

# **Empowered Principals' Decision-Making Styles, Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Student Academic Achievement**

**Maria Mozelle Abad-Perillo**

*The subjects of this study were 60 randomly elected public school principals in the cities of Pasig, Antipolo and Quezon who were empowered under the Principal Empowerment Program (PEP) implemented by the Department of Education in SY 1997-1998. They were given autonomy in the performance of instructional, administrative and fiscal tasks. An Empowerment Checklist showed that the school principals frequently used participative decision-making styles as evaluated by themselves and their teachers. Their decision-making styles were favorably correlated to teachers' job satisfaction as measured by Job Satisfaction Survey instrument, but there was no significant correlation between the principals' decision-making styles and student academic achievement as measured by the National Elementary Achievement Test. The socio-demographic factors that were correlated with decision-making styles were the principals' age, civil status, ordinal sibling position, years of experience as principal in the present school, assets and liabilities, and travel time from residence to school.*

## Introduction

A study done by Brown (1994) showed that change in local governance and flexibility in decision-making and accountability enhance the potential of school productivity because they allow initiatives and encourage long-term planning. Studies like this inevitably focus on the principals who, together with the teachers, best determine how a school can function in a "productive way".

Cognizant of this important role of the principal or school head in uplifting the quality of education particularly in the elementary level, the Department of Education or DepEd (formerly Department of Education, Culture and Sports or DECS) adopted reform programs, one of which is the Principal Empowerment Program (PEP), a restructuring program designed to give heads of school more autonomy in decision-making, local governance and site-based management.

In essence, the Principal Empowerment Program seeks to transform the principals' position from one of absolute dependence on a higher administrative authority to one of relative autonomy and freedom coupled with accountability in the performance of certain administrative and instructional leadership functions deemed important in making schools effective (DECS Masterplan 1996, p. 17).

The Program implementation guidelines as contained in DECS Order No. 17 are as follows:

1. Full-fledged school principals shall be appointed in every complete public elementary and secondary school. School principal items shall be considered of equal rank and

salary grade whether for elementary or secondary schools.

2. A career path for school principalship shall be instituted to provide stability and security of office for good performance.

3. The implementation of the policy of school principal empowerment shall begin on a pilot basis in school year 1997–1998.

4. The Bureau of Secondary Education shall be tasked with completing the required staff work to carry through the successful implementation of the policy.

The principals involved in the program were vested autonomy on the following specific tasks (Enclosure to DECS Memorandum No. 192):

1. Instructional tasks, including addition of subjects in the curriculum; flexibility in school programming; use of prepared/ready-made lesson plans; introduction of new technology as a school initiative; and signing/co-signing with the Schools Division Superintendent diplomas/certificates of graduating students.

2. Administrative tasks, consisting of involvement/participation in assessing, recommending and appointing teachers; selection/purchase of instructional materials; improvement/maintenance of school facilities and equipment; construction and repair of school buildings by administration; hiring school providers; extension of vacation/sick leave privilege to teachers with special assignments; maximization of the service of the Division Leader Schools (DLSs); designing training programs; declaration of supervisor's work as support/assistance; leveling of Principal positions in both elementary and secondary schools; issuance of travel orders by superintendents; determining school size and enrolment; selective improvement of curriculum activi-

ties by schools; equitable distribution of Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) by superintendents; and transfer of teachers by principals from one campus to another.

3. Fiscal tasks, including actual participation in budget preparation, defense, implementation and accountability; entitlement to Representation Allowance and Travelling Allowance (RATA); accommodation of requests for realignment of proceeds of income-generating projects to be used by the principals; and representation of a senior secondary principal in the school board.

Only two functions were not exercised by the principals: (1) management of school funds for Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE), which remained under the discretion of the Division Superintendent from whose office funds are obtained (Gonzales 2000); and (2) participation in the selection, recruitment and promotion of teachers, which remained with the Division and District Offices, in consultation with the Local Government School Board who pays the teachers' salaries until the teachers are absorbed by the Department of Education's National Office (Sto. Domingo 2000).

Before the actual implementation of the program, the DECS conducted national planning workshops to prepare the principals of identified pilot schools for the performance of their roles in the empowerment program and to develop the implementation guidelines for the program at the sub-national levels. Participants in the workshops held on April 21–25, 1997 developed strategic plans, project proposals, performance contracts, and implementing guidelines for the project.

