

Leadership Style and Motivating Language among Educational Leaders of a State University

Asia Pacific Journal of
Multidisciplinary Research
Vol. 7 No.3, 29-39
August 2019
P-ISSN 2350-7756
E-ISSN 2350-8442
www.apjmr.com
CHED Recognized Journal
ASEAN Citation Index

Jodi Belina A. Bejer
Batangas State University, Philippines
jodibejer@gmail.com

Date Received: June 16, 2019; Date Revised: July 21, 2019

Abstract - *This study aimed to identify the leadership style and the extent of using motivating language of the educational leaders of a State University. The descriptive method of research was used, and the respondents of the study were the educational leaders of the State University in the Philippines consisting of 53 deans, associate deans, department and program chairs from the total population of 64. The data were gathered and treated statistically using frequency, percentage and chi square. Results show that majority of the male and female educational leaders belong to age bracket of 36 – 55, married, and master's graduate. Most male respondents came from College of Teacher Education while most female from College of Arts and Sciences. Also, most male have less than 5 years in service while female have both less than 5 years and 5 to 9 years. The study identified that male have directing type of leadership and female leaders have coaching style. Furthermore, both male and female use leader motivating language to a moderate extent with regards to meaning making and direction giving. Likewise, male leaders use empathetic language to a moderate extent while female leaders have least extent of its use. In addition, there is no significant relationship between leadership style and leader motivating language of the male respondents whereas there is significant relation in terms of meaning making and direction giving of the female respondents. Lastly, there is no significant difference in the leadership style of the male and female respondents when grouped according to profile. The result of the study could help the State University to understand that educational leaders have different leadership style and they can assist male leaders with directing style and female leaders with coaching style to better perform their duties and responsibilities. In addition, the university may provide trainings and coaching on how the leaders may also enhance their use of motivating language to their subordinates.*

Keywords: *Educational Leader, Leader Motivating Language, Leadership Style, Situational Leadership*

INTRODUCTION

Universities play a crucial role in educational, research and social growth as front-runners. It offers the professional preparation for high-level employment, as well as the education needed for personality development, important institutions in social change and growth procedures, and through innovation generates fresh understanding and thoughts [1]. These roles of university would not be realized unless there are educational leaders who took actions in formulating, implementing and monitoring policies in attaining the vision.

Submitting the state university to different accrediting agency and quality assurance organization is one of the initiatives of the higher authority to deliver quality services to all stakeholders such as students, community, external partners and of course the employee. Upgrading all of the standards and

procedure help a lot in attaining continuous improvement in the university.

One of the important stakeholders aside from the students are the employees. These include both teaching and non-teaching staff. Commonly, satisfaction of employees comes from the working environment and the manner they were handled by their leaders aside from the compensation they received.

With the more complex situation in the organizations, handling people is the most challenging aspect of a leader. Facing feedbacks regarding leadership deemed to be a challenge for all educational leaders. Knowing the behavior of the subordinates and provide variation in handling them seems to be necessary in order to have a smooth operation in the campus. Communicating to the faculty members and other employees were needed to study in order to lead them.

Educational leaders as human behave differently which really affect their faculty members and supporting staff. Commonly, they were assessed by their employees depending on the leadership styles they portray.

Leadership styles is necessary to be considered effective leaders in this global competitive environment. It is the manner and approaches of giving direction, implementing plans and motivating people. It includes both implicit and explicit pattern of actions performed by the leader [2].

Leadership is one of the areas of any management field which is well studied. However, recent changes in the field of leadership models were tested and developed in different context and field of specialization.

Several leadership style models have been created. A psychologist, Kurt Lewin, developed the first model in the 1930s, and it provided the basis for many of the approaches that followed. He stated that there are three significant leadership styles: autocratic leadership, democratic management, and laissez faire [3].

In the meantime, Blake- Mouton Managerial Grid pointed out that the most suitable style to use is based on people's interest and your concern about production / tasks. Leaders in this model are either person-oriented or task-oriented [4].

The situational leadership created by Kenneth Blanchard and Paul Hersey is one of the latest developments in leadership style. This style relates to an attitude in which the rulers adjust the style based on the growth of the supporters or individuals whom they wish to affect. Changing the style is up to the leader, not the follower adapting to the style. In situational leadership, the style can alter on an ongoing basis to satisfy the requirements of others in the organization [5].

