

Comparative Analysis of Leadership Styles in Public and Private HEIs Using the Managerial Grid Model

FERNANDO B. CANLAS¹, CHRISTOPHER M. LADIGNON², NOEL T. FLORECONDIA³
^{1, 2, 3} Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Cabanatuan City

Abstract— This study examined and compared the leadership styles of administrators in selected public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Luzon, Philippines, using the Managerial Grid Model. A quantitative descriptive-comparative research design was employed involving 25 HEI administrators, including university administrators, deans, department chairpersons, program coordinators, and directors. Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire consisting of a demographic profile section and the Managerial Grid Questionnaire, which assessed leadership behavior in terms of concern for people and concern for tasks. Frequency and percentage, mean and standard deviation, and independent samples *t*-test were used to analyze the data. The respondents demonstrated a high level of concern for people, with an overall mean of 4.37 (*SD* = 0.96), and a high level of concern for tasks, with an overall mean of 4.26 (*SD* = 0.80). The highest-rated people-oriented behavior was honoring other people's boundaries (*M* = 4.88, *SD* = 0.33), while the highest-rated task-oriented behavior was closely monitoring schedules to ensure timely completion of tasks or projects (*M* = 4.72, *SD* = 0.54). The independent samples *t*-test showed no statistically significant difference between public and private HEI administrators in concern for people, *t*(23) = 1.506, *p* = .146, and concern for tasks, *t*(23) = 0.789, *p* = .438. The findings indicate that administrators from both types of institutions demonstrated comparable leadership behaviors characterized by strong concern for both people and task accomplishment. The study provides a basis for continuing leadership development initiatives that support interpersonal relationships, accountability, and effective task management in higher education institutions.

Index Terms— leadership styles, higher education institutions, Managerial Grid Model, concern for people, concern for tasks, public HEIs, private HEIs, Central Luzon

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

Leadership plays a crucial role in shaping the success and effectiveness of higher education institutions (HEIs), influencing faculty performance [11], student outcomes, and institutional development. Leadership significantly influences faculty motivation, student outcomes, and institutional development [7][10]. Understanding these leadership dynamics is essential in fostering an environment that promotes both productivity and employee well-being.

Philippine studies have identified both common patterns and institutional distinctions between public and private HEIs [1][4]. Region-specific analyses—particularly in Luzon—underscore the importance of contextual factors shaping leadership styles [3][5]. Central Luzon is a significant educational hub in the country, home to a diverse range of HEIs that cater to various academic disciplines and institutional missions. By analyzing the leadership styles of HEI administrators in Central Luzon, this study aims to provide insights into the leadership trends that prevail in public and private institutions. The findings may serve as a basis for leadership development programs, policy enhancements, and strategic management initiatives that foster effective leadership in the academic sector similar to other studies conducted in a different parts of the country [8][9].

In relation to this, researchers also compared leadership styles in the public sector and academic institutions, highlighting how directive and transactional approaches dominate in government settings, while transformational leadership is more evident in academia, fostering collaboration and innovation [6]. Their findings reinforce the need to examine how public and private HEIs in Central Luzon differ in leadership approaches and how these

impact institutional effectiveness and employee satisfaction

B. Objective of the Study

General Objective:

The main objective of this study is to compare the leadership styles of administrators in selected public and private HEIs in Central Luzon using the Managerial Grid Model.

Specifically, it aims to:

1. Determine the demographic profile of public and private HEI administrators
2. Describe the leadership styles of public and private HEI administrators using Managerial Grid Model [2]
3. Compare the leadership styles between public and private HEI administrators

C. Significance of the Study

This research will benefit the following groups:

Higher Education Administrators - This study will be most beneficial to higher education administrators in both public and private institutions, as it provides a comparative analysis of leadership styles using the Managerial Grid Model [2]. By understanding their leadership orientation, administrators can assess their current leadership approach and implement strategies to enhance organizational effectiveness, faculty engagement, and institutional performance. The findings may also guide leadership development programs that foster balanced leadership, promoting both concern for people and productivity.

