analytical					59	18	10	9	9	4	5	114	74.03
Varied Communication Style					6	3	1	2	2	1	1	15	9.74
Total	2	4	6	100.00	82	24	13	13	12	4	6	154	100.00
%	33.33	66.67	100.00		53.25	15.38	8.44	8.44	7.7	2.6	3.9	100.00	

It can be shown from the data that the highest number of principals with a percentage of 66.67% or 4 out of 6 belong to 31-35 years in service. Over-all, all or 100% of these principals are amiable in their communication style when under stress.

This implies that the principals tend to be patient to involve his constituents to whatever programs, projects or undertakings the school is involved. According to Baumgardner (2013) principals thrive on involvement, participation and inclusion. Under stress, they acquiesce or yield to the decision of others. Nonetheless, the result of the study contradicts with the study of Yambo, Kindiki, & Tuitoek (2012) that high level of stress among principals seems to threaten and vary in terms of levels of experience in school. On the other hand, majority of the teachers 114 out of 154 or 74.03% used analytical communication style when under stress. The length of service; however, does not in any way affect the communication style used when under stress. This implies that if the teacher is under stress, whether he/she is



old or new, he/she tends to be analytical. It is the reason why the analytical person tends to take longer time to reveal information about himself when under stress. (Reyes, 2014)

Table 37. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers When Under Stress and Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Communication Style	Principals					Teachers						
	MS T/MA ED Graduate	Ph.D. UNI TS	Ph.D. Graduate	Total	%	Bachelor's Degree	MS T/MA ED units	MS T/MA ED Graduate	Ph.D. uni ts	Ph.D. Graduate	Total	%
Expressive						7		5			12	7.79
Amiable						1	1	3			5	3.25
Driver						3	4	1			8	5.18
Analytical	3	1	2	6	100.00	50	15	47	2		114	74.03
Varied Communication Style						7	2	6	2		15	9.74
Total	3	1	2	6	100.00	68	22	62			154	100.00
%	50.00	16.67	33.33	100.00		44.16	14.29	40.26	1.30		100.00	



Precisely, the table reveals that all of the principals (100%) are analytical. The educational attainment does not affect the communication style when under stress. According to Baumgardner (2013) a person when under stress tend to be critical, picky, perfectionist and stubborn. Likewise, majority of the teachers with 114 out of 154 or 74.03% tend to be analytical when under stress while 50 out of 68 who finished Bachelor's Degree are also analytical. The educational attainment does not in any way affect the communication style of the teachers when under stress because they can still manage to make logical decisions. Generally, both the principals and teacher's despite of differences in their educational attainment can be logical especially in facing stressful situations. info@maximum advantage.com (2013) contends that analyzers are individuals who love to gather details and organize things, tend to be deep, thoughtful, analytical, serious and purposeful. They hesitate to make decision when they do not have enough facts.

Taking a look at Tables 35, 36, and 37 which deal on the communication style of the principals and teachers when under stress, it can be generally inferred that the principals and teachers when engaged with problems or situations under stress tend to be logical. This may be true due to their stressful duties in school which honed them to be critical and to be wise.

Table 38. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers on How Others View Them When Grouped According to Position

Communication Style	Principals						Teachers							
	HT3	P1	P2	P3	Total	%	T1	T2	T3	M1	M2	H1	Total	%
Expressive							4	1	7				12	7.79
Amiable			1	1	2	33.33	10		7				17	11.04
Driver			1		1	16.67	12	2	8				22	14.29



Analytical							20	1	18		1	1	41	26.62
Varied Communication Style	1	1		1	3	50	34		22	5	1		62	40.26
Total	1	1	2	2	6	100.00	80	4	62	5	2	1	154	100.00
%	16.67	16.67	33.33	33.33	100.00		51.95	2.60	40.26	3.25	1.30	.65	100.00	

It can be gleaned on the table that four among the six principals or 66.67% occupying Principal 2 and Principal 3 positions have varied communication styles especially on how others view them. 33.33% of the Principal 2 are amiable and driver while 33.33% of the Principal 3 also have varied communication style. These imply that with their differences in position, there can be a tendency that they would be viewed by others as passive or aggressive (Whitson, 2010). Conversely, many of the teachers (62 out of 154 or 40.26%) used varied communication styles regarding how others view them and they are in Teacher 1 and Teacher 3 positions. These imply that these teachers may have the tendency to be flexible and can use any of the communication styles and that would also be dependent on the perception of others. In other words, they tend to change their communication styles depending on with whom they interact with and as Edmonson (2009) supports this view: "A person's communication styles affect how others react to and perceive us."