This type of leadership has four styles to direct / tell, coach / sell, support / participate, and delegate. Directing /Telling style is where the leader gives particular roles and goals direction and carefully monitors the performance of the supporters to provide frequent feedback on outcomes. Coaching / selling style is when the leader explains why, asks for suggestions, praises roughly correct behaviors, and continues to guide task fulfillment. Supporting / participating style is when decision making between the leader and the follower. The leader's function is facilitating, listening, encouraging and supporting the follower. Delegating is when the leader empowers the worker with the suitable funds to do the work

separately. The leader shares accountability and is accessible for the goal setting, but does not interfere with the job of the supporters [6].

Commonly, the type of leadership style of an individual is being judge with the way they communicate and provide insights towards certain issues and concerns. It is important that the meaning whether it is literal, or sub literal must be transferred to the employees.

Further, one of the functions of the leader is to motivate its follower. In the context of the university, deans, associate dean, department and program chairperson, directors and assistant directors under the academic affairs must know how to motivate the faculty members, employees and students in order for them to deliver the quality service.

In motivating individuals, language play an important role. The language spoken by the leaders critically influence the workers' motivation and outcomes. A lot of leadership research implicitly underlines the significance of expression by the leader. In leading conversations, contingencies of reward and performance objectives are frequently articulated [7].

Thus, studying the leaders motivating language arises. Motivating language theory is a model that gives a comprehensive understanding on how the language of a leader affects the worker. This model predicts that strategic oral communication is a vital tool to motivate employees positively such as good performance and job satisfaction. According to the principles of motivating language theory (MLT), variations in important results shown by staff are the results of variance in how well executives act when communicating with subordinates in three basic speeches [8]. Speech acts were characterized as fundamental or minimal units of linguistic communication where language takes the form of regulations regulated, deliberate conduct Sullivan took the three primary classifications of speech acts, locutionary (meaning to make), perlocutionary (directional) and illocutionary (empathic). Locutionary or meaning-making language happens when the language of a leader to a member describes the organization culture's structure, laws, and values. Most important, locutionary language stimulates the cognitive scheme of the member to integrate cultural norms. Perlocutionary language provides direction and decreases uncertainty. Illocutionary language is empathic, an expression of mankind, where the leader is prepared to share his emotions with a member [6].

With this, for a leader to adapt for the situational leadership, it is also important to use motivating language appropriately. Currently, there no such study that link the leadership style and leaders motivating language however literatures link these two areas.

In case of a State University academic community, educational leaders deemed to have various leadership style. As a newly appointed Dean of Colleges for newly established campus, it is important to adapt a leadership style that would best fit on the type of employee to be encountered. Further, it is important the type of language to deliver to the subordinate in order to function the unit handled effectively and efficiently.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to determine the leadership style and extent of use of motivating language of male and female educational leaders in a State University. Specifically, this study (1) described the profile of the respondents in terms of age, civil status, educational attainment, department and years of service; (2) identified the leadership style of the respondents; (3) determined the extent of use of leader motivating language in terms of meaning making, direction giving and empathetic; (4) tested the relationship between leadership style and extent of use of motivating language; and (5) tested the difference on the leadership style of both male and female when grouped according to profile.

METHODS

Research Design

The main purpose of the study is to determine the leadership style and extent of use of motivating language of male and female educational leaders in a State University. The descriptive method of research was used. In a specific field of research, descriptive designs are intended to obtain more data about specific features. A descriptive study may be used to create theory, identify preferred practices, justify present practices, create decisions, or define what others may be doing incomparable behavior.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study were the educational leaders of a State University. They were composed of the deans, associate deans, department and program chairs. The researchers made use of the simple random sampling. The total population was 64 and upon computation using the Rao soft calculator the sample size was 53.

Data Gathering Instrument

The main data gathering instrument used by this study is the questionnaire. It is composed of three parts, the first part is the profile of the respondents, the second part is the questions to assess the leadership style of the respondents, and then the last part is related to the extent of utilizing motivating language of the respondents.

In terms of profile, the instrument asked the respondents’ age, civil status, educational attainment, department, and years in service. Respondents need to put a check mark on the bracket or option the best describe their profile.

The second part of the instrument is composed of 24 statements in which respondents need to check the extent of which they react on the mentioned statements based on the following scores:

Score	Categorical Responses
1	to almost no extent
2	to a slight extent
3	to a moderate extent
4	to a great extent
5	to a very great extent

The responses were summed up based on the group of statements that corresponds to each leadership style. The statements in the instrument were grouped according to the following:

Style	Item numbers
Facilitate	3,7,11,15,19,23
Delegate	4,8,12,16,20,24
Coach	2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22
Direct	1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21

Upon getting the sum, the style with highest score corresponds to the leadership style of the respondents. Since the approach is a situational leadership, combination of the four were also generated.