Faculty Members and Staff - They will also benefit from this study, as leadership styles directly influence workplace culture, job satisfaction, and overall institutional climate. Identifying leadership trends can help faculty and staff understand administrative decision-making processes and foster a more collaborative academic environment.

Higher Education Policymakers - For HEI policy makers, particularly those involved in educational governance in Central Luzon and the Philippines, the study offers valuable insights into leadership dynamics in public and private HEIs. These findings may contribute to leadership training initiatives, policy reforms, and capacity-building programs tailored to the unique challenges faced by academic leaders.

Future Researchers - Additionally, future researchers in the field of educational leadership and management may use this study as a reference for further investigations on leadership styles in HEIs. The study's comparative approach may inspire further research into how leadership influences institutional performance, faculty development, and student success in various educational settings.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research approach to systematically analyze and compare the leadership styles of administrators in selected public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Luzon, Philippines. Specifically, it utilized a descriptive-comparative research design, which aims to describe and compare the leadership styles of HEI administrators based on the Managerial Grid Model [2].

The descriptive aspect of the study focused on identifying the demographic profile of the respondents and describing their leadership styles according to the dimensions of concern for people and concern for production as measured by the Managerial Grid Questionnaire [2]. Meanwhile, the comparative component analyzed whether significant differences exist between the leadership styles of administrators in public and private HEIs.

B. Population and Sample of the Study

The population of this study consists of twenty-five (25) selected administrators from selected public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Luzon, Philippines. These administrators include university presidents, vice presidents, deans, department heads, coordinators, and directors

responsible for academic and administrative decision-making. The inclusion criteria focused on administrators who have been in leadership roles for a minimum period, ensuring they have sufficient experience to provide meaningful insights into their leadership styles.

The study used non-probability sampling technique, specifically convenience sampling, to distribute the questionnaire to the administrators who were only available at the time.

C. Research Instruments

This study utilized a structured questionnaire as its primary research instrument to gather quantitative data on the leadership styles of administrators in selected public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Luzon, Philippines. The questionnaire was divided into two main sections:

1. *Demographic Profile Section* – This section collected essential background information about the administrators including type of HEI (public or private) they are affiliated with, the current leadership positions they are holding and the number of years they have held their current positions.

2. *Managerial Grid Questionnaire* – The study adopted the Managerial Grid Questionnaire, a standardized instrument developed by Blake and Mouton (1964) [2] to assess leadership styles based on two key dimensions:

- 2.1 *Concern for People* – The extent to which a leader prioritizes the well-being, motivation, and development of their team members.

- 2.2 *Concern for Task* – The emphasis placed on achieving institutional goals, efficiency, and organizational performance.

The questionnaire consists of a set of statements measuring the respondents' leadership behaviors, which was rated using a 4-point Likert scale.

D. Data Collection Procedure

The data collection process for this study followed a systematic approach to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the gathered information. The procedure was conducted in the following steps:

1. *Securing Necessary Approvals* – Prior to data collection, the researcher sought approval from the appropriate authorities, including the Institutional Research Ethics Board (if applicable) and the administrative offices of the selected public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Luzon, Philippines. A formal letter of request will be sent to the participating institutions to obtain permission to conduct the study.

2. *Participant Recruitment* – The researcher identified and invited eligible HEI administrators to participate in the study. The selection was based on the predefined inclusion criteria, ensuring a balanced representation from both public and private institutions.

3. *Survey Distribution* – The finalized Managerial Grid Questionnaire [2] was distributed to the selected administrators either through printed copies or online survey platforms (e.g., Google Forms). The mode of distribution depended on institutional policies and the accessibility of participants.

4. *Informed Consent* – Before answering the questionnaire, participants were informed about the purpose, objectives, and confidentiality of the study. They were required to provide their informed consent, ensuring voluntary participation and adherence to ethical research standards.