School principal empowerment began on a pilot basis in SY 1997–1998 in participating DLSSs, Regional Science High Schools (RSHSs), Provincial Science High Schools, and Elementary Leader Schools (one per division throughout the country) whose principals attended and satisfactorily completed the national planning workshops. Although the scheduled full implementation of the program did not materialize in SY 1999–2000 due to changes in the national leadership, all the principals continued to exercise authority listed within the context of the empowerment policy. The Department continued training and empowering principals as real administrators who trained themselves for higher management through actual day-to-day administration of their schools (Gonzales 2000).

### Objectives and Methodology

The study sought to determine the decision-making styles of empowered public elementary school principals in selected schools in Antipolo City (Division of Rizal), Quezon City, and Pasig City, and to find out the relationship of these styles on teacher job satisfaction and student achievement.

Ten public elementary school principals from Antipolo City and Pasig City and 40 from the four districts of Quezon City were selected randomly and used as samples. Five more teachers from each selected school completed the respondents.

Five instruments were used to gather data: (a) a socio-demographic information sheet; (b) an empowerment checklist with 35 items on the principals' degree of performance of 6 items in the School Participant

Empowerment Scale (SPES) as developed by Short and Rinehart (cited in Paraiso 1998), 9 instructional functions, 14 administrative tasks, and 6 fiscal functions stated in the Empowerment Program; the degree of performance in this checklist was measured on a five-point scale: *always, frequently, occasionally, seldom, and never*; (c) a 40-item questionnaire on the Decision-Making Styles of Principals based on Guillermo (1990) that includes 14 items on *participative* style, 13 on *consultative* style, and 13 on *authoritative* style; (d) a 30-item Job Satisfaction Survey for Teachers (JSS), based on Spector (1997) to assess on a four-point scale nine facets of job satisfaction, namely, pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-workers, nature of work, and communication; and (e) the National Elementary Achievement Test (NEAT) to measure the academic achievement of students.

The responses to the 35-item empowerment checklist and the 40-item decision-making style questionnaire were factor-analyzed using the Varimax Rotation method to determine the inherent correlation between the items and to group those which are moderately and highly correlated with one another into factors. Loading of +0.35 was considered before testing. For the teacher job satisfaction survey data, the average mean for each sub-scale was computed and entered as the job satisfaction score in the coding sheets for positive and negative worded items. The mean NEAT scores were tabulated and analyzed by computing the average mean, mean difference,

standard deviation, and t-value. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to analyze the relationship among decision-making styles, job satisfaction and student academic achievement as reflected in the mean NEAT scores. The level of significance was set at 0.05 before testing. Pearson and Kendall Tau b Correlations were used to test the relation between the socio-demographic factors and the decision-making styles of the principals.

## Discussion of Results

### *Principals' Profiles*

Table 1 shows that majority of the principal respondents (73.34%) belong to the 51-60 age bracket. This confirms Sto. Domingo's statement (2000) that younger aspirants who are qualified to handle administrative positions have to wait for the current principals to retire or get promoted before they can lead schools.

Most of the principals are female (81.67%), married (83%), and middle children (45%). Around 45% of them received honors in high school but only 10% graduated with honors in college. They have high educational attainment; all of them are either master's/doctoral degree holders or pursuing MA/Ph.D. degrees. Majority (65%) own houses and vehicles (55%), but most of these were acquired through loans (75%). These school heads have been two or three years in their present assignment, which shows a high rate of turnover among principals in the public elementary schools.

**Table 1. Principals' Profile**

Profile	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	35 – 50	11	18.33
	51 – 60	44	73.34
	61 – 65	5	8.33
Gender	Male	11	18.33
	Female	49	81.67
Civil Status	Single	10	16.67
	Married	48	80.00
	Widow/Widower	2	3.33
Ordinate Position In the family	First	17	28.33
	Middle	27	45.00
	Youngest	15	25.00
	No Response	1	1.67
Academic Achievement (High School)	Valedictorian	3	5.00
	Salutatorian	7	11.67
	Honorable Mention	17	28.33
	Without Honors	33	55.00
Academic Achievement (College)	Summa Cum Laude	0	0
	Magna Cum Laude	0	0
	Cum Laude	6	10
	Without Honors	54	90
Educational Attainment	Master's units	2	3.33
	Master's Degree	19	31.67
	Doctoral units	21	35.00
	Doctoral Degree	18	30.00
Type of Residence	Own	39	65.00
	Own with Amortization	16	26.67
	Rent	4	6.66
	Live with Relatives	1	1.67
Car Ownership	With Car	33	55.00
	Without Car	26	43.33
	No Response	1	1.67
Existing Loan	With Loan	45	75.00
	Without Loan	15	25.00
Monthly Family Income	P 10,000- 20,000	38	63.33
	21,000- 40,000	16	26.67
	41,000- 60,000	3	5.00
	61,000- above	3	5.00