The last part of the instrument focuses on the extent of utilizing motivating language of the respondents in terms of meaning making, direction giving, and empathetic. There are 28 questions in which respondents ask the frequency of practicing the mentioned statements. Respondents put a check mark on the column of their responses based on the following scores:

Score	Categorical Responses
1	Never
2	Seldom
3	Often
4	Always

Regarding the statements, questions 1 – 9 correspond to statements for meaning making, 10-18 are for direction giving and 19-28 are for emphatic. Then the sum for each area will be computed and that will be the basis of the analysis wherein: for meaning making and direction giving, the score ranges from 1-9, it was interpreted as least extent, 10-18 as moderate extent, 19-27 as great extent and 28-36 as very great extent. For emphatic: 1 – 10 as least extent, 11 – 20 as moderate extent, 21-30 as great extent and 31 – 40 as very great extent. The questionnaire was presented to experts for analysis of the appropriateness of the questionnaire.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researchers asked the respondents for the approval before conducting the survey and sought consent among respondents. They agreed on the presented confidentiality agreement. The questionnaire was distributed to the educational leaders of State University. The researcher considered that data privacy act thus she asks permission first to the respondents through signing a waiver stating their consent of answering the instrument. The questionnaires were retrieved and analysed. All gathered data were handled with highest confidentiality. Furthermore, the researchers also gathered data from the books, theses, and journals.

Another source of data was gathered through interview. More so, the researchers studied related literature and statistical data pertaining to the matter of the study. Internet sites were also browsed and were studied.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The information was collected and statistically handled using different formulas such as frequency, percentage, and chi square to respond to the significant relationship between leadership style and extent of using motivating language and difference in male and female leadership style when grouped by profile.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 shows the distribution of the educational leaders in terms of age bracket. Results show that majority of the educational leaders belongs to age bracket 36 – 55 with a frequency of 33 and a percentage of 62.3. It was followed by age bracket 18-35 with 11 and 20.8 percent. The age bracket with the lowest frequency is 56 and above with 17 percent.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents in terms of age

	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
18-35	6	11.3	5	9.4	11	20.8
36-55	8	15.1	25	47.2	33	62.3
56 and above	3	5.7	6	11.3	9	17
Total	17	32.1	36	67.9	53	100

Among the male educational leaders, the age bracket with the highest frequency was 36-55 with 8 or 15.1 percent, it was followed by 18-35 with 6 or 11.3 percent, next was 56 and above with 3 or 5.7 percent of the respondents.

With regards to female educational leaders, the age bracket with the highest frequency was 36-55 with 25 or 47.2 percent, it was followed by 56 and above with 6 or 11.3 percent, next was age bracket 18-35 with 5 or 9.4 percent of respondents.

Leaders and leadership styles may also differ depending on the leader's age and age groups and the following. It was indicated, "With an elderly leader, the team may be more accessible to the transformative behaviors of a leader, as team members may accept the unique status of the leader more [9].

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents in terms of civil status

	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Single	7	13.2	3	5.7	10	18.9
Married	10	18.9	33	62.3	43	81.1
Total	17	32.1	36	67.9	53	100

Table 2 shows the distribution of the educational leaders in terms of civil status. Results show that majority of the educational leaders were married with 43 or 81.1 percent while single educational leaders were 10 with 18.9 percent.

Among the male educational leaders, 10 or 18.9 percent were married while 7 or 13.2 were single. With regards to female educational leaders, majority were married with 33 or 62.3 percent while single educational leaders were 3 or 5.7 percent.

The study of [10] demonstrates that workplaces where women's involvement in leadership is greater are motivated in a more democratic fashion, with more interpersonal and interactive interactions between executives and subordinates, and more managers' employee-mentoring duties. For more structural measures, no gender differences were discovered, such

as the degree of delegation to managers or the expansion of payment through outcomes.

Table 3. Distribution of Respondents in terms of educational attainment

	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Doctorate	8	15.1	14	26.4	22	41.5
Masters	8	15.1	22	41.5	30	56.6
Baccalaureate	1	1.9	0	0	1	1.9
Total	17	32.1	36	67.9	53	100

Table 3 shows the distribution of the educational leaders in terms of educational attainment. In terms of their educational attainment, majority of the respondents were Master’s degree holder with 30 or 56.6 percent. It was followed by respondents with doctorate degree with 22 or 41.5 percent. On the other hand, there is only 1 respondent with baccalaureate degree.

Among the male educational leaders, doctorate and master’s degree holder both have 8 or 15.1 percent while 1 or 1.9 percent was baccalaureate degree holder. With regards to the female educational leaders, holder of Master’s degree was 22 or 41.5 percent while doctorate degree holder was 14 or 26.4 percent of the total respondents.

