Decision Making, Personal Influence and Creativity Among School Heads

DIODENAH B. PELOSTRATOS
Principal I
Western Leyte College
Master of Arts in Education
Major in School Administration and Supervision
diodenahpelostratos@gmail.com

Abstract — The main purpose of this study was to determine the decision making, level of personal influence and creativity among school heads of Isabel 2 District, Leyte Division, School Year 2021-2022. Based on the findings of the study, a management enhancement plan was proposed. The study employed the descriptive –correlation method of research. The respondents of the study were the teachers of Isabel District II. Stratified random sampling using Slovin's formula was used in selecting sample teachers.

The school heads have a very good decision-making skills applied in a variety of leadership styles. School heads possess good manifestation of personal influence and showed excellent creativity. Gender is not a factor that differentiates decision making skills, personal influence and creativity among school heads. Furthermore, decision making, personal influence and creativity are significantly related to each other.

The male and female elementary school heads have the same level of decision-making skills, personal influence and creativity. The higher the elementary school head's decision making skill, the more influential they are. The higher the elementary school head's decision making skill, the more creative they become; and the higher the personal influence of the elementary school heads, the more creative they are.

The management plan being proposed should be considered for implementation. The school heads should strive to develop and improve their skills in decision making, personal influence and creativity.

Keywords — Decision Making, Personal Influence, Creativity

I. Introduction

One of the major skills school heads must possess is their ability to make decisions. The way they decide on things can affect the programs and activities of the school. It is believed that the decision making of school heads are being affected by their personal influence and creativity. If they can motivate and move people to their best and establish a harmonious relationship with them, the decision making of the heads are also directed to the welfare of the whole learning community. If the leaders want to lead effectively, they need to be able to make good decisions. If

they can learn to do this in a timely and well considered way, then they can lead their team to a spectacular and well delivered success.

According to Marites and Fule (2000) decision making is the pattern of behavior and action that leaders or administrators make a period of time as perceived by the followers. Decision making according to them, is the visible aspect of leadership. It is a manifestation of leader's assumption philosophies and attitudes. School administrators must understand their role under this condition of rapid change. They will find themselves facing condition that change as a result of forces outside of their own control. They must in these situations learn to adjust to new development. On the other hand, they find that their role in school is to promote change and create progress.

In the Philippines, one of the main reasons why personality must be looked into is to keep us on the job. Personality has a great deal to do with holding a job. In the field of education, teachers, students, administrators and parents and the entire community as a whole, are affected on how the school administrators influence, create and make decisions in the promotion of common goal. Because proper decision is a key factor in everything we do, it makes or unmakes a person, it can lead to failure or success of an organization and it can cause rise and fall of the position (Arbinoya 2003).

According to Clements (1990), effective influence does not just happen; it is how one gets people to buy one's ideas and needs. Being able to accurately read the situation, individual and groups applying the appropriate type of influence behavior are the keys to becoming successful at influencing. Influence is the ability to have others to take a desired action while building and maintaining the relationship. Education is human development. It is the development of knowledge, skills, and habits, and towards human excellence. Education today is not enough: it has to prepare the undergraduates for the change they have to face after graduation. Personal influence never stops, for better or worse. School administrators and mentors continue to influence people in the organization. In fact, their influence may actually increase with time. Influence can be subtle; two people might do the same thing or say the same words and yet exert very different influences. Personal influence radiates from the real person: whereas an unreal persona exercises personal manipulation. Personality-disguise is inauthentic, disingenuous, and self defeating. Even the best orator will be unconvincing if he does not believe his own message. Words that come straight from the heart speak straight to the hearts of others.

One of the essential ingredients of high-performing leaders, teams and organizations is creativity. According to Harris (2008) to be creative means releasing talent and imagination. It also deals with the ability to take risks and, in some cases, necessitates standing outside the usual or accepted frames of reference. Creative people push the boundaries; they seek new ways of seeing, interpreting, understanding and questioning. They can accept the ambiguity of contradiction and uncertainty. They can tolerate disorder and unpredictability. In fact, they thrive in circumstances which others might see as chaotic and disorderly. Kirton (1995) supports the

notion that all people have creative ability -and that these abilities are different in style and approach.

It is a reality that the school heads are to make decisions every day. With the presence of various undertakings, they are to make sure that the decisions they make are in conformity with what is best for the learning community. The personal influence and creativity of the school heads are believed to have influence on the decision they manifest in dealing with the affairs of the school.

In Isabel 2 District, Leyte Division, it has been observed that majority of the school principals are viewed by the teachers as passive when it comes to creativity. Most principals gave responsibility to the teachers to perform creative tasks. On the other hand, the decision making skills are not that perceived since most orders came from DepEd and principals need to follow the directives. The researcher observed that most school principals are reluctant and passive in their decision making and creativity. However, their influence is high manifested because they hold position. One situation happened in one of the schools where the school principal has to face legal issue pertaining to the wrong decision that was made. In other account, there was one school where the school head had a hard time convincing the teachers to follow her plan. These accounts somehow prompted the researcher to assess the extent of the decision making, personal influence and creativity of the elementary school heads.