Profile	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Travelling Time from home to school	Less than 30 minutes	16	26.67
	30-45 minutes	24	40.00
	46 minutes- 1 hour	8	13.33
	hour - 1hour & 30 min	6	10.00
	1 hour & 30 min- 2 hrs	3	5.00
	>2 hours	2	3.33
	No Response	1	1.67
Experience in Present School	2 years	24	40.00
	3 years	22	36.67
	4 years	7	11.66
	5 years	6	10.00
	6 years	1	1.67
Experience in Other Schools	21 < years	2	3.33
	11- 20 years	13	21.67
	1- 10 years	36	60.00
	1 >	1	1.67
	No Response	8	13.33
Teaching Experience	31 < years	4	6.66
	21 – 30 years	25	41.67
	11 – 20 years	25	41.67
	1 – 10 years	3	5.00
	No Response	3	5.00

### *Empowerment Classification*

Table 2 shows that the principals were satisfied and felt frequently empowered in the performance of the nine instructional functions and the six School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) items. They perceived that they were occasionally empowered with respect to administrative and fiscal functions.

**Table 2. Degree of Empowerment of Principals**

Functions	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
Instructional	4.2500	0.4654	1
SPES	4.2416	0.5046	2
Administrative	3.8761	0.5258	3
Fiscal	3.2194	0.9405	4

Scale: 1-Never; 2-Seldom; 3-Occasionally; 4-Frequently; 5-Always

*Decision-Making Styles*

Based on self-evaluation (Table 3) and evaluation by the teachers (Table 4), the principals tended to exercise participative decision-making style more frequently than the consultative style. Authoritative decision-making was occasionally done.

**Table 3. Decision-Making Styles of Principals Based on Self-Evaluation**

Category	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
Participative	4.4271	0.3666	1
Consultative	4.2189	0.3137	2
Authoritative	3.3454	0.4833	3

Scale: 1-Never; 2-Seldom; 3-Occasionally; 4-Frequently; 5-Always

**Table 4. Decision-Making Styles of Principals as Evaluated by Teachers**

Category	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
Participative	4.3450	0.4780	1
Consultative	4.1930	0.4649	2
Authoritative	3.7055	0.5169	3

Scale: 1-Never; 2-Seldom; 3-Occasionally; 4-Frequently; 5-Always

*Correlation of Empowerment and Decision-Making Style*

When the factor-analyzed results of the empowerment checklist and the decision-making styles were correlated, results showed (Table 5) that monitoring and implementation are significantly related with the democratic-participative style frequently used by the school principals. In terms of control on schedule, programs and recommendation and decision-making functions, the empowered principals frequently use the collaborative-participative, cooperative-consultative, and organized-consultative styles. The results show that principals take into consideration the opinions and welfare of their teachers and students first before making a final decision.

The budget, evaluation, and autonomy functions have no significant relationship with any decision-making style. This may be explained by the fact that under the PEP, the management of school funds, teacher selection, recruitment, and promotion were not exercised by the principal but remained with the Division superintendents, district supervisors, and the local school board.