This research demonstrates that the greatest academic qualifications did not affect management style. There is no important correction between the score and educational level of management style of teachers. In an earlier research, it was discovered that scores of leadership style and education level were not correlated [11].

Table 4. Distribution of Respondents in terms of department

	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
CABEIHM	2	3.8	7	13.2	9	17
CAS	2	3.8	9	17	11	20.8
CEAFA	2	3.8	5	9.4	7	13.2
CIT	2	3.8	3	5.7	5	9.4
CONAHS	0	0	3	5.7	3	5.7
CTE	5	9.4	5	9.4	10	18.9
IS	1	1.9	3	5.7	4	7.5
OSAS	3	5.7	1	1.9	4	7.5
Total	17	32.1	36	67.9	53	100

Table 4 show that the department with the greatest number of respondents was CAS with 11 or 20.8 percent, it was followed by the respondents coming from CTE with 10 or 18.9 percent, next was from the

CABEIHM department with 9 respondents or 17 percent. The CEAFA department has 7 or 13.2 percent while CIT department has 5 or 9.4 percent. The OSAS and IS departments have 4 or 7.4 percent while CONAHS has 3 or 5.7 percent of the total respondents.

Among the male respondents, 5 or 9.4 percent are from CTE, next was from OSAS with 3 or 5.7 percent. Moreover, 2 or 3.8 percent came from CABEIHM, CAS, CEAFA and CIT. There was 1 male educational leader came from IS.

With regards to female educational leaders, there were 9 or 17 percent came from CAS, it was followed by CABEIHM with 7 or 13.2 percent, next were from CEAFA and CTE both with 5 or 9.4 percent. Moreover, 3 or 5.7 percent came from CIT, CONAHS and IS while one (1) or 1.9 percent female educational leaders came from OSAS.

Table 5. Distribution of Respondents in terms of years in service

	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
<5 years	6	12.8	10	21.3	16	34
5-9 years	3	6.4	10	21.3	13	27.7
10-14 years	5	10.6	4	8.5	9	19.1
15-19 years	0	0	3	6.4	3	6.4
20-24 years	1	2.1	1	2.1	2	4.3
≥25 years	1	2.1	3	6.4	4	8.5
Total	16	34	31	66	47	100

Table 5 shows the distribution of the educational leaders in terms of years in service. Results shows that in terms of the years of service of the educational leaders, the bracket with the highest frequency was less than 5 years with 16 or 34 percent of the total respondents. It was followed by 5-9 years with 13 or 27.7 percent. Next was 10-14 years with 9 or 19.1 percent, followed by 25 years and above with 4 or 8.5 percent, then the 15-19 years with 3 or 6.4 percent and finally 20-24 years with 2 or 4.3 percent of the total respondents.

Among the male respondents, result shows that 6 or 12.8 percent are in service for less than 5 years, next was 13-14 years with 5 or 10.6 percent and it was followed by 5-9 years with 3 or 6.4 percent. Years in service bracket 20-24 and 25 years and above both have 1 with 2.1 percent while there are no male educational leaders who has 15-19 years of service.

On the other hand, there are 10 or 21.3 percent female educational leaders who are in service for less than 5 years and 5 – 9 years. It was followed by 10 – 14 years with 4 or 8.5 percent. Moreover 3 or 6.4 female

educational leaders are in service between 15-49 years while there is 1 or 2.1 percent for 20-24 and 25 years and above respectively.

The findings showed that staff with less than two years of service had considerably greater general management ambitions and greater valence scores compared to workers with more than two years of work. [12].

Table 6. Distribution of Respondents in terms of their leadership style

	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Facilitating	1	1.9	0	0	1	1.9
Coaching	3	5.7	8	15.1	11	20.8
Delegating	1	1.9	3	5.7	4	7.5
Directing	5	9.4	4	7.5	9	17
Facilitating/Coaching	0	0	1	1.9	1	1.9
Facilitating/Delegating	0	0	1	1.9	1	1.9
Facilitating/Directing	0	0	1	1.9	1	1.9
Coaching/Delegating	0	0	2	3.8	2	3.8
Delegating/Directing	1	1.9	3	5.7	4	7.5
Facilitating/Coaching/Delegating	1	1.9	0	0	1	1.9
Facilitating/Coaching/Directing	1	1.9	1	1.9	2	3.8
Coaching/Delegating/Directing	2	3.8	5	9.4	7	13.2
Facilitating/Coaching/Delegating/Directing	2	3.8	7	13.2	9	17
Total	17	32.1	36	67.9	53	100

Table 6 shows the distribution of respondents in terms of their leadership style. It shows that 11 or 20.8 percent falls under the coaching leadership style. It was followed by directing and the combination of facilitating/ coaching/delegating/directing with 9 or 17 percent of the respondents. Next fall under the combination of coaching/delegating/directing with 7 or 13.2 percent. Next leadership style was delegating with 4 or 7.5 percent. Combination of coaching/delegating and facilitating/coaching/directing have 2 or 3.8 percent. And the leadership style facilitating, facilitating/ coaching, facilitating/ delegating, facilitating/ directing, and facilitating/ coaching/ delegating each has 1 or 1.9 percent.

