

Anticipation of Face-To-Face Resumption of Classes: A Grounded Theory of Community-Motivated Leadership Style from the Sentiments, Views, and Insights of Institutional Leaders

Nordy D. Siason Jr.

Iloilo State College of Fisheries, Barotac Nuevo, Iloilo, Philippines

Email: nordysiason@gmail.com

Abstract

Even though academic leadership style seems to be popular nowadays, there is still much to discover on its practice into higher education in the context of the new normal. This constructivist grounded theory unearthed the interconnectedness of the three types of situational favorableness to develop a community-motivated leadership style based on the sentiments, views, and insights of institutional leaders. Data were collected through intensive interviewing from fifteen participants composed of campus administrators and college deans. Employing simultaneous comparative analyses revealed varied cohorts of institutional leaders who use organizational skills, foster team synergy, and work with the community to achieve goals appropriately. Investigating the cornerstones of community-oriented leadership, situational favorableness comes with (a) leader-team relations: provide appropriate conditions for learning and instruction, consider the need for licensure exams and laboratory skills, respond to community needs; (b) task structure: design or layout programs, start the plans, create community-based committees, and; (c) position power: designate roles in the system, enforce policies to the members of the learning community. Applying the Contingency Model to the projected face-to-face classes, community-motivated leaders would tend to work with stakeholders situated into wider learning spaces to change the situation favorably for the learners, teachers, and the whole learning community.

Keywords— contingency theory, face-to-face classes, institutional leaders, learning community, grounded theory

I. INTRODUCTION

Academic leadership has been challenged into where leaders have to work on personal attributes, unity in decentralization, and an opportunity to reinvent higher education institutions (Dumulescu & Muțiu, 2021). This is along with the current popularity of blended and hybrid learning that seem to be the future of higher education, wherein instructors are making efforts to learn, develop, and manage this form of learning during the pandemic and beyond (Singh, et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2022). Even though countries have devised innovative ways to compensate for the lack of physical mobility, by using digital platforms, it was also noted in the report of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2022) that the highest proportion

of campus closures was reported in lower-middle and low-income countries wherein the Philippines does belong. With this, the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on academic leadership and decision-making (Kezar, 2021). On this aspect, campus leaders should share information about equity-minded leadership for decision making and governance groups. Also, they have to embrace shared governance structures on campus rather than making unilateral decisions particularly on the key areas of priority setting, budget, admission, specifically those that relate to changes in programs and faculty (p. 30).

As stated by Mishra, et al., (2020), the third world countries are facing policy paralysis in handling the sudden shifting scenario of educational planning, management, and organization during this pandemic with their

fractured technical infrastructure, academic incompetency, and lack of resources. These are explicitly observed in low and middle-income countries that tend to suffer the setbacks most as they were already running out of finance (Thomas, 2020; UN, 2020).

The policy level intervention is also vital (Pokhrel & Chhetri, 2021) but there are school administrators who did not have an emergency action plan regarding the pandemic process (Aytaç, 2020). Situating the academic leadership into the future as typified by a Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous (VUCA) environment (Bennett & Lemoine, 2014; George, 2017; Kraaijenbrink, 2018), Sutton and Jorge (2020) mentioned the shift to rich learning spaces (Hsu & Chen, 2018; Klostén et al., 2019), a diaspora in the paradigm from professor-centric to learner-centric andragogy or adult education (El-Amin, 2020). Having this, post-COVID-19 decisions should be made and higher education institutions or HEIs should focus on enhancing the technological infrastructure, providing responsive troubleshooting services, and establishing robust communication channels among the management, learners, and professors that are all considered crucial factors in HEIs (El Said, 2021).

Several scholars conducted leadership research and proposed such an approach arguing that the style of leadership that would be most effective depended upon the situation (Fiedler, 1964)—in this case— HEI educational landscape contextualized amidst the COVID-19 pandemic and into a VUCA environment. Related to the purpose of this study, Kezar (2021) recommended developing more inclusive governance processes that seek stakeholder input, actively listen, and act with the campus community and its various constituents. Through this, it is suggested to universities and colleges to analyze the steps already taken by other educators to understand what has worked, what hasn't worked and how to tackle the challenges they may face. It was also emphasized that administrators should take quick action to safeguard their campuses and students in preparation for potential closures. As response of the universities to the constraints brought by the pandemic, Babbar and Gupta (2021) noted that the unexpected crisis highlighted the improper planning and unpreparedness of the education sector which was reflected in most challenges faced in digital pedagogy or cybergogy (Wang & Kang, 2006;

Siason, 2022). It is recommended that the new normal higher education demands no space for grave diligence and needs a strategic planning and implementation by various stakeholders (Babbar & Gupta, 2021). Thus, school administrators with these stakeholders play a big role in sustaining education during the COVID-19 pandemic.