Table 39. Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers on How Others View Them When Grouped According to Length of Service

Communication Style	Principals				Teachers								
	26-30	31-35	Total	%	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	Total	
Expressive					4	3	2	2	1			12	7.7



													9
Amiable		2	2	33.	10	1	4	2				17	11.
				33									04
Driver	1		1	16.	11	3	1	3	1	1	2	22	14.
				67									29
Analytical					20	6	4	2	7	2		41	26.
													62
Varied Communication Style	1	2	3	50	37	11	2	4	3	1	4	62	40.
													26
Total	2	4	6	100	82	24	13	13	12	4	6	15	100
				.00								4	.00
%	33.	66.	100		53.	15.	8.4	8.4	7.7	2.6	3.9	10	
	33	67	.00		25	58	4	4	9	0	0	0.0	
												0	

It can be inferred that 66.67% or 4 out of 6 principals ranged from 31-35 years of service used amiable and varied communication styles. However, generally speaking, 50% of the total number of principals used varied communication styles. Nevertheless, these imply that these principals have the tendency to interact with their subordinates in different ways adjusting to the communication styles of others. It is worthy to note that 62 or 40.26% of the teachers also used varied communication styles when dealing on how others perceive them. According to Robert Bolton and Dorothy Grover Bolton as cited by Levit (2013), "When two people of different styles live or work together, one or both must adjust."

Table 40. Communication Styles of Principal and Teachers on How Others View Them When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Comm unica- tion	Principals					Teachers						
	MS T/ MA	Ph. D. UNI	Ph. D. Gra	Tot al	%	Bache lor's Degre	MST/ MAED units	MST / MAE	Ph.D unit	Ph.D Gra-	Tota l	%



Style	ED Gra - dua te	TS	- dua te			e		D Grad	s	duat e		
Expressive						8		4			12	7.79
Amiable	2			2	33.33	10		7			17	11.04
Driver	1			1	16.67	11	1	10			22	14.29
Analytical						15	5	20	1		41	26.62
Varied Communication Style		1	2	3	50	24	16	21	1		62	40.26
Total	3	1	2	6	100.00	68	22	62	2		154	100.00
%	50.00	16.67	33.33	100.00		44.16	14.29	40.26	1.30		100.00	

It can be gleaned on the table that half the number of principals (3 out of 6 or 50%) used varied communication styles while 33.33 % is amiable when dealing with how others view them. Furthermore, the principals who are MST/MAED graduates tend to be amiable while those who earned the Doctorate units or who are graduates tend to use varied communication style. It could be inferred that the higher the educational attainment, the more flexible they become. It is also gleaned from the table that many of the teachers (62 or 40.26%) who are either holder of the Bachelor's Degree, MST, or MAED units used varied communication styles. In summary, the situation dealing with how others perceive or view



them as indicated on Tables 38, 39, and 40, generally indicate the communication styles of the respondents as varied. These imply that while the principals focus intently on the job on hand using strategic actions and differing behavioral styles as school managers, the teachers are also understanding and exploring their own style and the styles of others and to be willing to accommodate for differences as Milios (2015) contends.

Table 41. Significant Differences in Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in their Workplace and Grouped According to Position

Workpla ce	Specifi c Work Conte xt	Principals			Teachers		
		Comput ed Value	Probability Value	Interpretatio n	Compute d Value	Proba bili ty Value	Interpret ation
S1- Viewing themsel ves	1	7.64	0.05	Not significant	6.08	0.98	Not significant
	2	7.64	0.27	Not significant	24.06	0.06	Not significant
	3	2.09	0.55	Not significant	8.78	0.89	Not significant
S2-time frame	4	9.36	0.15	Not significant	14.94	0.46	Not significant
	5	5.55	0.14	Not significant	11.08	0.35	Not significant
	6	9.36	0.15	Not significant	12.79	0.62	Not significant
S3enviro nment & Setting preferen ces	7	4.87	0.56	Not significant	11.31	0.73	Not significant
	8	5.41	0.14	Not significant	11.27	0.73	Not significant
	9	2.63	0.45	Not	13.55	0.56	Not



				significant			significant
S4- motivat ed	10	2.63	0.45	Not significant	10.24	0.80	Not significant
	11	9.36	0.15	Not significant	20.74	0.14	Not significant
	12	2.09	0.55	Not significant	20.16	0.17	Not significant
S5- demotiv ated	13	4.87	0.18	Not significant	19.20	0.21	Not significant
	14	5.41	0.14	Not significant	20.06	0.17	Not significant
	15	7.64	0.05	Not significant	19.87	0.18	Not significant
S6- commun ication patterns	16	2.63	0.45	Not significant	17.78	0.28	Not significant
	17	6.59	0.36	Not significant	22.10	0.11	Not significant
	18	7.64	0.27	Not significant	5.90	0.98	Not significant
S7- decision Making	19	2.63	0.45	Not significant	11.67	0.70	Not significant
	20	7.64	0.05	Not significant	6.31	0.97	Not significant
	21	4.87	0.18	Not significant	8.85	0.89	Not significant
S8- under stress	22	2.63	0.45	Not significant	8.87	0.88	Not significant
	23	2.63	0.45	Not significant	7.70	0.94	Not significant
	24	---	----	Not	21.09	0.13	Not



				significant			significant
S9- how others view them	25	6.59	0.36	Not significant	23.22	0.08	Not significant
	26	6.59	0.36	Not significant	16.44	0.35	Not significant
	27	2.63	0.45	Not significant	11.41	0.72	Not significant