In academic institution, most of the time the leaders come from the work floor. This is the reason why the result was the highest number of leaders used coaching as their style of leadership. They know the real situation in every department because they themselves experienced it. And since the state university is quite a

big in number other leaders used directing and delegating. But at times academic leaders used combination of these leadership style depending on the people they lead.

Among the male educational leaders, the leadership style of 5 or 9.4 percent was directing, next was coaching with 3 or 5.7 percent, it was followed by coaching/delegating/ directing and facilitating/ coaching/ delegating/directing leadership style each with 2 or 3.8 percent. There is 1 or 1.9 percent among educational leaders who fall under facilitating, delegating, delegating/directing, facilitating/ coaching/delegating and facilitating/ coaching/ directing.

With regards to the female educational leaders, 8 or 15.1 percent falls under coaching leadership style, it was followed by facilitating/ coaching/ delegating/ directing, next was coaching/delegating/directing with 5 or 9.4 percent. Moreover, 4 or 7.5 percent falls under directing leadership style, next were delegating and delegating/directing with 3 or 7.5 percent. There were 2 or 3.8 percent falls under coaching/delegating. The facilitating/ coaching, facilitating/ delegating, facilitating /directing and facilitating/coaching/ directing leadership style each have 1 or 1.9 percent.

Most of academic institution are dominated by female. Female leaders are always hands-on in their work, they make sure that the subordinates know what they are doing and give all the necessary information to accomplish the job assigned. On the other hand, male leaders always trust his subordinates and make sure that he hires the best people to work with and with that male leaders are mostly using the directing leadership style.

According to R. Johnson [13] in the workplace, there are distinct kinds of leadership styles. Within each leadership style, there are advantages and disadvantages. An organization's culture and objectives determine which style of management suits the company best. Within the organization, some businesses give several leadership styles, depending on the duties required to finish and departmental needs.

Table 7. Extent of Using Leaders Motivating Language in terms of Meaning Making

	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Least Extent	7	13.2	13	24.5	20	37.7
Moderate Extent	7	13.2	17	32.1	24	45.3
Great Extent	2	3.8	6	11.3	8	15.1
Very Great Extent	1	1.9	0	0	1	1.9

Table 7 shows the extent of using leaders motivating language of the respondents in terms of meaning making. Overall, it can be gleaned that respondents use meaning making language to a moderate extent as manifested by its frequency of 24 or 45.3 percent. There are 20 or 38 percent who use meaning making language to a least extent evidenced by its frequency of 20 or 37.7 percent. Only eight respondents or 15.1 percent of them use meaning making language to a great extent while only one (1) respondent or 1.9 percent of the total use meaning making language to a very great extent.

Another finding that can be gleaned in table 7 is the extent of using meaning making language by male and female respondents. Analyzing the responses of male educational leaders, most of them use meaning making language to a moderate and least extent as evidenced by their frequency of seven (7) or 13.2 percent of them. Only few use meaning making language to a great and very great extent with a frequency of 2 or 3.8 percent and 1 or 1.9 percent respectively.

In case of female employees, most of them use meaning making motivating language to a moderate extent having a frequency of 17 or 32.1 percent. There are also 13 respondents or 24.5 percent who use meaning making language to a least extent. Only few use meaning making language to a great extent with a frequency of 6 or 11.3 percent. None of the female respondents use meaning making language to a very great extent.

The result signifies that educational leaders use meaning making language to a moderate extent which is due to the fact that most of the educational leaders of state university focus on the specific task to be done by their subordinates. In addition, most of them are considered young and their length of stay are almost the same with their subordinates thus they assume that the organizational information needed for the job are already known by them.

The result seems to be unfavorable in the part of the organization since this type of language helps the new employees to become well equipped with the organizational culture, values and norms. Though currently, only few employees come and be part of a state university but still this aspect is very important.

The research of James Stephon, [14] observed that expediting meaning making language could be regarded as leaders' projects to absorb staff into the organization to fit well into the organizations' culture, values, and standards and be recognized as part of it. Including meaning-making language is mostly indirect,

leader communication, particularly for organizational assimilation of an employee and leadership of organizational change.