This paper considers what meaningful academic leadership looks like in relation to the new normal educational landscape in HEIs. Providing higher learning must address the administrative needs of the teachers and learners in order to cater the demands for academic experiences, particularly for the communities that the graduates will serve in the future. Institutional leaders in the campuses and colleges have initially addressed these needs through a prospective course of actions for the eventual opening of the face-to-face classes.

II. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Currently, most universities around the world are preparing for a safe and effective learning environment by altering their normal schedules and organization at the institutional and national levels (UNESCO, 2022). In the Philippines, institutional leaders such as deans and campus administrators in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) take in ways on the anticipated or targeted resumption of face-to-face classes. The lowering of alert level status by the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) in the country allows more ease to physical interaction and movements in academic institutions; on the other hand, the quandary of the projected face-to-face classes also bears with it the sentiments from the views and insights among these institutional leaders.

Contextualized in a Philippine state college, this study explored the transition to possible in-person instruction from the sentiments, views, and insights of institutional leaders. The case in point is the learning communities or group situations—campuses and/or the colleges in a particular state college—wherein the campus directors and deans take in their set of academic leadership styles. At the college level, face-to-face classes or courses are now to be offered after two years of distance learning modality because of the threats imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. Through the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) guidelines (CHED, 2021), HEIs are set to the eventual, expanded, and progressive limited face-to-face classes

especially to skills-based or laboratory-based courses.

Academic leadership during the pandemic is a crucial concept. During the decision-making process, institutional leaders provide the necessary information to come up with a course of actions to be taken, which these cohort of education leaders deem effective and applicable to the faculty and college students. In general, these action plans or anticipations of targeted resumption of the face-to-face classes empower and cascade responsibilities to institutional leaders—campus administrators and deans—informing them of the proposal from the university president and making them feel the sense of community through assessing their respective college or campus needs, conducting self-assessments, and crafting their own proposal for the eventual face-to-face instruction. As the presidents of HEIs decide on this matter through a set of policies, learning from institutional leaders by capturing their sentiments, views or insights through an in-depth reflection can be a source of institutionalizing, fine-tuning, and making a learning community-based policy for the projected face-to-face classes.

III. RESEARCH FOCUS AND QUESTIONS

This study focused on the investigation of leadership styles drawn out from sentiments, views, and insights of institutional leaders of a Higher Education Institution (HEI) anticipating the resumption of limited face-to-face classes relevant to the learning communities as represented by campuses and colleges. This also aimed to understand the needs and administrative solutions or practices of institutional leaders from a state college to overcome their problems encountered in managing the eventual face-to-face instruction during the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions: What do sentiments, views, and insights reveal about the institutional leaders on the projected face-to-face classes in an HEI? How does Contingency Model (CM) work in practice to identify leadership challenges and develop leadership capabilities responsive to an HEI's needs in the new normal? What can be learned about how CM can create group situations and leadership style among the institutional leaders in particular and the organizational system of an HEI in general?

IV. METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

As these academic leadership styles are new as a contemporary concern during the novel COVID-19 pandemic, the nature of the research questions and gaps is best addressed by a grounded theory. Through this, the researcher intended to generate a theory grounded in empirical data that had been systematically collected and analyzed (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This research project employed the constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014) for this shares the principles as presented by Karpouza and Emvalotis (2018) that: (a) the researcher is an active 'architect' of a specific understanding of the phenomenon under investigation (Willig 2013), and (b) the interviews are mutual interactions between the participants and the researcher, where data can emerge (Mills, et al., 2006) and experiences can be explored and validated (Charmaz, 2014). Grounded theory is highly interpretive and interactive and does not attempt to isolate data, but considers it as part of a relevant societal context (Bonner & Adams, 2011)—in this case, a higher education institution managed by institutional leaders, the campus administrators and college deans in the Philippines.