The table displays the significant differences in the communication styles of the principals and teachers in the workplace when grouped according to position. It can be gleaned on the table that despite of differences in administrative positions of the principals as well as the variations of ranks among the teachers, it is worthy to note that they have no differing communication styles when faced with different situations such as viewing themselves, viewing time frame, viewing environment and setting preferences, when motivated, when demotivated, viewing their communication patterns, in decision making, when under stress and how others view them. In other words, both the principals and teachers regardless of their functions and descriptive positions in schools tend to communicate and understand each other because of using common communication style/s in general. These imply that there is a mutual understanding and notable interaction among them; thus, productivity, job satisfaction, trust, and collegiality are imminent in the six general high schools in Baggao.

Table 42. Significant Differences in the Communication Styles of Principals and Teachers in their Workplace and Grouped According to Length of Service

Communication Styles in the Workplace	Specific Work Context	Principals			Teachers		
		Computed Value	Probability Value	Interpretation	Computed Value	Probability Value	Interpretation
S1- Viewing themselves	1	0.37	0.55	Not significant	15.14	0.65	Not significant
	2	2.09	0.35	Not significant	36.07	0.007	significant



	3	2.09	0.15	Not significant	9.82	0.94	Not significant
S2-time frame	4	3.82	0.15	Not significant	20.69	0.29	Not significant
	5	0.00	0.80	Not significant	11.11	0.52	Not significant
	6	1.05	0.59	Not significant	25.12	0.12	Not significant
S3environment & Setting preferences	7	3.14	0.21	Not significant	24.16	0.15	Not significant
	8	0.91	0.34	Not significant	17.65	0.48	Not significant
	9	2.63	0.11	Not significant	22.79	0.19	Not significant
S4-motivated	10	0.91	0.34	Not significant	22.68	0.20	Not significant
	11	3.82	0.15	Not significant	22.51	0.21	Not significant
	12	0.37	0.55	Not significant	29.95	0.04	significant



S5- demotiv ated	13	2.09	0.15	Not significant	22.62	0.21	Not significan t
	14	0.91	0.34	Not significant	27.04	0.078	Not significan t
	15	0.37	0.55	Not significant	17.81	0.47	Not significan t
S6- commun ication patterns	16	0.91	0.34	Not significant	25.09	0.12	Not significan t
	17	1.05	0.59	Not significant	28.59	0.05	Not significan t
	18	3.14	0.21	Not significant	17.61	0.48	Not significan t
S7- decision Making	19	2.63	0.11	Not significant	23.17	0.18	Not significan t
	20	0.37	0.55	Not significant	19.37	0.37	Not significan t
	21	0.37	0.55	Not significant	13.38	0.77	Not significan t
S8- under stress	22	2.63	0.11	Not significant	15.63	0.62	Not significan t



	23	0.91	0.34	Not significant	10.29	0.92	Not significant
	24	---	----	Not significant	12.17	0.84	Not significant
S9- how others view them	25	3.82	0.15	Not significant	12.38	0.83	Not significant
	26	1.05	0.59	Not significant	18.34	0.43	Not significant
	27	0.91	0.34	Not significant	23.18	0.18	Not significant

Apparently, the data revealed that there is no significant differences in the communication styles of the principals with respect to their length of service in the government and when confronted with different situations in their workplace. These imply that despite of the differences of the principals in terms of their years in service in the government, it does not affect in any way their communication styles. The tendency to adjust and adapt to the communication styles of their subordinates is inherent and not possible to happen; thus accomplishing organizational goals. (Naile&Selesho, 2014)

Conversely, it can be gleaned on the table that there are significant differences with respect to the communication styles of the teachers in their workplace specifically in two (2) of the nine (9) situations given such as viewing themselves and when motivated since the probability values are less than 0.05. These imply that teachers tend to be diverse in the manner they communicate when viewing themselves. This is so, due to their diversity of cultural backgrounds and considering their years of service as supported by Table 15. Moreover, the teachers also have significant differences in their communication styles when



motivated or encouraged as seen in Table 24. These means that teachers go along the way they are being exposed especially on their cultural backgrounds and on the manner they perceive things. (Naile& Selesho,2014) ;(Leigh, 2014)