The researcher who is a school principal for more than five years believes that the decision making of the school heads are being influence by their personal influence and creativity. Better decision making styles are products of the school heads' display of equally better personal influence and creativity. It is in this premise that the researcher conducts the study to find out if the decision making of the school heads of Isabel 2 District, Leyte Division has significant bearing on their personal influence and creativity.

Specifically, this study will seek to answer the following queries:

1. What is the profile of the elementary school heads in terms of:
    1.1   Age;
    1.2   Gender;
    1.3   Highest Educational Attainment;
    1.4   Length of service; and
    1.5   Number of management-related seminars attended?
2. What is the perceived decision making skills elementary school heads in terms of the following leadership styles:
    2.1 Autocratic;
    2.2 Democratic;
    2.3 Laissez-Faire; and

2.4 Consultative?

3. What is the perceived level of personal influence of the elementary school heads in terms of:

3.1 Reward and Punishment;

3.2 Participation and Trust;

3.3 Common Vision; and

3.4 Assertive Persuasion?

4. What is the perceived level of creativity of the elementary school heads in terms of:

4.1 Intuition;

4.2 Insights;

4.3 Logical Formation; and

4.4 Unconscious Scanning?

5. Is there a significant difference between male and female elementary school heads in terms of the following:

5.1 Decision making styles:

5.2 Personal influence; and

5.3 Creativity?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the following:

6.1 Decision making styles and Personal influence;

6.2 Decision making styles and Creativity; and

6.3 Personal influence and Creativity?

7. What management enhancement plan can be proposed based on the findings of the study?

II. Methodology

Design. The study employed the descriptive –correlation method of research. This is designed to gather data, ideas, facts and information related to study and to determine the extent to which different variables are related to each other in the population of interest. The study is descriptive since it assessed the decision making styles and personal influence and creativity of public elementary school heads in the Isabel 2 District, Leyte Division. It is also correlation since it determined the relationship between the elementary school heads' profile, decision making styles, personal influence, and creativity of elementary school heads.

Sampling. The study was conducted in Isabel 2 District, Leyte Division. The respondents of the study were the teachers of Congressional II. Stratified random sampling using Slovin's formula was used in selecting sample teachers. Table 1 shows the sampling distribution of respondents. There were 200 teachers involved as respondents of the study, who rated the personal influence, creativity and decision making styles of their respective school heads. The study made use of researcher-modified instruments in gathering the data. Four (4) sets of modified instruments

will be employed. The first questionnaire consists of the elementary school head's personal data on age, gender, highest educational attainment, length of service and numbers of seminars attended. The questionnaire on personal influence was adopted from the instruments of Newman (1992) found in (http//:com.yahoo www-rollins edu.comm/wschmdt assment) and (http//:www.acsu-bufalo.edu/stterry). The questionnaire for creativity was taken from website of (http://www.myskillsprofile.com/csq.html) and the decision making styles was from the standard questionnaire from (DepEd Basic Education School Management Course) RELC, Davao City July 6-15 2005).

For the decision-making styles of the school heads, the study used a modified questionnaire of De George (1982) composed of 40 items. The questionnaire do not specify as to what particular style the items belong. After which, their answers were tallied tabulated and identified as to what particular decision making style the school has adopted.

The decision making styles was categorized as: autocratic, consultative, democratic, and laissez-faire. Items in the questionnaire for autocratic are numbered 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33 and 37. For consultative are items 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34 and 38. For democratic, these are numbered 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31, 35, and 39, and for Laissez-faire are items 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36, and 40. Part 3 determined the level of personal influence. The items in the questionnaire are grouped into 4 categories in terms of reward and punishment, participation and trust, common vision, and assertive persuasion.

Research Procedure. Formulation of Survey Questionnaire was done first. The questionnaires were formulated to be able to achieve the objective of the study. Names of School Heads was retrieved from the office of the Schools Division Superintendent and letter to conduct the said study in their area of responsibility.

Permission to conduct the study was through letters addressed to the schools Division Superintendent and heads of various schools under study. Upon the approval of the request, the researcher personally administered the distribution of the questionnaire to the respondents.

Slovin's formula and random sampling technique was used to determine the number of population. After the desired respondents was determined, the researcher distributed the questionnaires to obtain responses. The profile of the school heads was also sought.