Sampling and Data Collection

The participants of this research on grounded theory were the 15 Higher Education Institution or HEI campus administrators and deans who are also considered as institutional leaders in an educational management system. These participants shared their sentiments, views, and insights reflecting their anticipation toward the opening of face-to-face classes in a state college. Institutional leaders in the Philippine HEIs usually play a major role in the decision making with the university president as the foremost of the cohort of these educational leaders.

For the initial sampling (Charmaz, 2006; Charmaz, 2014), the researcher selected participants based on the criteria of being an institutional leader in an HEI. This is backed up by purposeful sampling that allows the researcher to gather data from documents that are most salient in the study, and from participants who are most familiar with the subject matter (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015)—otherwise indicated on this paper as the projected face-to-face classes during an educational crisis, the COVID-19 pandemic. Also, this set of

samples—campus administrators and college deans—represents their expertise as defined by the researcher, rather than generalities (Creswell, 2014). In the second stage of this research endeavor, the simultaneous data collection and analysis practices (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) were employed to work out the theoretical sampling by identifying participants who were expected to maximize the opportunities for comparative analysis and returning to certain participants for supplementary data, so that we could fill the gaps in the grounded theory. The researcher also continued the data collection until it has get hold of saturation for the research categories (Charmaz, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Data Analysis

As inspired by the methods used by Karpouza and Emvalotis (2018), the researcher took into consideration the written responses of the 15 participants. Transcriptions brought out the codes in memos following the simultaneous data collection and analysis which is considered an essential element in grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). After which, new codes were highlighted after the initial (particularly incident-by-incident) coding (Charmaz, 2014), which the researcher utilized for the first transcriptions. This study also worked on the focused coding (Charmaz, 2014) from initial codes to the most significant and frequent ones for the analysis of the gathered data. All these have become crucial in developing the grounded theory.

To further the methods used for analysis according to Karpouza and Emvalotis (2018), axial coding was utilized to identify (a) the conditions of some categories, (b) the participants' actions and interactions related to them, and (c) their consequences (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Through the fundamentals of theoretical sampling, the researcher had a constant comparative analysis, theoretical

sampling, and diagramming (Charmaz, 2014). Through data saturation, no newer data emerged and the categories were developed and determined their relationships (Charmaz, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). All these were consistently followed in the conduct of this study to develop a better understanding of the anticipation of the targeted resumption of face-to-face classes during a pandemic.

V. FINDINGS

This paper established its investigation on the leadership styles of institutional leaders in a Higher Education Institution (HEI). Through an in-depth analysis of the narratives from the campus administrators and college deans, the discussion focused on their characteristics as institutional leaders in the academe, assessment of the readiness of a college or a campus, and matching of the group situation and leadership styles. Moreover, the leadership style is grounded on the lens of Contingency Theory that reflects the mechanisms to be implemented by these leaders in a rare academic setting which is during an education crisis brought by the COVID-19 pandemic. This study also underscored the qualitative approach in dealing with the concepts of contingency theory as practiced by the institutional leaders at the tertiary level of the education system. Pseudonyms were assigned to each participant to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

Characteristics of Institutional Leaders in an HEI Toward the Face-to-Face Classes

Through comparative analysis, theoretical sampling, and diagramming, the researcher has come up with a set of leadership styles informed by the Contingency Theory of Fiedler (1964). Grounding from the concepts presented by Fiedler, it was observed in this study that the third set of leadership styles in the HEI during a pandemic is Community-Motivated as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of HEI Institutional Leaders Toward the Face-to-Face Classes

Leadership Styles	Themes of the Insights, Sentiments and Views on the Anticipated Resumption of Face-to-Face Classes in an HEI
Task-Motivated & Relationship-Motivated	Use Organizational Skills to Achieve Goals Efficiently Foster Team Synergy to Achieve Goals
Community-Motivated*	Work <i>with</i> the Community to Achieve Goals Appropriately

*Grounded Theory on a Community-Motivated Leader

Task-Motivated and Relationship-Motivated Leaders

Through the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale developed by Fiedler (1964), it is obviously easy to determine the characteristics

of either a Task-Motivated or Relationship-Motivated leader. In this paper, the themes supplemented the numerical undertaking of Fiedler in the context of institutional leaders in the academe particularly in an HEI.