5. *Data Collection* – Respondents were given a reasonable timeframe to complete the questionnaire. Follow-ups were also conducted via email or messaging applications to encourage participation.

6. *Data Verification and Organization* – Upon retrieval, the completed questionnaires were reviewed for completeness and accuracy. Incomplete or inconsistent responses were checked and, if necessary, clarified with the respondents. The data was systematically encoded and prepared for statistical analysis.

E. Statistical Treatment

To ensure a comprehensive and accurate analysis of the collected data, the study employed appropriate statistical tools aligned with the research objectives. The following statistical techniques were used:

1. Frequency and Percentage – To summarize categorical variables such as institutional affiliation (public or private), leadership positions and number of years in that position.
2. Mean and Standard Deviation – To describe the leadership styles of administrators based on their scores in the Managerial Grid Questionnaire [2].
3. Independent Samples t-Test – To compare the leadership styles between public and private HEI administrators, an independent samples t-test was conducted. This test will determine whether there is a statistically significant difference in leadership styles based on the concern for people and concern for task dimensions of the Managerial Grid Model [2].

III. RESULTS

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from the respondents.

1. Frequency Distribution of the Respondents

Table 1 summarizes the demographic distribution of the 25 respondents based on institutional affiliation, leadership position, and length of service. A nearly equal number of participants came from public (52.00%, $n = 13$) and private (48.00%, $n = 12$) higher education institutions (HEIs). The most common leadership roles were Dean and Program Coordinator, each held by 32.00% ($n = 8$) of the respondents, followed by Department Chairperson (20.00%, $n = 5$), and both Vice President for Academic Affairs and Director (8.00%, $n = 2$ each). In terms of tenure, 40.00% ($n = 10$) had served for 1 to 3 years, 32.00% ($n = 8$) for 4 to 6 years, 20.00% ($n = 5$) for less than one year, and only 8.00% ($n = 2$) for 7 to 9 years.

Demographics	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Institutional Affiliation</i>		
Private HEI	12	48.00%
Public HEI	13	52.00%
<i>Current Leadership Position</i>		
Vice President for Academic Affairs	2	8.00%
Dean	8	32.00%
Department Chairperson	5	20.00%
Program Coordinator	8	32.00%
Director	2	8.00%
<i>Number of Years (Current Position)</i>		
Less than 1 year	5	20.00%
1–3 years	10	40.00%
4–6 years	8	32.00%
7–9 years	2	8.00%
Total	25	100.00%

2.1 Descriptive Summary of the Respondents Leadership Behavior According to the Managerial Grid Questionnaire in Terms of Concern for People

Table 2.1 presents the descriptive summary of the respondents' leadership behavior according to the Managerial Grid Questionnaire in terms of Concern for People.

The highest mean was observed in the statement “I honor other people's boundaries” ($M = 4.88$, $SD = 0.33$), which was verbally described as “Always.” This indicates that the respondents strongly value respect for personal and professional boundaries in the workplace.

In contrast, the lowest mean was recorded in the statement “When correcting mistakes, I do not worry about jeopardizing relationships” ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.64$), described as “Sometimes.” This suggests that while most behaviors reflect high concern for people, some respondents are still cautious about balancing correction with maintaining relationships.

The overall mean of 4.37 ($SD = 0.96$) shows that respondents “Always” demonstrate leadership behaviors that reflect a strong concern for people, underscoring a generally people-oriented leadership style.