The data was retrieved, tallied, classified, and presented in a tabular and graphical form to facilitate the statistical interpretation

Treatment of Data. The following statistical tools were used in the study. Simple Percentage. This was utilized to determine the profile of the school heads based on age, gender, length of service, highest educational attainment and number of seminars attended. Weighted Mean. This was employed to determine the most appropriate tool for the interval data. The same statistic was used to describe the level of measurement. This was used to determine the decision making styles, personal influence and creativity. T-test Independent Sample. This determined the

significant difference between male and female school heads in terms of decision making styles, personal influence and creativity. Chi-square. This was used to determine the significant relationship between the school heads' profile and decision making styles, personal influence and creativity. Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation. This was used to determine the relationship between personal influence and decision making styles and between creativity and decision making styles of the school heads.

III. Results and Discussion

I-A. Decision Making Skill of School Heads in terms of Autocratic Leadership Style

Presented in Table 3 is the decision making skill of elementary school heads in terms of autocratic leadership style which reveals a very good decision maker with the overall mean score of 3.90. Out of the ten items there is one that show excellent decision making with the mean score of 4.24 that believing with the subordinates are empowered a better picture of right decisions are achieved. However, items that denotes very good as a decision maker are: 4.24 on suspects the subordinates respect; 4.17 for being not decisive but basically has decision making; 4.13 for believes that subordinates rely on the professional expertise and experience to make decisions; they see their role as decision implementers; 3.97 for takes charge of important decisions; 3.86 on leaves every important issue to the subordinates to decide so he/she can have more time to plan in advance; 3.78 on does consciously rely on subordinates to make decisions; 3.77 believes that there is little point in involving subordinates in decision-making ; 3.76 exerts little efforts in discussing any important issue with subordinates; 3.75 works against time, the quicker he/she makes any decision the sooner he/she gets results. There is one item that obtains good in terms of lack decision-making skills with the mean score of 3.32.

Table 3
Level of Decision Making of School Heads
in terms of Autocratic Leadership Style

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. exerts little efforts in discussing any important issue with subordinates	3.76	1.10	Very Good
2. may not be decisive but basically has decision making	4.17	0.73	Very Good
3.takes charge of important decisions	3.97	0.83	Very Good
4.suspects the subordinates respect	4.24	0.87	Excellent
5.does consciously rely on subordinates to make decisions	3.78	0.90	Very Good
6.believes that there is little point in involving subordinates in decision-making	3.77	1.11	Very Good
7.works against time, the quicker he/she makes any decision the sooner he/she gets results	3.75	1.10	Very Good
8.believes that subordinates rely on the professional expertise and experience to make decisions; they see their role as decision implementers	4.13	0.78	Very Good
9. leaves every important issue to the subordinates to decide so he/she can have more time to plan in advance	3.86	0.92	Very Good
10. lacks decision-making skills	3.32	1.26	Good
Average Weighted Mean	**3.90**	**0.57**	**Very Good**

I-B. Level of Decision Making of School Heads in terms of Democratic Leadership Styles

Presented in Table 4 is the level of decision making of school heads in terms of democratic which reveals as an excellent decision maker with the overall mean score of 4.19. Most of the items denotes excellent with the mean scores of 4.59 for believing that two heads are better than one; 4.41 in agreeing on the involvement of subordinates in making decision with confidence; 4.33 for involving subordinates in making joint decision; 4.31 said that wherever possible does not take the easier way to decide unilaterally; instead urges subordinates to decide jointly; 4.31 for strongly feels that a group decision is always better as the group will subsequently try to make the decision work; 4.26 for encouraging the subordinates to review issues and problems and let them decide how the issues are to be resolved jointly. The following items that denotes very good are 4.11 in enjoying group discussion with subordinates; 4.07 for agreeing on the involvement of

subordinates in making decision with confidence; 3.94 for putting much effort into sharing ideas to subordinates by guiding logically; and 3.53 in making decision by involving subordinates.

The level of decision making of schools in terms of democratic reveals very good. This implies that school heads are eeffective leaders that have strong listening skills in order to understand situations, improve cooperation, and encourage people to take responsibility.

Table 4
Level of Decision Making of School Heads
in terms of Democratic Leadership Style

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. believes that two heads are better than one	4.59	0.80	Excellent
2. involves subordinates in making joint decision	4.33	0.65	Excellent
3. encourages the subordinates to review issues and problems and let them decide how the issues are to be resolved jointly	4.26	0.74	Excellent
4. strongly feels that a group decision is always better as the group will subsequently try to make the decision work	4.31	0.80	Excellent
5. enjoys holding group discussion with subordinates	4.11	0.86	Very Good
6. puts much effort into sharing ideas to subordinates by guiding logically	3.94	0.93	Very Good
7. agrees on the involvement of subordinates in making decision with confidence	4.41	0.72	Excellent
8. agrees on the involvement of subordinates in making decision with confidence	4.07	0.77	Very Good
9. Wherever possible does not take the easier way to decide unilaterally; instead urges subordinates to decide jointly	4.31	0.78	Excellent
10. makes decision by involving subordinates	3.53	1.12	Very Good
Average Weighted Mean	**4.19**	**0.52**	**Very Good**