Table 8. Extent of Using Leader Motivating Language in terms of Direction Giving

	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Least Extent	7	13.2	13	24.5	20	37.7
Moderate Extent	7	13.2	18	34	25	47.2
Great Extent	2	3.8	5	9.4	7	13.2
Very Great Extent	1	1.9	0	0	1	1.9

Table 8 presents the extent of using leader motivating language in terms of direction giving. Based on the result, it can be gleaned that most of the respondents use direction giving language to a moderate extent as manifested by the frequency of 25 or 47.2 percent. Meanwhile, there are 20 respondents or 37.7 percent use direction giving language to a least extent. There are few who use direction giving language to a great extent with 7 respondents or 13.2 percent and only 1 or 1.9 percent uses the mentioned language to a very great extent.

Dealing with the responses of male respondents, 7 of them or 13.2 percent use direction giving language to a least and a moderate extent. On the other hand, 2 male respondents or 3.8 percent use direction giving language to a great extent and only 1 or 1.9 percent to a very great extent.

Analyzing the female responses, most of them use direction giving language to a moderate extent having a frequency of 18 or 34 percent. Twenty (20) female respondents or 37.7 percent use direction giving language to a least while only 5 female respondents or 9.4 percent use this language to a great extent. None of the female respondents use direction giving language to a very great extent.

The result of the study shows that educational leaders of the State University use direction giving language to a moderate extent. In practice, it can be observed among the educational leaders in State University that they often provide helpful direction to attain the goal however, defining responsibility and giving instruction about the task are done very seldom since most of them handled faculty members and staff who are considered well educated. They often provide liberty to their subordinate to do their task on their own way provided that the target objective is clear.

However, this result seems to be risky in the part of the organization since it may provide inefficiency

among the subordinates. Unclear instruction on how to do specific tasks create ambiguity to the subordinates. Thus, repetition of the process to get the objective done is highly observable.

As mentioned by J. Howell and D. Costley [15], one of its most significant tasks is to give leadership speech, which specifically affects their role clarity in the psychological elements of the supporters. It is generally essential to have an efficient performance to have a clear knowledge of an employee's role in performing job duties, as well as their connection with the leader and colleagues. Providing data on the expectations of the leaders guides the staff in using the technique of job and assigning a job that uses the capacity of the supporters.

Table 9. Extent of Using Leader Motivating Language in terms of Empathetic

	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Least Extent	6	11.3	16	30.2	22	41.5
Moderate Extent	8	15.1	15	28.3	23	43.4
Great Extent	2	3.8	5	9.4	7	13.2
Very Great Extent	1	1.9	0	0	1	1.9

Table 9 presents the extent of using empathetic motivating language of the respondents. It can be noted that most of the respondents uses empathetic motivating language to a moderate extent having a frequency of 23 or 43.4 percent. Twenty-two (22) respondents or 41.5 percent uses empathetic language to a least extent. Only 7 or 13.2 percent uses this language to a great extent while only 1 or 1.9 percent uses this language to a very great extent.

Analyzing the responses of male educational leaders, still most of them uses empathetic motivating language to a moderate extent as manifested by its frequency of 8 or 15.1 percent. There are 6 respondents or 11.3 of them uses empathetic motivating language to a least extent. Only 2 or 3.8 percent uses this type of motivating language to a great extent while there is only one (1) male respondent or 1.9 percent uses empathetic language to a very great extent.

Meanwhile, most of the female respondents use empathetic motivating language to a least extent having a frequency of 16 or 30.2 percent. There are 15 or 28.3 percent of the respondents use empathetic language to a moderate extent. Only 7 or 13.2 percent of them utilizes this type of motivating language to a great extent. None of them utilizes empathetic language to a very great extent.

The result signifies that the educational leaders of State University utilizes the empathetic language to a moderate extent. This is due to the fact that most of the educational leaders are well focused on the operation of the department where they are assigned. They commonly notice the health and emotional welfare of their subordinates once the employee talks to them.

With this result, it can be noted that there is still needed to improve in the way how they handle the employees especially in the languages they use in motivating them. Seldom or moderately using the empathetic language may lead to barriers between leaders and subordinates. Having barrier may lead to several human resource outcome including dissatisfaction.

Empathetic language is a leader's strength that invites supporters to communicate with it. The more this form of language is used, the higher the variety of employee connections [16]. Furthermore, this language is also used to demonstrate that an employee is appreciated more than his performance capabilities in the workplace— as a human being rather than merely as an organizational asset [17].