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description
1. I encourage my team to participate when it comes decision-making time and I try to implement their ideas and suggestions.	4.64	0.57	Always
4. I enjoy coaching people on new tasks and procedures.	4.60	0.65	Always
6. I encourage my employees to be creative about their job.	4.72	0.54	Always
9. I enjoy reading articles, books, and journals about training, leadership, and psychology; and then putting what I have read into action.	4.20	0.82	Always
10. When correcting mistakes, I do not worry about jeopardizing relationships.	3.12	1.64	Sometimes
12. I enjoy explaining the intricacies and details of a complex task or project to my employees.	4.32	0.75	Always
14. Nothing is more important than building a great team.	4.76	0.60	Always
16. I honor other people's boundaries.	4.88	0.33	Always
17. Counseling my employees to improve their performance or behavior is second nature to me.	4.12	0.88	Often
Overall	4.37	0.96	Always

Range: 0-0.32 never; 0.33-1.66 rarely; 1.67-2.48 occasionally; 2.49-3.32 sometimes; 3.33-4.16 often; 4.17-5.00 always

2.2 Descriptive Summary of the Respondents Leadership Behavior According to the Managerial Grid Questionnaire in Terms of Concern for Tasks

Table 2.2 presents the descriptive summary of the respondents' leadership behavior according to the Managerial Grid Questionnaire in terms of Concern for Tasks.

The highest mean was noted in the statement "I closely monitor the schedule to ensure a task or project will be completed in time" (M = 4.72, SD = 0.54), which was verbally described as "Always." This indicates that respondents place strong emphasis on time management and timely task completion.

On the other hand, the lowest mean was recorded in the statement "I find it easy to carry out several complicated tasks at the same time" (M = 3.80, SD = 0.96), which received a verbal description of "Often." Despite being the lowest, this still reflects a generally positive tendency toward task efficiency.

The overall mean of 4.26 (SD = 0.80) suggests that respondents "Always" exhibit behaviors aligned with a high concern for task accomplishment, demonstrating strong task-oriented leadership attributes.

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Description
2. Nothing is more important than accomplishing a goal or task.	4.48	0.65	Always
3. I closely monitor the schedule to ensure a task or project will be completed in time.	4.72	0.54	Always
5. The more challenging a task is, the more I enjoy it.	4.12	0.83	Often
7. When seeing a complex task through to completion, I ensure that every detail is accounted for.	4.64	0.57	Always
8. I find it easy to carry out several complicated tasks at the same time.	3.80	0.96	Often
11. I manage my time very efficiently.	4.08	0.70	Often
13. Breaking large projects into small manageable tasks is second nature to me.	4.16	0.99	Often
15. I enjoy analyzing problems.	4.20	0.71	Always
18. I enjoy reading articles, books, and trade journals about my profession; and then implementing the new procedures I have learned.	4.12	0.83	Often
Overall	4.26	0.80	Always

Range: 0-0.32 never; 0.33-1.66 rarely; 1.67-2.48 occasionally; 2.49-3.32 sometimes; 3.33-4.16 often; 4.17-5.00 always

3. Comparison of the Leadership Styles Between Public and Private HEI Leaders Using Independent Sample t-test

Table 3 presents the results of an independent sample t-test comparing the leadership styles of higher education institution (HEI) leaders from public and private institutions in terms of concern for people and concern for task. The results indicate no statistically significant difference between the two groups in their concern for people, with public HEI leaders (M = 8.14, SD = 0.66) and private HEI leaders (M = 7.58, SD = 1.14), $t(23) = 1.506$, $p = .146$. Similarly, the difference in concern for task was not significant, $t(23) = 0.789$, $p = .438$, with public HEI leaders (M = 7.82, SD = 0.74) and private HEI leaders (M = 7.50, SD = 1.22). These findings suggest that the leadership styles of public and private HEI leaders are generally comparable, with no meaningful distinction in their orientation toward people or tasks.

Leadership Style	HEI	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	df	p-value	Remarks
Concern for People	Public	8.14	0.655	1.506	23	0.146	Not Significant
	Private	7.58	1.142				
Concern for Task	Public	7.82	0.741	0.789	23	0.438	Not Significant
	Private	7.50	1.220				

**p < 0.05

IV. CONCLUSION

A. Summary of Findings

This study explored and compared the leadership styles of administrators in public and private Higher

Education Institutions (HEIs) using the Managerial Grid Model, which assesses leadership behavior in terms of concern for people and concern for tasks.