I-C. Level of Decision Making of School Heads in terms of Laissez-Faire

Presented in Table 5 is the level of decision making of school heads in terms of laissez-faire which reveals a very good decision maker with the overall mean score of 3.94. The following mean scores that denotes excellent are: putting a lot of effort in encouraging subordinates to think and decide and are accountable for the results with the mean score of 4.36 and 4.24 in allowing subordinates to decide on matters affecting their work to find it more meaningful. The items that

show very good decision maker are: finding extra time to work with subordinates and leaves subordinates in making their own decisions with the mean score of 4.10; allowing subordinates to make decisions with the mean score of 4.07; 4.06 for believing that the quality of subordinates' decision will improve in the absence of the administrator; 3.92 for encouraging subordinates to make decisions on their own without expecting any assistance; 3.92 for believing that if subordinates' decisions fail, they will learn to make better decisions in the future; 3.75 for worrying whenever subordinates are left to make decisions; 3.53 for seeing no point in giving subordinates the freedom to make decision if they still need guidance and supervision; and 3.42 in discouraging subordinates of becoming an extension of machine cog if he/she is not given an   opportunity to make important decisions on her/his own.

The findings show that school heads monitor what is being achieved and communicate this back to his or her team regularly. Most often, laissez-faire leadership works for teams in which the individuals are very experienced and skilled self-starters.

Table 5
Level of Decision Making of School Heads in terms of Laissez-Faire Leadership Style

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. does not worry whenever subordinates are left to make decisions	3.75	1.09	Very Good
2. puts a lot of effort in encouraging subordinates to think and decide and are accountable for the results	4.36	0.68	Excellent
3. allows subordinates to make decisions	4.07	0.86	Very Good
4. allows subordinates to decide on matters affecting their work to find it more meaningful	4.24	0.77	Excellent
5. discourages subordinates of becoming an extension of machine cog if he/she is not given an opportunity to make important decisions on her/his own	3.42	1.17	Very Good
6. sees no point in giving subordinates the freedom to make decision if they still need guidance and supervision	3.53	1.08	Very Good
7. finds extra time to work with subordinates and leaves subordinates in making their own decisions	4.10	0.86	Very Good
8. believes that the quality of subordinates' decision will improve in the absence of the administrator	4.06	0.97	Very Good
9. encourages subordinates to make decisions on their own without expecting any assistance	3.92	0.97	Very Good
10. believes that if subordinates' decisions fail, they will learn to make better decisions in the future	3.92	0.97	Very Good
Average Weighted Mean	**3.94**	**0.63**	**Very Good**

II-D. Level of Decision Making of School Heads in terms of Consultative

Presented in Table 6 is the level of decision making of school heads in terms of consultative. The overall mean score is 4.19 described as a very good decision maker. The following are the items that proves the school heads to be an excellent decision maker: 4.49 values the joint-consultation; 4.41 makes better decision if an issue has been openly brainstormed with subordinates; 4.36 finds it easier to make a decision after discussing the matter; 4.25 reviews issues of subordinates on their opinions before making a decision ; 4.24 feels that the quality of the decisions improves by seeking subordinates' opinions . However, they prove to be a very good decision maker in terms of the following items with the mean scores of: 4.13 values highly the words of the subordinates ; 4.09 finds meeting the subordinates and getting their views as essential part of the job as a manager although subordinates are poor in decision making ; 4.09 believes that the approach to decision-making is to invite subordinates to contribute as much as they know while listening,; 4.00 tends to avoid making a hasty decision without getting enough information from subordinates; 3.80 believes that when the subordinates are empowered a better picture of right decisions are achieved.

Table 6
Level of Decision Making of School Heads in terms of Consultative Leadership Style

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. finds it easier to make a decision after discussing the matter	4.36	0.69	Excellent
2. makes better decision if an issue has been openly brainstormed with subordinates	4.41	0.61	Excellent
3. values the joint-consultation	4.49	0.71	Excellent
4. believes that when the subordinates are empowered a better picture of right decisions are achieved	3.80	0.92	Very Good
5. finds meeting the subordinates and getting their views as essential part of the job as a manager although subordinates are poor in decision making	4.09	0.82	Very Good
6. feels that the quality of the decisions improves by seeking subordinates' opinions	4.24	0.71	Excellent
7. reviews issues of subordinates on their opinions before making a decision	4.25	0.80	Excellent
8. tends to avoid making a hasty decision without getting enough information from subordinates	4.00	0.98	Very Good
9. values highly the words of the subordinates	4.13	0.82	Very Good
10. believes that the approach to decision-making is to invite subordinates to contribute as much as they know while listening,	4.09	0.85	Very Good
Average Weighted Mean	**4.19**	**0.52**	**Very Good**

II. Level of Personal Influence of School Heads

A. Rewards and Punishment.

Presented in Table 7 is the level of personal influence of school heads in terms of rewards and punishment as perceived by teachers with the overall mean of 3.81 which denotes good personal influence. The following are the mean scores: 4.20 as to gives other people credit for their ideas; 4.14 as to heightens others' awareness of the benefits of pulling together as one; 3.85 for using moral imperatives such as "should, ought and must"; 3.80 for giving impressive judgment of others; 3.67 in wanting something without hesitation so others will give it; 3.56 for using authority to get things done and 3.43 as to admitting lack of knowledge and expertise in a situation.