Table 43. Significant Differences in the Communication Styles of the Principals and Teachers in their Workplace and Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Workplace	Specific Work Context	Principals			Teachers		
		Computed Value	Probability Value	Interpretation	Computed Value	Probability Value	Interpretation
S1-Viewing themselves	1	3.82	0.15	Not significant	6.70	0.67	Not significant
	2	6.59	0.16	Not significant	21.54	0.01	significant
	3	3.82	0.15	Not significant	7.01	0.64	Not significant
S2-time frame	4	5.55	0.24	Not significant	19.77	0.10	Not significant
	5	1.73	0.42	Not significant	8.87	0.18	Not significant
	6	2.77	0.60	Not significant	5.28	0.81	Not significant
S3environment & Setting preferences	7	3.82	0.43	Not significant	22.73	0.007	significant
	8	2.63	0.27	Not significant	9.96	0.35	Not significant
	9	2.63	0.27	Not significant	7.89	0.55	Not significant
S4-motivate	10	1.59	0.45	Not significant	7.61	0.57	Not significant



d	11	5.55	0.24	Not significant	9.47	0.40	Not significant
	12	1.05	0.59	Not significant	10.46	0.32	Not significant
S5- demotiva ted	13	1.05	0.59	Not significant	9.62	0.38	Not significant
	14	2.63	0.27	Not significant	6.44	0.69	Not significant
	15	1.05	0.59	Not significant	6.98	0.64	Not significant
S6- communi cation patterns	16	1.59	0.45	Not significant	11.29	0.26	Not significant
	17	5.55	0.24	Not significant	10.49	0.31	Not significant
	18	7.64	0.11	Not significant	8.00	0.53	Not significant
S7- decision Making	19	2.63	0.27	Not significant	15.77	0.07	Not significant
	20	3.82	0.15	Not significant	9.56	0.39	Not significant
	21	3.82	0.15	Not significant	5.79	0.76	Not significant
S8-under stress	22	1.59	0.45	Not significant	9.55	0.39	Not significant
	23	1.58	0.45	Not significant	8.74	0.46	Not significant
	24	---	----	Not significant	4.62	0.87	Not significant
S9- how others	25	8.32	0.08	Not significant	7.38	0.59	Not significant



view them	26	2.77	0.60	Not significant	6.44	0.69	Not significant
	27	1.59	0.45	Not significant	15.13	0.09	Not significant

The table shows the significant differences in the communication styles of the principals and teachers in their workplace when grouped according to educational attainment. The table revealed that the principals have no significant differences in their communication styles in their workplace with respect to their educational attainment. These imply that whether they are Master's Degree Graduate or just acquired Master's units, Doctorate units or Doctorate Degree, it does not affect the manner they communicate with their subordinates and with their staff or stakeholders for the results affirm the flexibility of the principal's despite of administrative positions and functions in the school. This is confirmed and supported by Table 13 where principals use various communication styles despite of differences in educational attainment.

On the other hand, it is worthy to note that the teachers have significant differences with respect to their communication styles in two (2) situations such as viewing themselves and in viewing environment and setting preferences considering their educational attainment. These mean that these teachers tend to use different communication styles in perceiving themselves in cognizance to their educational background as supported by Table 16. These teachers can likewise adjust to the communication styles of others depending on how they view themselves. Furthermore, they also differ in their communication styles when viewing environment and setting preferences. This implies that the educational attainment affects the communication styles of the teachers specifically in viewing environment and setting preferences.

Table 44. Chi-square Analysis on the Significant Differences Between the Principals and Teachers' Communication Styles in the Workplace

Workplace	Specific Work Context	Principals/Teachers		
		Computed Value	Probability Value	Remarks



S1-Viewing themselves	1	1.96	0.58	Not significant
	2	0.85	0.84	Not significant
	3	1.22	0.75	Not significant
S2-time frame	4	4.18	0.24	Not significant
	5	6.32	0.04	significant
	6	2.94	0.40	Not significant
S3environment & Setting preferences	7	1.82	0.61	Not significant
	8	3.52	0.32	Not significant
	9	8.49	0.04	significant
S4-motivated	10	6.27	0.09	Not significant
	11	8.43	0.04	significant
	12	3.34	0.34	Not significant
S5-demotivated	13	3.54	0.32	Not significant
	14	9.62	0.02	significant
	15	3.66	0.30	Not significant
S6-communication patterns	16	19.23	0.00	significant
	17	4.36	0.23	Not significant
	18	6.14	0.11	Not significant



				significant
S7-decision Making	19	0.64	0.89	Not significant
	20	1.16	0.76	Not significant
	21	2.17	0.54	Not significant
S8-under stress	22	2.59	0.46	Not significant
	23	3.15	0.37	Not significant
	24	7.94	0.047	Not significant
S9- how others view them	25	1.77	0.62	Not significant
	26	3.56	0.31	Not significant
	27	8.26	0.04	significant

The table explains the Chi-square analysis on the significant differences between the principals and teachers' communication styles in the workplace. It is worthy to note that with respect to the profile variables of the respondents such as position, length of service, and educational attainment, it can be inferred from the table several significant differences of the principals and teachers (6 out of 9) in consideration to the nine (9) given situations. The six (6) identified situations which they tend to be varied are: viewing time frame, viewing environment and setting preferences, when motivated, when demotivated, communication patterns, and how others view them. The principals and teachers are significantly different in viewing time frame specifically in the situation where urgency of their presence in a meeting is needed as probability value is 0.04. This implies the test of punctuality and dedication of both parties especially on given time on-task. The manner they deal with the situation is significantly different as supported by Tables 17,18, and 19 respectively.