The frequency distribution revealed that the respondents were nearly equally distributed between public (52.00%, $n = 13$) and private (48.00%, $n = 12$) HEIs. The most commonly held leadership positions were Dean and Program Coordinator, each representing 32.00% ($n = 8$), followed by Department Chairperson (20.00%, $n = 5$), while both Vice President for Academic Affairs and Director positions were held by 8.00% ($n = 2$) of the respondents. In terms of length of service, 40.00% ($n = 10$) had served for 1 to 3 years, 32.00% ($n = 8$) for 4 to 6 years, 20.00% ($n = 5$) for less than one year, and 8.00% ($n = 2$) for 7 to 9 years.

In terms of leadership behavior focused on concern for people, the highest-rated item was "I honor other people's boundaries" ($M = 4.88$, $SD = 0.33$), reflecting consistent adherence to respectful interpersonal interactions. The lowest-rated item, "When correcting mistakes, I do not worry about jeopardizing relationships" ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.64$), suggests some leaders exhibit caution in balancing correction with maintaining relationships. The overall mean score for concern for people was 4.37 ($SD = 0.96$), which indicates that respondents generally "Always" demonstrate people-oriented leadership behaviors.

For concern for tasks, the highest mean was observed in the statement "I closely monitor the schedule to ensure a task or project will be completed in time" ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 0.54$), highlighting a strong commitment to time management and organizational efficiency. The lowest mean, "I find it easy to carry out several complicated tasks at the same time" ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.96$), though slightly lower, still reflects a positive tendency toward multitasking. The overall mean score for task concern was 4.26 ($SD = 0.80$), also suggesting a high degree of task-oriented leadership behavior among the respondents.

Finally, the independent samples t-test revealed no statistically significant difference between public and private HEI leaders in terms of concern for people, $t(23) = 1.506$, $p = .146$, nor in terms of concern for tasks, $t(23) = 0.789$, $p = .438$. This indicates that both groups demonstrate comparable leadership styles,

exhibiting high concern for both people and task performance, without a significant distinction based on institutional affiliation.

B. Conclusions

This study investigated and compared the leadership styles of administrators in public and private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) through the lens of the Managerial Grid Model, which emphasizes concern for people and concern for tasks as key dimensions of effective leadership. The findings yielded several important conclusions.

1. First, the demographic profile of the respondents revealed a balanced representation from both public and private HEIs, with leadership roles predominantly held by Deans and Program Coordinators. The diversity in tenure among respondents also suggests a wide range of leadership experience within the sample.

2. Second, the overall results show that HEI leaders generally exhibit a leadership style characterized by a high degree of concern for both people and tasks. Respondents consistently demonstrated respect for personal and professional boundaries and showed strong commitment to task completion and time management. These findings align with the 9, 9 leadership style of the Managerial Grid Model, which is considered the most effective, as it reflects a balance between fostering positive interpersonal relationships and achieving organizational goals.

3. Lastly, the results of the independent samples t-test revealed no statistically significant differences in leadership styles between public and private HEI leaders. This suggests that institutional affiliation does not substantially influence the degree to which leaders demonstrate concern for people or for tasks. Regardless of whether they serve in public or private institutions, HEI leaders tend to adopt similar leadership behaviors that prioritize both human relationships and productivity.

Overall, the findings underscore the presence of a generally effective and balanced leadership style among HEI administrators, which may contribute positively to institutional performance, organizational culture, and employee engagement

C. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are proposed to further enhance leadership effectiveness in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs):

1. Promote Continuous Leadership Development

Both public and private HEIs should implement ongoing leadership development programs that reinforce the balanced leadership style reflected in the Managerial Grid Model. Training sessions, workshops, and mentoring programs focusing on enhancing concern for both people and tasks can help sustain and further develop effective leadership behaviors.