The highest rated item is on "gives other people credit for their ideas." This means that the school heads are likely to use consultative leadership style. The school heads accepts suggestions and recognizes authorship and ownership of suggestion. The recognition is often expressed in verbal and spoken manner and based experience it gives a good feeling to the members of the organization. The lowest rated item is on "admits a lack of knowledge and expertise in a situation." This means that school heads still succumb to autocratic leadership style.

Table 7
Level of Personal Influence of School Heads in terms of Rewards and Punishment

Rewards and Punishment	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. gives impression of setting in judgment with others	3.80	1.03	Good
2. uses moral imperatives such as "should, ought and must"	3.85	0.87	Good
3. wants something without hesitation so others will give it	3.67	1.19	Good
4. uses authority to get things done	3.56	1.23	Good
5. admits a lack of knowledge and expertise in a situation	3.43	1.14	Good
6. gives other people credit for their ideas	4.20	0.79	Very Good
7. heightens others' awareness of the benefits of pulling together as one	4.14	0.77	Good
Average Weighted Mean	**3.81**	**0.72**	**Good**

B. Participation and Trust. Presented in Table 8 is the level of personal influence of school heads in terms of participation and trust as indicator of personal influence, the teachers perceived that school heads are very good in this aspect with the overall mean score of 4.27. The following are the mean scores for participation and trust: 4.38 or very good in helping others to

present their ideas; 4.34 for proposing and suggesting things that have a strong impact on others; 4.29 in leading others to see exciting possibilities in a situation as well as causes people to work with, more aware of the common aims and goals; 4.27 in conveying sense of excitement to others; 4.24 in making it clear as what is expected and 4.09 in making on wishes and desires known to others quickly.

The highest rated item is on "helps other to be heard of one's ideas." This means that the schools heads are supportive of other's ideas. This also means that the school heads provide rooms or space for other voice's to be heard. Good opinions are necessary in an organization and if this comes, the school head is aware of its necessity and would always support creative ideas. The lowest rated item is on "quick to make on wishes and desires known to others." This means that the school head is less familiar and comfortable speaking in front of other people. Public school heads are hesitant to make request most especially if it is personal and not necessary. People in public school are well aware of their professional interest and sometimes would not mind personal and wishful thinking of the school heads.

Table 8
Level of Personal Influence of School Heads in terms of Participation and Trust

Participation and Trust	Mean	Std.dev	Interpretation
1. quick to make on wishes and desires known to others	4.09	0.94	Good
2. brings other to see the exciting, possibilities in a situation	4.29	0.73	Very Good
3. makes it clear what to give in return for what is wanted	4.24	0.82	Very Good
4. helps other to be heard of one's ideas	4.38	0.73	Very Good
5. speaks to conveys a sense of excitement to others	4.27	0.76	Very Good
6. causes people to work with more aware of the common aims and goals	4.29	0.74	Very Good
7. proposes and suggests things that have a strong impact on others	4.34	0.76	Very Good
Overall	**4.27**	**0.64**	**Very Good**

C. Common Vision. Presented in Table 9 is the level of personal influence of school heads in terms of common vision. The teachers perceived that their school heads have a very good personal influence with the overall mean score of 4.36. The school heads obtained very good with the mean score of 4.50 in expressing sympathy to others when they experience difficulties; 4.39 in encouraging people to come up with their own solutions; 4.39 in letting others know for meeting

set of standards; 4.38 in delegating full responsibility for important task; 4.34 in giving quick credit for good work; 4.27 in opening opportunities of personal hopes and fear and 4.27 in showing tolerance and acceptance of others' feelings.

The highest rated item is on "expresses sympathy to others when they have difficulties." This means that the school heads express social empathy towards the people in organization. This is an important quality of a leader since its people in organization should be dealt with as human beings with feelings and emotions. The lowest rated item is on "opens about personal hopes and fear and shows tolerance and acceptance of others' feelings." This means that the leader is still practicing autocratic leadership style. School heads are viewed firm and adamant on their decision and manner of dealing with other people. In ordinary occasion, school heads should show firmness and decency.