Use Organizational Skills to Achieve Goals Efficiently. With the analysis of the views and insights from institutional leaders, the researcher came up with a set of characteristics of being a task-motivated leader. Accordingly, Luis shared,

Strict implementation of health protocols, harmonized scheduling, and physical facilities are major concerns that I hope can be looked on thoroughly [by institutional leaders].

Having this, Luis also added his views on the opening of face-to-face classes and said,

We, under the applied science course, prefer this method [as stated above] for an effective delivery of lessons [during a pandemic].

Then, this statement was supported by Greg who has emphasized the organization of necessary amenities before conducting a limited face-to-face instruction. Greg stated,

My stand to this, as of this time, [...] there are many things to consider still. First and foremost are the facilities and rooms to be used for a [face-to-face] instruction. In general, facilities and faculty must be given [enough] budget allocation to meet their needs having the new normal instruction.

Foster Team Synergy to Achieve Goals.

Another set of leaders came out from the sharing of the anticipated face-to-face classes in an HEI. In particular, Ramona stressed that the face-to-face instruction is a great concern not only of a few individuals but of the whole college system—she said,

This is a challenging year for all of us, we have to be ready no matter what [for] the world keeps changing. We cannot go back to our routines. In fact, a new normal is the key to moving forward not only by some of us but the whole state college.

Having the perspective of the resumption of face-to-face classes as a collective effort of each campus or college, Helter shared her affirmation on it and said,

Other Departments such as the CoT and CHM are ready in terms of the laboratory rooms. Procurements for the safety needs are still in process but they have been

doing something [for the learners and the faculty].

Both of these leadership styles can be deciphered through the views and insights of these institutional leaders in a state college. On the other hand, they have also mentioned some sentiments on the opening of face-to-face classes amidst the pandemic. For instance, Ramona shared her hopes for a better administration. She explicitly shared her sentiments as follows:

I hope and pray that in our quest for excellent service and commitment, for the sake of every head's mobility. May privileges regarding load allowance, considerate travel allowance for some higher designations be given credit and by heard by this new [and] dynamic leadership [...].

Another administrator named Chris added to this aforementioned concern. He expressed that:

We need to have a system on this [limited face-to-face classes] so that we could deliver instruction better and prepare our students for the world of work.

In terms of the preparations made by the HEI, Wilma was more concerned about making sure that all the preparations are made before the conduct of a limited face-to-face class. She shared her sentiments about it as presented below.

For physical preparation for that matter, our campus is still in the process [for limited face-to-face classes]. Thus, [we] are not yet ready for this semester. In terms of faculty, especially [handling] the laboratory subjects, I think it would be very difficult for them to handle several groups in one subject--[It would appear] like [that] if there are hundreds of students in a year level, plus there are more than two preparations which are all for laboratory-based courses; Then, this seems to be exhausting for them [faculty].

Moreover, Gilbert indicated during his discussion that the HEI is not yet ready for a limited face-to-face to be implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic. As stated by him,

[...] My views about the opening of classes would be about the institution's preparedness and it has to do a lot of preparations to be undertaken. There are many arrangements that need to be addressed such as [the availability of] classrooms and other school facilities.

Lastly, some of the institutional leaders also highlighted the issues on handling multiple sections, teaching loads, and lack of classrooms due to the increase in enrollment. Anita identified and elaborated these accordingly:

Limited face-to-face [instruction] would be difficult for [the] faculty especially those with many sections [teaching loads]. However, [one of the] problems that can be foreseen is the lacking classrooms due to the increase in enrollment. Adjustments should be placed to reduce the [limited face-to-face] meetings with the students.

Community-Motivated Leader

Commonly, leaders would fall under the two types of leadership as presented above—task-motivated and relationship-motivated. On the other hand, it was noted in this study that in order to expand the definition of being a leader from the confines of an organization or of a team, a community-based approach is necessary for a limited face-to-face class to be realized in an HEI.