2. Encourage Reflective Leadership Practices

Leaders are encouraged to engage in self-assessment and reflective practices using tools such as the Managerial Grid Questionnaire. This will allow them to identify areas where they may improve, particularly in addressing the balance between maintaining professional relationships and ensuring task completion.

3. Foster a Culture of Mutual Respect and Accountability

Institutions should cultivate a work environment where respect for individual boundaries and interpersonal relationships is as valued as task performance. Encouraging open communication and collaborative decision-making may further reinforce the people-oriented dimension of leadership.

4. Support Task Management Skills and Multitasking Abilities

While respondents generally exhibited strong task-oriented behaviors, areas such as multitasking were identified as relatively lower. HEIs may consider providing time management and productivity tools or training to help leaders manage complex responsibilities more efficiently.

5. Conduct Further Research with Larger and More Diverse Samples

To enhance the generalizability of the findings, future studies should consider involving a larger and more geographically diverse sample of HEI leaders. Comparative studies across different regions or cultural settings may offer deeper insights into contextual influences on leadership styles.

6. Utilize Leadership Assessments in Hiring and Promotion Decisions

HEIs may benefit from integrating leadership style assessments as part of their leadership selection or promotion processes. Identifying candidates with a balanced concern for people and tasks can contribute to more effective governance and institutional outcomes.

By implementing these recommendations, both public and private higher education institutions can continue to cultivate leadership practices that foster organizational effectiveness, promote employee well-being, and support academic excellence.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abustan, A. J., Ali, A., Bautista, S., Bermudo, P. J., Serrano, E. J., & Yango, A. (2023). Leadership factors of educational leaders, organizational culture and teacher competence in selected private higher education institutions in Binan, Laguna. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 44(1), 560–572. [Technium](#)
- [2] Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1964). *The Managerial Grid: The Key to Leadership Excellence*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.
- [3] Caibigan, R. A., & Javier, F. V. (2025). Leadership styles on gender equality and work-life balance among hotels in Central Luzon: Basis of a strategic plan. *Int'l Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 13(1), 163–176. [Consortia Academia](#)
- [4] Elardo-Zabala, P. S. (2021). The leadership styles of the local universities and colleges' administrators. *Int'l Journal of Educational Management & Development Studies*, 2(2), 20–37. [IIARI](#)
- [5] Lobo, J. (2022). Leadership styles of choreographers vis-à-vis commitment of student-dancers across various HEIs in Luzon,

- Philippines. *American Journal of Arts and Human Science*, 1(1), 11–26. [E-Palli](#)
- [6] Nilo, M. J. V., Dungca, E. J. C., Mallari, M. O., & Florencondia, N. T. (2025). Leadership Dynamics: A Comparative Study of Public Sector and Academic Setting. *Iconic Research And Engineering Journals*, 8(11). [IRE Journals](#)
- [7] Palencia, R. S. (2022). Executive leadership traits and the organizational culture of selected higher education institutions in Region VIII, Philippines: A cross-sectional survey. *Int'l Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S6), 8765–8778. [International Journal of Health Sciences](#)
- [8] Rodriguez, R. (2023). Leadership Styles of Senior High School Coordinators in Isabela City, Basilan Philippines. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Social Sciences*, 16(2), 39–48. retrieved from [Journal of Multidisciplinary in Social Sciences](#)
- [9] Rodriguez, R., Salain, H., Babas, L., Flores, L., Mangubat, M. and Alipio, R. (2024) Leadership Styles of Middle-Managers of Higher Education Institutions in Basilan, Philippines. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 12, 302-317. [Scientific Research Publishing](#)
- [10] Sayyadi, M., & Provitera, M. J. (2022). What grid organizational development could mean for higher education. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 87(4), 15–34.
- [11] Vargas, R. (2024). Leadership Style of Academic Heads in Private Higher Education Institutions as Correlate of Work Motivation and Organizational Commitment of Faculty Members. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 17(6), 552-566.