**Table 5. Correlation of Empowerment and Decision-Making Style Factors**

Empowerment Function	Decision Making Style	p value
Monitoring	Democratic-Participative	0.0097
Implementation	Democratic-Participative	0.0240
Decision-Making	Organized-Consultative	0.0405
Control	Collaborative-Participative	0.0043
	Cooperative-Consultative	0.0042

### *Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Empowerment of Principals*

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) assessed overall teachers' of job satisfaction and nine facets of job satisfaction which are briefly described by Spector (1997):

	<i>Satisfaction with:</i>
Pay	-pay and pay raises
Promotion	-promotion opportunities
Supervision	-the person's immediate supervisor
Fringe benefits	-fringe benefits
Contingent Rewards	-rewards (not necessarily monetary) given for good performance
Operating Conditions	-rules and procedures
Co-workers	-co-workers
Nature of Work	-the type of work done
Communication	-communication within the organization

Each of the 30 items in the JSS is a statement that is either favorable or unfavorable about an aspect of the job. Tables 6 and 7 present the results of the survey for positively worded items and negatively worded items, respectively. Table 6 shows that teachers are generally satisfied with their co-workers, nature of work and the principals' supervision. They were least satisfied with their fringe benefits, pay and promotion. Table 7 confirms that teachers dissatisfaction over their fringe benefits and promotion.

**Table 6. Positive Sub-scale Contents of the Job Satisfaction Survey**

Facet/Subscale	Item Numbers	Mean	Rank
Co-workers	7, 18	3.4123	1
Nature of Work	14, 19, 23	3.4111	2
Supervision	3, 22, 28	3.3670	3
Operating Conditions	30	3.2800	4
Communication	9	3.1605	5
Contingent Rewards	5	3.0733	6
Promotion	29	3.0669	7
Pay	1	2.7200	8
Fringe benefits	11	2.5184	9

Scale: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Agree; 4-Strongly Agree



**Table 7. Negative Sub-scale Contents of the Job Satisfaction Survey**

Facet/Subscale	Item Numbers	Mean	Rank
Fringe benefits	4, 21	2.7267	1
Operating Conditions	6, 17, 27	2.5727	2
Promotion	2	2.2562	3
Contingent Rewards	12, 26	2.0500	4
Co-workers	13, 25	1.9716	5
Communication	15, 20, 24	1.8555	6
Nature of Work	8	1.8294	7
Supervision	10, 16	1.6680	8

Scale: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Agree; 4-Strongly Agree

### *Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Decision-Making Style*

Based on the data in Table 8, the more democratic-participative the principals are in their supervision, communication and dealing with their subordinates, the more satisfied the latter becomes. This confirms Sharp's (1997, p. 68) findings that teachers' participation in the decision-making process leads to the involved teacher's increased satisfaction. Other teachers who feel that their ideas and opinions are being considered are also satisfied. They feel a sense of responsibility to make sure that decisions are carried out successfully. Similarly, if the principals frequently use the other participative and consultative styles, teachers tend to be satisfied in the different facets.

**Table 8. Correlation of Positively Job Satisfaction Facets and Decision-Making Style**

Job Satisfaction Facet and Questionnaire Items	Decision-Making Style	p value
<b>Co-worker</b>		
a. Incompetent coworkers	Democratic-Participative	0.0052
b. Bickering and fighting	Democratic-Participative	0.0011
<b>Nature of Work</b>		
a. Like doing things at work	Democratic-Participative	0.0124
b. Feel a sense of pride	Collaborative-Participative	0.0304
	Benevolent Authoritative	0.0016
<b>Supervision</b>		
a. Competent principal	Organized-Consultative	0.0017
b. Unfair principal	Cooperative-Consultative	0.0327
c. Insensitive principal	Democratic-Participative	0.0388
	Democratic-Participative	0.0402
<b>Operating Conditions</b>		
a. Too much work	Exploitative-Authoritative	0.0444
b. Preparing instructional materials	Collaborative-Participative	0.0227
	Organized-Consultative	0.0069
	Cooperative-Consultative	0.0263

Job Satisfaction Facet and Questionnaire Items	Decision Making Style	p value
<b>Communication</b> a. Do not know anything b. Lack explanation	Democratic-Participative Democratic-Participative	0.0184 0.0022
<b>Contingent Rewards</b> a. Work not appreciated b. Efforts not properly rewarded	Cooperative-Consultative Democratic-Participative Facilitative-Participative	0.0028 0.0292 0.0095
<b>Promotion</b> a. Chances for promotion	Collaborative-Participative Cooperative-Consultative	0.0272 0.0051
<b>Pay</b> a. Fair salary	Exploitative-Authoritative	0.0067

Table 9 reveals that the frequent use of autocratic-authoritative decision-making style has negative effect on these facets: operating conditions, contingent rewards, communication, nature of work, and supervision. The results also show that democratic-participative and collaborative-participative decision-making styles have negative relationship with fringe benefits.