It is also noted that they have significant differences in the manner they view environment and setting preferences, to be specific, when principals deal with subordinates and when teachers deal with the students. This implies that they can utilize all the four communication styles depending on the uniqueness of the person and depending on his/her adaptability to the environment and on his/her preferences. This is also true due to the differences of their school's location as well as the diversity of culture and behavioral patterns of students and co-workers as well. The differences emanated in Tables 20, 21, and 22 respectively. In the situation where principals or teachers are motivated, they are also showing differences specifically in times of appreciation or recognition of a certain achievement. Obviously, they tend to be flexible with the manner others would like to be appreciated. As gleaned in Table 23 confronted with the same situation, the principals and teachers are dominantly expressive in terms of position variable; however, the distinct differences of those not included in the expressive style are distributed to the other three types of communication styles which can prove that really principals and teachers are diverse when motivated. Furthermore, looking into their length of service as gleaned on Table 24, it can be inferred that principals who have longer length of service are using the same communication styles with those teachers who are new; however, the rest of the principals and teachers who have served for quite long years are diverse. This means therefore that whether new or old in the service, they tend to vary their communication styles when motivated. In terms of educational attainment, the principals and teachers have also significant differences in their communication styles when motivated. Based on Table 25, more than half of the principals and teachers who finished Master's Degree and Bachelor's Degree used the expressive style; yet, the rest of the respondents who have almost the same in number with the first group vary in their communication styles when motivated, thus making their significant differences distinct.

The principals and teachers have also significant differences in situation number five (5) which is on discouragement or when demotivated with the probability value of 0.02. This denotes the variations of communication styles they used specifically in handling personal feelings towards discouragement. As seen in Tables 26, 27, and 28, the profile variables do



not in any way affect the communication styles of the respondents in this particular situation. These imply that no matter what position they belong, no matter how long their length of service and how high their educational attainment or vice-versa, they still manifest differing communication styles when discouraged although when you look at each variable in each table, there seems to be dominant communication styles among them. However, grasping their over-all communication styles would go to one conclusion that is gleaned on the table above. In addition, the principals and teachers have significant differences with respect to their communication pattern particularly in perceiving themselves as a communicator. Assessing the communication styles of the respondents in relation to the profile variables, it can be inferred that their number is distributed to the 4 communication styles given as supported by Tables 29, 30, 31, thus proving their diversity. These imply that both principals and teachers use varied communication styles and do not have specific communication pattern. Finally, the principals and teachers have significant differences in their communication styles in how others view them especially when talking with others. This implies that both principals and teachers vary in their communication style/s as supported by Tables 38, 39, and 40. In conclusion, the communication styles of the principals and the teachers are affected by the six (6) situations in the workplace.

Table 45. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Problems Encountered in Communication

Problems of Communication in Schools	f	%
Misinterpretation of data or information	34	21.25
Altered messages	13	8.13
Inaccurate information	11	6.87
Ko Lack of trust & openness in communication	16	10
Timeliness of information dissemination	10	6.24
Differences in background knowledge	8	5
Non-compliance of disseminated information	9	5.62
Inaccurate message relay	12	7.5
Misinterpretation of non-verbal cues	19	11.88



Cultural difference in communication	13	8.13
Inappropriate information dissemination	15	9.38
TOTAL	160	100

From the data given above, it can be gleaned that the highest number of problems encountered by these respondents is the misinterpretation of data or information with 34 or 21.25%. It is followed by misinterpretation of non-verbal cues with 19 or 11.88% and lack of trust and openness in communication with 16 or 10% respectively. The result of the findings implies that communication problems can cause organizational breakdown, it can erode trust and pervades discourse. However, according to Root III (2015) in his article, "Examples of Communication in the Workplace," we can develop policies that help to decrease the problem and encourage positive communication. Thus, the organization can maintain its productive workplace. Adler (2009) contends on understanding the many factors that might impact a school culture and who suggested some principles which include building credibility using a communication style that fit the situation; analyzing delivery mode for optimum effectiveness; truthful communication to help build healthy workplace relationships; expressing purpose by being clear and concise; managing messages by being able to communicate about various issues such as workplace culture, responsibility, hierarchy, time management, financial state and job sense; and evaluating communications strengths and weaknesses.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the summary of findings, the researcher concluded that the National High Schools of the Baggao Districts are generally manned by young and developing faculty who are led by more experienced and educationally advanced principals. The position, length of service and the educational background of principals and teachers do not affect their general communication styles. However, differences in communication styles occur in situations where psychological mindset and personal challenges are involved like viewing time frame, viewing environment and setting preferences, when motivated, when demotivated, communication patterns, and on how others view them. It can be generally concluded that the communication styles of both the principals and teachers vary as they are confronted with situations such as viewing time-frame; viewing environment and setting preferences;



when motivated; when demotivated or discouraged; communication patterns; and on how others view them specially when they are in their workplace.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the aforementioned summary of findings and conclusions, the researcher recommends the following:

1. The results of this study be given as a baseline data for principals to familiarize them with the communication styles of teachers accorded to their leadership to have better understanding and interpersonal relationship in the school they are in.
2. The survey questionnaires on communication styles in the workplace be enhanced and retested for possibility of its future standardization.
3. The proposed action plan shall be undertaken to improve the effectiveness of communication and strengthen the interpersonal relationship of the teachers in the six secondary schools in Baggao.
4. Evaluation of action plan be made after its implementation to determine its effectiveness.
5. Make project proposal or seminar proposal for teachers in Baggao to strengthen their interpersonal relationship and to enhance their communication management.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Journal

Edmonson, J. (2009, Sep.) Let's be clear: How to manage communication styles. T + D 69.3: 30-31.

De Vries, et. al. (2010). Leadership = Communication? The relations of leaders' communication styles with leadership styles, knowledge sharing and leadership outcomes. Journal of Business and Psychology.

Farrington, J. (2013, May). The 4 social styles LifeHealthPro.



Gorski, T.(2014, Spring). Are you talkin' to me? Understand and adapt to different communication styles. *The Canadian Manager* 39.1 : 22-23,4.

Hanke, S. (2009, Jul). Know and use communication styles to have more impact. *Women in Higher Education* 18.7: 16

Sabol, B. (2011, April). Adjusting your style improves communication with difficult and challenging personalities. *Business Credit*.113.4: 8,10-11.

Understand, adapt to different communication styles (2014,May/Jun). *Healthcare Executive* 29.3:54-55

Internet/website

Abu Bakar, H. et.al. (2015). Measuring communication styles in the Malaysian workplace: instrument development and validation. Retrieved April 17, 2015 from wcaweb.org/measuring-communication-styles/

Ali,H.(2015).Communication Theory. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from <http://communicationtheory.org/communication-accommodation-theory/>

Anne (2013). The one-two combo : using your communication style to get results. Retrieved March 9, 2015, from <http://www.acclivityperformance.com/2013/10/the-one-two-combo-using-your-communication-style-to-get-results/>

Are Higher Education's Administrators and Faculty Really Different? Retrieved May 24, 2015 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED353886.pdf>

Baumgardner, A. (2013).Communication styles. Retrieved April 21, 2015 from <http://www.astridbaumgardner.com/articles/articles-3/58-communication-styles.html>



Burley, K. (2015) What impact are variations in communication styles having on the workplace? Retrieved March 12, 2015 from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/impact-variations-communication-styles-having-workplace-19347.html>

Butts, A. (2008) Managers' communication styles and employees' job satisfaction: A quantitative study. Retrieved March 19, 2015 from <http://www.search.proquest.com>

Clement, D. (2008). Educational leaders. Retrieved March 22, 2015 from <http://www.educationalleaders.govt.nz/Managing-your-school/Guides-for-managing-your-school/Effective-communications>

Coppola, M. (2010). The four work-related personality styles: drivers; analyticals; amiables; expressives. Retrieved March 14, 2015 from <http://www.examiner.com/article/the-four-work-related-personality-styles-drivers-analyticals-amiables-expressive>

Cox, A. (2014, Spring). Increasing purposeful communication in the workplace: two school district models. Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin 80.3: 34-38. Retrieved May 24, 2015 from www.search.proquest.com

Cross, V. (2014). The path-goal theory of leadership in companies. Retrieved November 20, 2014, from smallbusiness.chron.com.

Da Silva, H. et. al. (2014). Extracting emotions and communication styles from Prosody. Retrieved April 17, 2015 from <http://www.springer.com/978-3-66245685-9>

DeMatthews, D. (2014). Shared decision-making: what principals need to know. Retrieved May 31, 2015 from <http://www.academia.edu/8506816/shared-decision-making-what-principals-need-to-know>



Drynan, L. (2011). Communication clash: gender and generational effects on communication in the workplace. Deputy Clerk, Lanark Country. Retrieved March 14, 2015 from <http://www.genderportal.eu/resources/communication-clash-gender-and-generational-effects-communication-workplace>

Gao, D. (2009). Gender differences in communication styles from social cultural perspective. Retrieved April 28, 2015 from www.globethesis.com/?t_215536024955188

Ekaterini,G. (2010). The impact of leadership styles on four variables of executive workforce. International Journal of Busieness Management 5.6: 3-16. Retrieved May 3, 2015 from [www. search.proquest.com](http://www.search.proquest.com)