Work with the Community to Achieve Goals Appropriately. With the intrusion of the pandemic, the decision-making of academic leaders has also evolved into a comprehensive approach that is sensitive to community's needs. Just like Masha, the majority of the institutional leaders conducted consultations regarding the projected face-to-face classes in an HEI. She pointed out this best practice involving the community below.

We spoke with a few students and their family members and they wanted face-to-face classes to be opened because they are already exhausted with the online classes. For them, ... [online learning] is not as effective as face-to-face [classes].

Masha added that the implementation has to consider the set of guidelines as prescribed by the Commission on Higher Education or CHED. She said,

What we need to do is to follow the CHED guidelines and the school must have a strict implementation on conducting face-to-face classes. We really need to elaborate, from time to time, the movement of the conduct of face-to-face classes.

This is also affirmed by Helter who shared her views about the limited face-to-face classes and specified that:

From my personal point of view, it is still better to start in the first semester so that

everything can be placed in order and there is enough time for the preparations as we need consultations from students or parents, and even with our stakeholders.

Melissa also mentioned the importance of having the limited face-to-face classes amidst the threats of the COVID-19 pandemic. She expressed her desire for the sense of immediacy of its implementation and said,

Based on feedback [from the] talks or dialogues with students, parents, and other stakeholders, they are very happy and eager to push through the [limited] face-to-face classes. [...] and I know that our administration is also looking for some remedies to comply with the guidelines of CHED for a face-to-face instruction to occur. I think by helping one another, we can achieve this and give justice to the learning needs of the students.

Notable, these preparations need to be addressed immediately by implementing them as planned. Rudolf, one of the institutional leaders, revealed that:

We have conducted and attended meetings for the preparation of the opening [of limited face-to-face classes] but we haven't started our plans [yet]. In fact, we haven't created a set of committees that are in-charge in the preparation for this. This is now the right time to start implementing whatever plans that we had for the readiness of the face-to-face classes for our students.

This sentiment of Rudolf was also indicated in the response of Albert saying,

Remember, we still have a lot of things to consider like retrofitting the classrooms, and other facilities. I guess we have to start working for it [a limited face-to-face class].

It was noted that even the institutional leaders in an HEI have encountered problems in dealing with their initial plans to the administration. Just like in the sentiments shared by Bren:

[...] But, the management should design or lay out a program for the opening of [limited] face-to-face classes specially for classrooms to be used by the faculty and students... Better yet, we have to involve the whole learning community to actively participate in implementing all these [guidelines].

Situational Favorableness on the Projected Resumption of Limited Face-to-Face Classes

As shown in Table 2, group situations are necessary to be considered when dealing with

decisions in the academic setting especially in an HEI considering the constraints brought by the pandemic and the demands from the members of the learning community.

Table 2. Situational Favorableness for a Community-Motivated Leadership Style

Situational Favorableness	Descriptions of Community-Motivated Leadership Style Generated from the Insights, Sentiments and Views of Institutional Leaders
Leader-Member Relations	Appropriate Conditions for Learning and Instruction, Need for Licensure Exams and Laboratory Skills, Responsive to Community Needs
Task Structure	Design or Layout Programs, Start the Plans, Create Community-Based Committees
Position Power	Designate Roles in the System, Enforce Policies to the Members of the Learning Community

Leader-Member Relations. In terms of leader-member relations, the leadership style must foster trust among its members. Sharing their views and insights on the administration of an HEI, most of the institutional leaders have shown trust and confidence in the possibility of the state college to have the limited face-to-face classes soon. One of them is *Sasha* affirmed that:

I agree with this initiative in our school to open the limited face-to-face classes. Our school is ready to accept the challenges that must be undergone to implement limited face-to-face classes. Rest assured that the safety of our students is mainly focused during our instructions.

This was also given value and worth by *Samantha* who considered the importance of limited face-to-face classes on the success of the learners on large-scale assessments measuring their competencies as graduates of the college before they can professionally work in the field. She mentioned that:

[It is] much better to have [limited] face-to-face classes, to attend or focus on students' welfare and concerns especially on programs with licensure exams.

Not only licensure exams are the primary concern of institutional leaders but also the skills necessary to be developed in a face-to-face format. The ecstatic feel of *Steve* toward the opening of classes can be gleaned through this statement:

I am very much excited and ready for these incoming [limited] face-to-face classes. Actually, my students are very much

willing and excited for the said plan. We are preparing our computer laboratories [for the learners] to practice their skills.