**Table 9. Correlation of Negatively Job Correlation Facets and Decision-Making Style**

Job Satisfaction Facet and Questionnaire Items	Decision Making Style	p value
<b>Fringe Benefits</b> a. Good benefits b. Withheld benefits	Democratic-Participative Collaborative-Participative	0.0021 0.0055
<b>Operating Conditions</b> a. DECS rules and regulations b. Too much work c. Too much ancillary work d. Preparing instructional materials	Autocratic-Authoritative Autocratic-Authoritative Coordinated-Consultative Autocratic-Authoritative	0.0048 0.0463 0.0067 0.0115
<b>Contingent Rewards</b> a. Efforts not properly rewarded	Autocratic-Authoritative	0.0031
<b>Communication</b> a. Good communication	Autocratic-Authoritative	0.0066
<b>Nature of Work</b> a. Enjoyable job	Autocratic-Authoritative	0.0253
<b>Supervision</b> a. Unfair principal b. Insensitive principal c. Principal's decision-making style d. Like principal	Autocratic-Authoritative Autocratic-Authoritative Autocratic-Authoritative Autocratic-Authoritative	0.0066 0.0031 0.0116 0.0012
<b>Pay</b> a. Fair salary	Coordinated-Consultative	0.0406

### *Principals' Profiles and their Decision-Making Styles*

The socio-demographic factors presented earlier were classified as categorical and quantitative variables. The categorical factors are gender, civil status, ordinate sibling position, type of residence and car ownership. The quantitative socio-demographic factors are age, honors received in high school and college, experience as principal and teacher, monthly income, loan, and travel time.

The Pearson and Kendall Tau b correlations were used on the results of quantitative and categorical socio-demographic factors and the nine decision-making styles, namely, Democratic-Participative, Collaborative-Participative, Facilitative-Participative, Cooperative-Consultative, Organized-Consultative, Coordinated-Consultative, Autocratic-Authoritative, Exploitative-Authoritative, and Benevolent-Authoritative.

Table 10 shows that among the categorical data, civil status, ordinate sibling ownership, and car ownership have significant relationship to decision-making styles.

**Table 10. Significant Categorical Factors**

Socio-Demographic Factors	Decision Making Style	p value
Civil Status (83%-Married)	Benevolent-Authoritative	0.0053
Ordinate Sibling Position (45%-Middle Child)	Democratic-Participative	0.0397
Car Ownership (55%-With Car)	Coordinated-Consultative	0.0122

On the other hand, Table 11 shows that among the quantitative socio-demographic data, age, years of experience as principal in present school, loan, and travel time have significant relationship to specific decision-making styles.

**Table 11. Significant Correlation between Quantitative Socio-Demographic Factors and Decision-Making Style**

Socio-Demographic Factors	Decision-Making Style	p value
Age (Mean- 53.71)	Autocratic-Authoritative	0.0017
Honors Received in High School (55%-W/out Honors)	Facilitative-Participative	0.0172
Years of Experience in the Present School (Mean- 2.967)	Benevolent-Authoritative	0.0164
Existing Loan (75%-With Loan)	Benevolent-Authoritative	0.0201
Travel Time (66.67%-<45 min)	Democratic-Participative	0.0047

Based on the results of the correlation, the principals' civil status, financial liability (with loans) and years of experience in supervising their present school are significantly related to the benevolent- authoritative decision-making style (Tables 10 and 11). It seems that married principals, those with existing loans and those who stayed less than three years in their current post tend to be authoritative.

Age is significantly related to autocratic-authoritative decision-making style. It appears that as the principal gets older, he/she tends to make decisions using only whatever information is accessible.

Personal asset, specifically car ownership, is significantly related to coordinated-consultative decision-making style. It seems that as the principal becomes more financially stable, he/she shares school problems with his/her subordinates before making a decision which may or may not reflect his/her subordinates' influence.

Democratic-participative decision-making style is related to the respondents' travel time (from their residence to their place of work) and to their ordinate sibling position in the family. It seems that the less travel time a principal has, the more democratic-participative he/she becomes. The finding regarding ordinate sibling position confirms Adler's description of middle children as good negotiators (Feshback, et al. 1996).