Employee-Motivation-Skills.com (2009-2013). Effective communication in the workplace for motivation, solutions and success. Retrieved April 29, 2015 from www.employee-motivation-skills.com/communication-in-the-workplace.html

Ergen, E. (2010). Workplace communication: a case study on informal communication network within an organization. Retrieved April 17, 2015 from ergen.gr/files/WorkplaceCommunicationInformalCommunicationFramework.pdf

Four Styles of Communication (2013). Retrieved March 22, 2013 from www.maximumadvantage.com/four-styles-of-communication.html

Free management e-Books (2014). Workplace communication styles. Retrieved March 22, 2015 from <http://www.free-management-ebooks.com/faqcm/effective-02.htm>

Gardner-Webb University (2015). How administrators can empower teachers. Retrieved May 31, 2015 from www.teachhub.com/working-together-administrators-role-empowering-teachers.



Griffin, (2015). Communication accommodation theory. Retrieved March 21, 2015 from http://www.afirstlook.com/edition-7/theoryresources/by-theory/Communication_Accommodation_Theory

Griffin, (2015). Standpoint theory. Retrieved March 21, 2015 from http://www.afirstlook.com/edition-7/theoryresources/by-theory/Standpoint_Theory

Harp, A. (2011). Effective change communication in the workplace. Retrieved May 6, 2015 from www.trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2111&content=utk_gradthes

Harding, S. & Wood (2014). Communication Theories in Practice. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from <http://cloud.lib.wfu.edu/blog/com100spring2014/2014/04/29/standpoint-theory-of-sandra-harding-and-julia-t-wood>

Halawah, I. (2013). The relationship between effective communication of high school principal and school climate. Retrieved March 21, 2015 from <http://donnieholland.wiki.westga.edu/file/view/relationship+bw+principal+communication+and+climate.pdf/349266840/relationship%20b>

Healthfield, S. (2015). What value do you add to your organization? Retrieved March 21, 2015 from <http://www.humanresorces.about.com>

Holmes, S. (2013). Improving relationships in the workplace by handling different communication styles. Retrieved April 30, 2015 from www.mateadentleadership.com/communication-styles.html

Husain, Z. (2013). Effective communication brings successful organizational change. *The Business Review* 3.2: 43-50. London: The Academy of Business and Retail Mangement (ABRM)



Influence of communication on teachers' job performance(2015). Retrieved March 16, 2015 from

https://www.academia.edu/6789084/INFLUENCE_OF_COMMUNICATION_ON_TEACHERS_JOB_PERFORMANCE

Jonasson, C.,et.al (2012). Cultural differences in use: the power to essentialize communication styles. *Journal of Communication Management*. 14.4: 405-419. Retrieved May 24, 2015 from [www. search. proquest.com](http://www.search.proquest.com)

Lai,E.; Klasik, D.; Loeb, S.(2009). Principal time-use and school effectiveness. Institute for Research on Educational Policy and Practice. Stanford University. Retrieved May 24, 2015 from [web.stanford.edu/~sloeb/papers/Principal%20 Time-Use%20%revised%29.pdf](http://web.stanford.edu/~sloeb/papers/Principal%20Time-Use%20%revised%29.pdf)

Li, H. et. al.(2014). Effects of communication styles on acceptance of recommendations in intercultural collaboration. *Journal International Business and Cultural Studies*. Retrieved May 2, 2015 from <http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/141874.pdf>

Levit, A. (2013)Want to be more productive at work? Know your people style. Retrieved March 21, 2015 from <http://quickbase.intuit.com/>

Manker, A. (2015). Open communication in the workplace:definition, skills, and benefits. Retrieved April 28, 2015 from study.com/academy/lesson/open-communication-in-the-workplace-definition-skills-benefits.html

Marshall,D. (2013). Communication styles. Retrieved March 8, 2015, from <http://www.astridbaumgardner.com/articles/articles-3/58-communication-styles.html>

Martin, J. (2014). Personalities and communication styles in the workplace. Retrieved March 22, 2015 from [http://www.woman.the nest.com/personalities-communication-styles-workplace-9643.html](http://www.woman.thenest.com/personalities-communication-styles-workplace-9643.html)



Mayo Clinic Staff (2014). Why assertive communication makes sense. Retrieved March 22, 2015 from <http://www.mayoclinic.org/healthy-living/stress-management/in-depth/assertive/art-20044644>

Milios, R. (2015). Managing personality conflicts. Retrieved May 23, 2015 from www.ptotoday.com/pto-today-articles/article/710-managing-personality-conflicts.