Table 9
Level of Personal Influence of School Heads in terms of Common Vision

Common Vision	Mean	Std.dev	Interpretation
1. quick to give credit for good work	4.34	0.74	Very Good
2. encourages people to come up with their own solutions	4.39	0.68	Very Good
3. expresses sympathy to others when they have difficulties	4.50	0.69	Very Good
4. let others know for meeting set of standards	4.39	0.65	Very Good
5. opens about personal hopes and fear	4.27	0.77	Very Good
6. shows tolerance and acceptance of others' feelings	4.27	0.73	Very Good
7. delegates full responsibility for important task	4.38	0.71	Very Good
Overall	**4.36**	**0.56**	**Very Good**

D. Assertive Persuasion. Presented in Table 10 is the level of personal influence of school heads in terms of assertive persuasion. The teachers perceived that their school heads have good personal influence as revealed in the overall mean score of 4.00. They obtained good personal influence with the mean scores of: 4.32 for setting a good logical argument; 4.30 for putting forward lots of good ideas and proposals; 4.15 on depending ideas energetically; 4.14 in putting forth ideas that are both incisive and highly relevant to the problem at hand ; 3.82 in penning bargain or deals to get what is wanted from others; 3.78 in coming forward quickly with counter argument when opposed; and 3.50 in   ignoring others mistakes.

Table 10
Level of Personal Influence of School Heads in terms of Assertive Persuasion

Assertive Persuasion	Mean	Std.dev	Interpretation
1. puts together a good logical argument	4.32	0.73	Very Good
2. puts forward lots of good ideas and proposals	4.30	0.74	Very Good
3. when opposed, he/she is quick to come forward with counter argument	3.78	0.94	Good
4. ignores others mistakes	3.50	1.07	Good
5. puts forth ideas that are both incisive and highly relevant to the problem at hand	4.14	0.81	Good
6. depends ideas energetically	4.15	0.74	Good
7. pens bargain or deals to get what is wanted from others	3.82	1.00	Good
Overall	**4.00**	**0.61**	**Good**

III. Level of Creativity of School Heads

A. Intuition. Presented in Table 11 is the level of creativity of school heads in terms of intuition. The overall all mean score is 4.39 with a descriptive interpretation of excellent creativity. The teachers perceived that their school heads possessed excellence in creativity particularly on intuition. The following mean scores are: 4.52 in acting readily on something important; 4.44 in listening to one's own point of view; 4.43 in feeling that teachers are accomplishing something; 4.34 in telling people about ones thoughts; 4.34 in considering proposal for change; 4.32 in being conventional and 4.31 in finding and seeing the future easily.

The highest rated item is on "ready to act on something important." This means that the school heads knows how to prioritize things and does not hesitate to act on important decisions. The lowest rated item is on "finds it easy to see the future." This item is still interpreted as excellent, which means that the school heads are visionary and good planners. The researcher observed that intuition is a common and important trait or skill that a school head should posses. It provides fast act on decision and steadfast decision making.

Table 11
Level of Creativity of School Heads in terms of Intuition

Intuition	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. listens to one's own point of view	4.44	0.72	Excellent
2. feels that teachers are accomplishing something	4.43	0.73	Excellent
3. is conventional	4.32	0.62	Excellent
4. ready to act on something important	4.52	0.71	Excellent
5. tells people about one's thoughts	4.34	0.71	Excellent
6. considers proposal for change	4.34	0.68	Excellent
7. finds it easy to see the future	4.31	0.70	Excellent
Average Weighted Mean	**4.39**	**0.57**	**Excellent**

B. Insights. Presented in Table 12 is the level of creativity in terms of insights. As indicator of creativity, the teachers perceived that their school heads are excellent with the overall mean score of 4.38. All items obtained excellent level with the following mean scores: 4.52 in developing new ideas of doing things; 4.49 in respecting customs and traditions; 4.46 in supporting status quo; 4.42 in originating ideas and change; 4.39 in being full of ambition; 4.19 in working on usual practice than innovation and 4.18 in taking calculated risk.The highest rated item is on "develops new ideas of doing things." This means that the school heads never seize to learn and experience something new and novel. The lowest rated item is on "takes calculated risk." This means that the leader does not gamble and always want to make sure that the decision is final and well calculated. This also implies good planning for the school heads in doing something.

Table 12
Level of Creativity of School Heads in terms of Insights

Insights	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. respects customs and tradition	4.49	0.68	Excellent
2. supports the status	4.46	0.64	Excellent
3. is full of ambition	4.39	0.67	Excellent
4. develops new ideas of doing things	4.52	0.71	Excellent
5. originates ideas and change	4.42	0.73	Excellent
6. works steadily than in innovation	4.19	0.81	Above Average
7. takes calculated risk	4.18	0.89	Above Average
Average Weighted Mean	**4.38**	**0.54**	**Excellent**

C. Logical Formation. Presented in Table 13 is the level of creativity in terms of logical formation. As indicator of creativity, the teachers perceived excellent with the overall mean score of 4.34. all items under this indicator obtained the following mean scores and described as

excellent: 4.55 in working hard to accomplish the goals; 4.40 in setting self-challenge on teachers; 4.34 in producing original ideas; 4.34 in expressing views that are realistic; 4.27 on giving way when there is difference of opinion; 4.24 in promoting practical and realistic approaches than creative and inventive ways and 4.23 in preferring established methods to radical alternatives. The highest rated item is on "works hard to accomplish the goals." This means that the school heads are hardworking and good implementers of their plan. They value work and effort that needs to be exerted for a plan to work and be successful. The lowest rated item is on "gives way when there is differences of opinion." This is still viewed as excellent, however, almost all the time this is occasional and seldom happen.