#### *Student Academic Achievement*

Academic achievement does not seem to be significantly related to the principals' decision-making styles. Table 12 presents the average of the school's mean scores in the 1995 and 1996 and in the 1999 and 2000 National Elementary Achievement Test (NEAT). The 1995 and 1996 NEAT covered four subject areas (Mathematics, Science, English, and HeKaSi or Heograpiya, Kasaysayan at Sibika while 1999 and 2000 NEAT covered the four subject areas and a fifth, Filipino. The differences in means are also shown, indicating an increase in the average mean scores for all schools (except School 09, which did not participate in the earlier NEATs) between the 1995 and 1996 NEATs and the 1999 and 2000 NEATs. The 1997 and 1998 NEATs were not included because many of the schools did not participate in those years. The PEP started in 1997; therefore, the two groups of NEAT results occurred before and after the Principal Empowerment Program.

**Table 12. Student Achievement in the NEATs Before and After the Principal Empowerment Program**

School Number	1995 & 1996	1999 & 2000	Difference
01	72.285	82.045	9.76
02	69.275	76.385	7.11
03	67.075	85.485	18.41
04	72.34	80.845	13.77
05	72.005	92.535	20.53

School Number	1995 & 1996	1999 & 2000	Difference
06	76.55	81.56	5.01
07	66.11	88.31	22.2
08	66.55	80.71	14.16
09		75.265	
10	64.485	80.895	16.41
11	68.81	89.865	21.055
12	73.095	94.815	21.72
13	79.385	89.525	10.14
14	71.63	89.145	17.515
15	70.395	84.195	13.8
16	67.175	90.205	23.03
17	76.265	94.825	18.56
18	74.975	94.37	19.395
19	71.05	90.78	19.73
20	67.135	85.365	18.23
21	64.295	85.03	20.735
22	70.975	88.235	17.26
23	63.57	81.685	18.115
24	70.53	90.605	20.075
25	72.97	89.435	16.465
26	70.515	87.61	17.095
27	82.105	96.74	14.635
28	65.185	91.635	26.45
29	82.455	93.21	10.665
30	71.75	90.11	18.36
31	79.495	100.585	21.09
32	65.815	85.705	19.89
33	73.78	100.44	26.66
34	75.76	95.865	20.105
35	76.275	99.755	23.48
36	79.47	100.155	20.685
37	60.915	80.93	20.015

School Number	1995 & 1996	1999 & 2000	Difference
38	77.66	95.235	17.575
39	76.95	96.08	19.13
40	71.63	86.815	15.185
41	74.87	97.045	22.175
42	67.745	89.84	22.095
43	72.155	90.65	18.495
44	71.475	86.44	14.965
45	70.345	87.495	17.15
46	74.395	93.90	19.505
47	71.28	90.96	19.68
48	71.055	88.115	17.06
49	69.23	86.765	17.535
50	78.13	94.045	15.915
51	71.71	87.01	15.3
52	74.245	93.145	18.9
53	73.625	93.17	19.545
54	83.75	105.755	22.005
55	62.945	77.92	14.975
56	80.685	96.445	15.76
57	77.535	90.21	12.675
58	74.34	90.74	16.4
59	73.325	91.525	18.2
60	72.685	89.385	16.7
		<b>Average</b>	<b>17.78373</b>
		<b>Std Deviation</b>	<b>4.08728</b>
		<b>T value</b>	<b>33.42</b>
		<b>P value</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>

The data in Table 12 show that the mean of the differences between the student achievement in the NEATs before and after the start of the PEP is 17.78373. These data were correlated to the factor-analyzed decision-making styles using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient. Table 13 shows that there was no significant relationship between the decision-making styles and the NEAT results or student academic achievement. Thus, it seems that the improvement of the performance of the schools in the NEAT is not related to the

principals' decision-making styles. This finding can be explained by the quick turnover of principals in the public elementary schools. It appears that principals cannot make long-term academic goals for their current schools because they are aware they will be transferred to another school as soon as a memorandum for school transfer comes from the Division Superintendent. It also appears that the length of their stay in a particular school - two to three years - does not give them sufficient time to affect the student academic achievement. Perhaps, the teacher factor and the NEAT review sessions may have a direct relationship with the NEAT results. Roco (2001) reported that in the past few years, public schools have been conducting review sessions prior to the examination. Thus, the NEAT results could be false and misleading.