Naile, I.&Selesho, J. (2014). The role of leadership in employee motivation. Retrieved May 31, 2015 from www.mcser.org/journal/index.php/mjss/article/viewFile/2131/2118

National Association of Secondary School Principals and National Association of Elementary School Principals(2013). Leadership matters. What the research says about the importance of recognizing leadership. Retrieved May 24, 2015 from [www.naesp.org/sites/default/files/Leadership Matters.pdf](http://www.naesp.org/sites/default/files/Leadership%20Matters.pdf)

Newton, C. (2014). The five communication styles. Retrieved March 18, 2015 from file:///C:/Users/josie/Documents/The Five Communication Styles - Claire Newton

Pattnaik, B.K. and Mishra, S. (2014,Jan-Jun). Communication styles of managers: a comparative study on public and private sector. Social Science International Vol. 30 no.1,pp 177-187. Retrieved March 21, 2015 from <http://www.search.proquest.com/docview/1542686463?accountid=33657>

Prevost, S. (2013).4 unique working styles : what's yours? Retrieved March 14, 2015 from <http://www.inc.com/shelley-prevost/4-unique-working-styles-whats-yours.html>

Rampur, S. (2012). Communication styles according to types of individuals. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.buzzle.com/articles/communication-styles-in-the-workplace.html



Reyes, S. (2014). **Understanding communication styles in the workplace** . Retrieved March 8, 2015 from <http://tribehr.com/blog/understanding-communication-styles-in-the-workplace>

Richards, L. (2014). Organizational change and leadership styles. Retrieved on November 20, 2014.

from smallbusiness.chron.com

Root III, G.(2015). Examples of communication problems in the workplace. Retrieved May 27, 2015 from smallbusiness.chron.com/examples-communication-problems-workplace-11243.html

Sabol, B. (2011). *Adjusting your style improves communication with difficult and challenging personalities. Business Credit. 113.4: 8, 10-11*

Shulfer, K. (2015). Leadership development project. Leadership-the attribution. Retrieved March 9, 2015 from <http://kyleshulfermba530.weebly.com/chapter-4-leadership.html>

Skillyouneed.com (2015). The demand for communication and analytical skills. Retrieved May 23, 2015 from <http://www.skillsyouneed.com/rhubarb/communication-analytical-skills.html>

Social styles (2002-2015). Changing minds. Retrieved April 21, 2015 from http://changingminds.org/explanations/preferences/social_styles.htm

Stephen, G. (2008). Communication problems in organizations. Retrieved May 24, 2015 from http://stephenjgill.typepad.com/performance_improvement_b/2008/12/communication-problems-in-organizations.html.

Teamworks (2015). Workplace communication styles. Retrieved April 17, 2015 from teamworks-works.com/workplace-com-styles/



Tober, C. (2014). How to tell good leadership from bad and how good leaders behave. Demand Media. Retrieved November 20, 2014, from smallbusiness.chron.com

Unvelope.com(2015). Communication styles in the workplace. Retrieved April 30, 2015 from www.unvelope.com/p/communication-styles-workplace-interpersonal-communication

Usop, A. (2013). Work performance and job satisfaction among teachers. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. Vol. 3, No. 5. Retrieved May 24, 2015 from www.search.proquest.com

Wang, Y. (2011). The role of communication in enhancing employees' organizational commitment: exploring the relationship between social-emotional-oriented communication, work-oriented communication and organizational commitment in China. Retrieved May 6, 2015 from uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:600000/FULLTEXT01.pdf

What's my Style (2015). Retrieved March 14, 2015 from http://www.quia.com/files/quia/users/mmiranda2/Personality_Style_Quiz.pdf

Whitson, S. (2010, Nov). 10 Things aggressive people say. Retrieved March 22, 2015 from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/passive-aggressive-diaries/201011/10-things-passive-aggressive-people-say>

Wolfe, J. (2012). Communication styles in engineering and other male-dominated fields. In B. Bogue & E. Cady (Eds.). Applying Research to Practice (ARP) Resources. Retrieved May 23, 2015 from <http://www.engr.psu.edu/awe/ARPresources.aspx>

Yambo, J; Kindiriki, J; & Tuitoek, J. (2012). Investigating high school principals' stress in relation to their job experience in schools in Southern Nyanza Region of Kenya. International Journal of Academic Research in Program Education and Development. Retrieved May 31, 2015 from www.hrmar.com.adminpics/1175.pdf



Yamcharoen, N. (2015, Jan). Buddhist communication styles for new generation in present-day Thailand. *Asian Social Sciences* 11.2: 174- 180. Retrieved March 20, 2015 from <http://www.search.proquest.com>

Yip, G. (2010). A theoretical basis of intercultural communication competence: Gudykunst's anxiety/uncertainty management theory. Retrieved April 4, 2015 from www.globalmissiology.org

Zelman, M. (2015). Four effective communication styles in the workplace. Retrieved March 22, 2015 from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/four-effective-styles-communication-workplace-15280.html>

DISSERTATION

Villenes, R. (2013). The correlation of learning system the perceived leadership-management synergy and the stakeholders assessed quality services of alternative(ALS)Lopez West District: basis for enhancing programs and projects. An action research paper. Philippine Normal University, Lopez Quezon.