Table 10. Relationship between Leadership Style and Leader Motivating Language of the Male Respondents

Leader motivating language	p-values	Computed values	VI
Meaning	.25	28.212	Not Significant
Direction	.35	.872	Not Significant
Emphatic	.36	28.286	Not Significant

The table illustrates that the leader motivating language with p-value of .25 for meaning, .35 for direction, and .36 for emphatic were all higher than .05 level of significance, then the computed values of 28.212, .872, and 28.286 revealed that there was no significant relationship between leadership style and leader motivating language of the male respondents. Thus, the study failed to reject the null hypothesis. This implies that the directing leadership style of male leaders have no association on their moderate extent of use of leader motivating language.

This finding is linked to Ghazzawi, El Shoughari, and El Osta [18] which motivates efficient management style staff to achieve required organizational objectives, encouraging excellent management that contributes to increased efficiency of staff. Situational leadership has been shown to be a very efficient style

of management to motivate staff in various industries. Another, in Sarros, Elvira, Densten and Santora [19], direction giving language was mostly used in strategic or people-related management operations and leadership, followed by meaning-making and empathic language. The results indicate a repertoire of language methods could be developed by company leaders to accomplish organizational results.

Table 11. Relationship between Leadership Style and Leader Motivating Language of the Female Respondents

Leader motivating language	p-values	Computed values	VI
Meaning	.01	6.082	Significant
Direction	.036	81.214	Significant
Emphatic	.072	3.238	Not Significant

The table 11 shows that the leader motivating language with p-value of .01 for meaning and .036 for direction were both lower than .05 level of significance, then the computed values of 6.082 and 81.214 revealed that there was significant relationship between leadership style and leader motivating language of the female respondents. Thus, the study rejects the null hypothesis. This explains that their coaching leadership style has relation on their moderate use of leader motivating language as assessed by female respondents.

This finding explains that situational leadership requires flexible leaders to have the social perceptiveness and data to suit their conduct with situational requirements, which suggests that the more flexible leader is one capable of displaying suitable behavioral reactions to a wider truth and variety of situations [20].

Table 12. Difference in the Leadership Style of the Respondents (Male) in terms of Profile

Profile variables	p-values	Computed values	VI
Age	.13	22.36	Not Significant
Civil status	.266	9.98	Not Significant
Educational attainment	.31	18.204	Not Significant
Designation	.098	23.61	Not Significant
Department	.295	52.776	Not Significant
Years in service	.16	39.867	Not Significant

The table 12 demonstrates that the difference in leadership style with p-value of .13 for age, .266 for

civil status, .31 for educational attainment, .098 for designation, .295 for department and .16 for years in service were all higher than .05 level of significance, then the computed values of 22.36, 9.98, 18.204, 23.61, 52.776, and 39.867 revealed that there were no significant differences on the assessment of the male respondents on their leadership style when grouped according to profile. Thus, the study failed to reject the null hypothesis. This implies that the assessments of male respondents on their leadership style are the same regardless of the profile.

The research of Kotur and Anbazhagan [21] shows, contrary to this finding, that the prevailing style of population leadership is that age and gender have their own effect on the worker's management styles. The study also demonstrates that employees exhibit comparatively less power with a rise in age, and gender is also discovered to affect employee leadership styles. Indeed, the two variables chosen for this study, age and gender, influence the management styles of the staff respectively. Research indicates that the style of democratic leadership is dominant among the employees, and with increasing age the employees tend to show less authority, and more autocratic in nature is the female employees.

Table 13. Difference in the Leadership Style of the Respondents (Female) in terms of Profile

Profile variables	p-values	Computed values	VI
Age	.67	16.695	Not Significant
Civil status	.17	14.073	Not Significant
Educational attainment	.57	8.58	Not Significant
Designation	.518	19.057	Not Significant
Department	.46	70.528	Not Significant
Years in service	.532	43.585	Not Significant

The table displays that the difference in leadership style with p-value of .67 for age, .17 for civil status, .57 for educational attainment, .518 for designation, .46 for department and .532 for years in service were all higher than .05 level of significance, then the computed values of 16.695, 14.073, 8.58, 19.057, 70.528, and 43.585 revealed that there were no significant differences on the assessment of the female respondents on their leadership style when grouped according to profile. Thus, the study failed to reject the null hypothesis. This implies that the leadership style is the same as assessed by female respondents.