Table 13
Level of Creativity of School Heads in terms of Logical Formation

Logical	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. prefers established methods to radical alternatives	4.23	0.72	Excellent
2. produces original ideas	4.34	0.68	Excellent
3. gives way when there are differences of opinion	4.27	0.73	Excellent
4. sets teachers' self-challenge	4.40	0.75	Excellent
5. works hard to accomplish the goals	4.55	0.66	Excellent
6. is practical and realistic than creative and inventive	4.24	0.77	Excellent
7. expresses views that realistic rather than wouldn't like	4.34	0.72	Excellent
Average Weighted Mean	**4.34**	**0.56**	**Excellent**

D. Unconscious Scanning. Presented in Table 14 is the level of creativity in terms of unconscious scanning. The teachers perceived that their school heads are excellent with the overall mean score of 4.29. All items under this indicator obtained excellent level with the following mean scores: 4.52 in seeing how to improve things; 4.38 in encouraging to push in doing one's part; 4.31 in generating ideas for change; 4.24 in pushing subordinates' views and ideas; 4.21 in feeling assertive in any opinion and 4.09 in tackling complex problem.The creativity of school heads is excellent with the overall mean score of 4.35. They are excellent particularly on their creativity in terms of intuition, insights, logical and unconscious scanning. This implies that they possess the creativity which is important in their decision making when it comes to fostering their roles as administrators. The findings affirmed with Baer and Moran (1999) that creativity can an inter and intra personal processes that one goes through to develop new and original ideas.

Table 14
Level of Creativity of School Heads in terms of Unconscious Scanning

Unconscious Scanning	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. generates ideas for change	4.31	0.79	Excellent
2. feels assertive in my opinion	4.21	0.78	Excellent
3. likes tackling complex problem	4.09	0.83	Above Average
4. pushes our views and ideas	4.24	0.68	Excellent
5. encourages to push in doing one's part	4.38	0.58	Excellent
6. sees how to improve things	4.52	0.58	Excellent
Average Weighted Mean	**4.29**	**0.56**	**Excellent**

V. Test of Difference Between Male and Female School Heads In Terms of Decision Making, Personal Influence And Creativity

Presented in Table 15 is the significant difference between male and female school heads in terms of decision making, personal influence and creativity. For decision making the obtained mean scores are 4.07 for male and 4.02 for female. The computed t value of 0.830 with the p value of 0.407 revealed no significance. There is no significant difference on decision making when administrators are grouped by gender thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. Both male and female school heads obtained equal level as to their decision making.

This implies concept on equality and balance by Daft (1998). School heads are leaders of their own organization and thus the requirements on being a good decision maker is a must. Gender is not a factor to be good in decision making; it is the experience that makes a school head, a seasoned decision maker.

Table 15
Test of Difference Between Male and Female School
Heads In Terms Of Decision Making, Personal Influence And Creativity

Variables	Administrator's gender	Mean	Std. Dev	Computed t	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Decision making	Male	4.07	0.54	0.830	0.407	Accept Ho	No significant difference
	Female	4.02	0.51				
Influence	Male	4.15	0.52	1.224	0.222	Accept Ho	No significant difference
	Female	4.08	0.55				
Creativity	Male	4.35	0.50	0.027	0.979	Accept Ho	No significant difference
	Female	4.35	0.53				

V. Test of Relationship Between the Decision Making, Personal Influence and Creativity of School Heads

Presented in Table 16 is the relationship between decision making, personal influence and creativity of school heads. There is a significant positive relationship when decision making is correlated to personal influence as revealed with the computed r value of 0.790 with the p value of 0.000. The result is significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant positive relationship between the two variables. This means that personal influence among school heads has something to do with their decision making.

This means that the school head to effectively influence other people should sought out good foundation in decision making. Decision making is crucial to make other people believe and support leaders in an organization. Harmonious relationship and successful organization are the products of good decision. Influencing other people is hard but if you have good decision making, somehow other people would pay attention and give their trust on the leader.

On the other hand, there is a significant positive relationship when decision making is correlated with creativity of school heads. The data shows that a positive relationship was obtained with the computed r value of 0.703 with the p value of 0.000. The result is significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant relationship between the variables decision making and creativity. This means that the creativity of school heads is related to their decision making.