**Table 13. Correlation Between Decision-Making Styles and NEAT Results (Student Academic Achievement)**

Decision-Making Style	Before PEP 1995 & 1996 p value	After Start of PEP 1999 & 2000 p value
Autocratic-Authoritative	0.4063	0.8828
Coordinated-Consultative	0.6968	0.9849
Exploitative-Authoritative	0.2045	0.3871
Collaborative-Participative	0.3128	0.6822
Organized-Consultative	0.3224	0.1789
Cooperative-Consultative	0.8756	0.7266
Benevolent-Authoritative	0.8258	0.7964
Facilitative-Participative	0.7062	0.6012

## Conclusion and Recommendations

The significant findings of this study are as follows:

1. The empowered principals frequently used the participative decision-making styles as against consultative and authoritative.
2. The empowered principals' decision-making styles favorably affected teachers' job satisfaction. The teachers were generally satisfied with their co-workers, nature of work, and principals' supervision; they were least satisfied with their fringe benefits, pay, and promotion. Results of the correlation between job satisfaction and decision-making style showed that the more democratic-participative the principals were in their supervision, communication, and dealing with their subordinates' nature of work, the more satisfied were the teachers in these facets: operating conditions, contingent rewards, communication, nature of work, and supervision.
3. The empowered principals' decision-making style is not correlated with student academic achievement. The mean performance in the 1999 and 2000 NEATs were higher than those of 1995 and 1996 when the Principal Empowerment Program was not yet in effect but the difference was not significant.

4. The socio-demographic factors that have significant relationship with the decision-making styles of principals are age, civil status, ordinate sibling position, years of experience as principal in the present school, assets and liabilities, and travel time from residence to place of work.

The objectives of the Principal Empowerment Program of the Department of Education are not fully realized as shown by the results of the study. This could be explained by the fact that not all the provisions of the program are implemented, the most important of which is fiscal autonomy. When the teachers were asked what dissatisfied them, the answers were fringe benefits, pay and promotion.

Student achievement improved under the empowered principals but the difference as shown in the t-test was not significant. This could be attributed to the relatively short time within which the achievement was evaluated after the start of PEP. There is a probability that the effect of the principals' empowerment had not as yet filtered to the students.

Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations are made: (1) the Empowerment Program for the Principals must be fully implemented and its evaluation should take place within a reasonable length of time, say five years; (2) participative decision-making styles of principals contributed to the job satisfaction of teachers; the principals must be made aware of this and be encouraged to use this style; (3) a parallel study must be undertaken at the secondary level to find out the effects of the DepEd Principal Empowerment Program; and (4) the Department of Education must take actions to remove the impediments to fiscal autonomy of the principals.

## References:

- Brown, J. 1994. "Decentralization in Educational Government and Management." *The International Encyclopedia of Education*, Vol 3, BPC Wheatons Ltd.
- Dimmock, C. and T. Donoghue. 1997. *Innovative School Principals and Restructuring*. NY: Routledge, Chapman & Hall Inc.
- DECS Masterplan for Basic Education, 1996-2000. Manila: DECS.
- DECS Memorandum No. 192, s. 1997. "Orientation of Schools Division Superintendents on the Principal Empowerment Pilot Project."
- DECS Order No. 17, s. 1997. "Adopting a Policy of Empowering School Principals."
- Feshback, S., et al. 1996. *Personality*, 4th ed. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co.
- Gonzales, A. 2000, April. "Our Principals." *Manila Bulletin*.
- Guillermo, S. 1990. *Effects of Personal and Organizational Variables and Value Orientations of Public Elementary School Principals on their Decision-making Styles*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- Paraiso, M. 1998. *Teacher Empowerment as Perceived by the Grade School and High School Teachers of the School of the Holy Spirit of Quezon City for School Year 1998-99*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City.



- Roco, Raul. 2001, April. "First 100 Days DECS Action Agenda." *Education News*. 2 (4).
- Sharp, W. and J. Walter.1997. *The School Superintendent (The Profession and the Person)*. Pennsylvania: Technomic Publishing Co.
- Spector, P. 1997. *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. CA: Sage Publications.
- Sto. Domingo, A. 2000, August. "Views on Principal Empowerment Program." Transcribed Interview.
- Terry, P. 1995. "Empowerment." ERIC. ED 410 630