The findings are similar to the study of Jones, and Bekhet [22] that the demographic profile of leaders was found to have no impact on respondents' leadership styles. Age, tenure, and the best level of education achieved are not important considerations in distinguishing the general leadership styles (transformation or transactional) and the sub-scales of the participants to the company leader. This indicates that demographic profiles of leaders do not distinguish factors in determining styles of transformation and transactional leadership.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study revealed that majority of the male and female educational leaders belong to age bracket of 36 – 55, married, and master's graduate. Most male respondents came from CTE while most female from CAS. Also, most male have less than 5 years in service while female have both less than 5 years and 5 to 9 years. The study identified that male have directing type of leadership and female leaders have coaching style. Furthermore, both male and female use leader motivating language to a moderate extent with regards to meaning making and direction giving. Likewise, male leaders use empathetic language to a moderate extent while female leaders have least extent of its use. In addition, there is no significant relationship between leadership style and leader motivating language of the male respondents whereas there is significant relation in terms of meaning making and direction giving of the female respondents. Lastly, there is no significant difference in the leadership style of the male and female respondents when grouped according to profile.

The result of the study could help the State University to understand that educational leaders have different leadership style and they can assist male leaders with directing style and female leaders with coaching style to better perform their duties and responsibilities. In addition, the university may provide trainings and coaching on how the leaders may also enhance their use of motivating language to their subordinates. The study is limited to those positions directly coordinating the program offerings of the State University. A future research activity may also cover the other higher positions in the university.

REFERENCES

[1] Sharma, Radhe Shyam. (2015). Role of Universities in Development of Civil Society and Social Transformation. <http://ideas.repec.org/p/sek/iacpro/2604181.html>

[2] Hofstede, G. (2007). Culture and Organizations: Software of the Mind. New York: McGraw-Hill.

[3] Lewin, Kurt (2010). Resolving social conflicts and field theory in social science. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

[4] Filho, Antônio Del Maestro, Cleuza Lúcia Pimenta & Karine Mirielle de Almeida Borges, (2015). Study of the Leadership Styles Considering Gender Differences. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: An Administration and Management*. Volume 15 Issue 2 Version 1.0

[5] Samosudova, Natalia. (2016). Modern Leadership and Management Methods for Development of Organization. MATEC Web of Conferences 106:08062

[6] Mwai, Esther. (2011). Creating Effective Leaders through Situational Leadership Approach. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/38039602.pdf>

[7] Mayfield, Jacqueline, Milton Mayfield and Jerry Kopf. (2016). Motivating Language: Exploring Theory with Scale Development. job.sagepub.com

[8] Sullivan, J. (1988). Three roles of language in motivation theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 1, 104-115.

[9] Kearney, E (2008). Age differences between leader and followers as a moderator of the relationship between transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology* 81(4), 803–811.

[10] Melero, E. (2004). Sex Differences in Managerial Style: *IZA Discussion Paper No. 1387*.

[11] Muhammad Javed Sawati, S. A. (2013). Do Qualification, Experience and Age Matter for. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 403-413.

[12] Singer, M. (2012). The Relationship Between Employee Sex, Length of Service and Leadership Aspirations: A Study from Valence, Self-Efficacy and Attribution Perspectives. *The international Association of Applied Psychology*.

[13] Johnson, R. (2017). <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/5-different-types-leadership-styles-17584.html>

[14] Stephon, James. (2016). The Effect of Perceived Organisational Support and Motivating Language of Leaders on Job Performance, Satisfaction and Commitment of Employees, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1ca1/fd49c97a22137737c477846e36a6074796b7.pdf>

[15] Howell, J., & Costley, D. (2006). Understanding behaviors for effective leadership (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall

[16] Crossland, R., & Clarke, B. (2008). The leader's voice: How your communication can inspire action and get results. New York, NY: SelectBooks.

- [17] Mayfield, J. (2009). Motivating language: a meaningful guide for leader communications. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 23(1), 9-11.
- [18] Ghazzawi, K., El Shouhari, R., & El Osta, B. (2017). Situational Leadership and Its Effectiveness in Rising Employee Productivity: A Study on North Lebanon Organization. *Human Resource Management Research* 7(3), 102-110.
- [19] Sarros, J. C., Elvira, L., Densten, I., & Santora, J. C. (2014). Leaders and their use of motivating language. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 35(3).
- [20] Almansour, Y. M. (2012). The Relationship between Leadership Styles and Motivation of Managers. *Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce* 3(1), 161-166.
- [21] Kotur, B. R., & Anbazhagan, S. (2014). The Influence of Age and Gender on the Leadership Styles. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)* 16(1), 30-36.
- [22] Jones, S. K., & Bekhet, K. E. (2015). Leadership Styles and Personal Demographic Profile: An Empirical Study on Private Business Organizations in Egypt. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research* 20(2), 127-147.

COPYRIGHTS

Copyright of this article is retained by the author/s, with first publication rights granted to APJMR. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4>).