Table 16

Test of Relationship Between the Decision Making, Personal Influence and Creativity of School Heads

Variables	Computed r	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Decision making and Personal Influence	0.790	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant positive relationship
Decision making and Creativity	0.703	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant positive relationship
Creativity and Personal Influence	0.810	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant positive relationship

IV. Conclusion

The male and female elementary school heads have the same level of decision making skills, personal influence and creativity. The higher the elementary school head's decision making skill, the more influential they are. The higher the elementary school head's decision making skill, the more creative they become; and the higher the personal influence of the elementary school heads, the more creative they are.

V. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions the following are recommended:

1. The management plan being proposed should be considered for implementation.

2. School heads should evaluate their decision making, personal influence and creativity to foster positive impact on the working relationships with their teachers as well as to be able to attain the goals of school which is a collaborative activity among personnel;

3. School heads should strive to improve their creativity since it is revealed to have significant relation with decision making and personal influence. A related seminar on the three aspects may enhance the skills of the school heads.

4. School heads should take part on using the different leadership styles to suit the needs and situations that would arise in their organization. As it is found out that the decision making skills are influenced from varied leadership styles;

5. School heads should create more venue and space for team work, sharing and feed backing as it was revealed that school heads should be open for new insights and participative approach in decision making;

6. Teachers must be participative and continue to take part on their responsibilities as channel of learning to students and further to work harmoniously with their school heads, parents and community stakeholders.

7. Similar studies may be conducted in other schools in different regions

REFERENCES

[1] Aquino, Guadencio V (2000). Educational Management: Principles, functions, Concepts, Manila; Rex Books Store

[2] Abinoya, L. (2003). Decision Making. Basic Management Process

[3] Baer, J. (1999). Creative Teachers, Creative Students, Boston: Allyn and Nacon.

[4] Bassutt. M (2004). Development Guide to implementing Learning

[5] styles instruction in Bermudian school based on Department observation of the Diverse Classes

[6] Boddy, David (2002). Management: An Introduction, Edinburgh: Prentice Hall Pearson, Educational Limited.

[7] Calmorin et,al. 2001. Methods of Research and Thesis Writing, Rex Printing Company Inc.

[8] Chan, Tak Cheung, and Harbison Pool (2002). Principles Priorities versus Their Realities: Reducing the Gap. Prentice Hall.

[9] Daft, Richard L. (1998). Management. Chicago: The Dryden Press

[10] Felder, Richard 2002. How Students Learn: Adapting Teaching

[11] Styles to Learning Styles, Proceedings Frontiers in Education Conference.

[12] De George, Richard T. (1982). Business Ethics. New York: Mc Millan Publishing House, Inc.Hennessey, B.A. (1997). Teaching for creative Development a Social-Psychological approach. In N. Colangelo & Davis (Eds.)

[13] Isaken, SG, Dorval K,B & Treffinger DJ. (2000). Creative Approaches to Problem Solving: A framework for change, Buffalo, New York,

[14] Koontz, Harold and Heinz Weirich. (1990)Essential of Management 5th ed. New York : Mc.Graw-Hill.

[15] Marites, CR. and Fule GS (2000). Management of Human Behavior in Organization 2nd edition.

[16] Newman, Diann and Richard M. Hodgets (1992). Human Resources Management: A Customer Oriented Approach. 6th Edition. Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights, MA.

[17] Merriam-Webster's Desk Dictionary (Springfield, Massachusetts: (Merriam-Webster, Inc. 2000).

[18] Moscreillo, Susan (2002). Your Personal signature: The management style that empower the volunteer program.

[19] Sergiovannie, Thomas . (1992). The Principalship Educational Leadership.

[20] Stoner, J and Wankel, C. (1999) Management. Prentice-Hall International, Inc.

[21] World Book Encyclopedia, 2001.

AUTHOR'S PROFILE

DIODENAH B. PELOSTRATOS

The author is born on June 26, 1976 at Libertad, Isabel, Leyte, Philippines. She is married to Jesril A. Pelostratos and has 3 children. She finished her Bachelor of Secondary Education, Major in English at Saint Peter's College, Ormoc City on 1997.

She is currently a Principal I in Department of Education and she is assigned as School Head at Tubod Elementary School, Isabel District, Division of Leyte, Philippines. She has been a School Head for six (6) years and is the Isabel District Risk Reduction Management (DRRM) Coordinator since 2016. She was a classroom adviser for 15 years. She had been a winning coach in the District and Division level in different fields of competition such as Journalism, Academics and Literary. She has been employed at the Department of Education for 21 years.

She was a completer of the NEAP's School Heads Development Program in 2017. She became one of the Resource Speakers during the Division Capability Building to School Heads on the Standardized DRRM Modules and SDRRM Manual on January 13-18, 2020. At present, she is one of the Leyte Division LeaderSHAPE Academy scholars.

.