On the other hand, sentiments shared by the institutional leaders called out for a more responsive approach in dealing with the constraints brought by the pandemic such as slow internet connection and limited number of classrooms for face-to-face instruction. As *Helter* shared,

I am very willing to open the school for face-to-face classes; however, our classrooms or laboratories for the CoEd Department are under renovation (on-going) ... Hopefully, all of these can be finished by April (doubtful)...

As an institutional leader, *Anita* was more concerned of the increasing number of learners which the current number of available classrooms cannot accommodate. She said,

The intention to conduct [limited] face-to-face classes is very much welcome due to the problems with the internet connection for online classes. The plan for the [limited] face-to-face classes will provide better learning to students. However, [one of the] problems that can be foreseen is the lack of available classrooms due to an increase in the enrollment.

Task Structure. In terms of task structure, the sentiments of the institutional leaders flared up while discussing this type of group situation. All these have been recorded through the descriptions in the aforesaid community-motivated leadership. It was uncovered in the statements of *Rudolf* that “we have to start implementing whatever plans” and *Bren* mentioned that “the management should design or lay out a program for the opening of face-to-

face classes.” Unfortunately, these plans have been made out but no concrete actions were undertaken. *Albert* even mentioned the need “to start working for it [limited face-to-face instruction].” Notable among the sentiments, *Bren* highlighted the importance of the task structure to be “used by the faculty and students or even the whole community involved in implementing all these [guidelines].”

Position Power. In terms of position power, situational favorableness is seen through highlighting authority of the institutional leaders over their constituents in a learning community. For example, *Gilbert* shared his sentiments on some teachers taking advantage of the situation. As indicated in *Gilbert*’s narratives,

[...] On the other hand, this time a [limited] face-to-face class is necessary because other teachers are having a difficult task to conduct their classes unlike before that they are really inside a typical classroom. Then, students have less exposure and less learning because other teachers are having this difficulty to provide enough materials for the subject assigned to them. Likewise, internet connectivity is not accessible [as a primary reason for both the teachers and students who cannot attend their online classes].

As indicated above, an immediate concern is the use of position power of institutional leaders to demand limited face-to-face classes at the college level. *Ramona* also mentioned that the HEI must be proactive in dealing with the projected limited face-to-face instruction. She expressed her concern on having the will to implement it.

This will help the designated personnel to work hard and commit for the students’ welfare and the system as a whole.

Accordingly, *Anita* considered that the opening of limited face-to-face classes is responsive to what is needed by the situation in order for the learning competencies to be mastered by the college students. She accentuated the imposition of position power to make the situation more favorable to the learners, teachers, and the learning community in general.

The intention [of the resumption of a limited face-to-face class] is the answer to

the new normal situation while COVID-19 is still in the pandemic mode. The ulterior motive is to benefit the learners, teachers, and especially the stakeholders or industries who receive our graduates in the field of work.

In addition to this, *Chris* shared his stand on the implementation of the limited face-to-face classes:

I think the reopening of face-to-face classes will give [more] opportunities for the students to learn better compared to what we have now [distance or flexible learning]. [The] faculty of my Department really wanted to have a [limited] face-to-face class but we need to secure our students’ safety and health concerns.

All these narratives affirming the conduct of a limited face-to-face class were supported by *Bren* who mentioned that “we can deliver quality education to our students for them to become best in the community” and by *Greg* who highlighted that the “face-to-face instruction is really needed for the success of education.” *Luis* also brought about a welcoming atmosphere for this learning delivery stating that the “forthcoming limited face-to-face may be done; provided, [...] that the safety of both the students and the school personnel be assured and all other members of this learning community.”

Matching Up the HEI Situations and Leadership Styles of Institutional Leaders

As the focus of this paper, the sentiments, views, and insights of institutional leaders regarding the projected limited face-to-face classes in an HEI were thoroughly investigated. Grounding the discussions of this paper from Fiedler’s Contingency Model, the researcher worked on the matrix of the characteristics of a Community-Motivated Leader applied in the context of an HEI which is indicated in Table 3. This study answers the contemporary inquiry and gap on what academic leadership style may best suit HEI settings during a pandemic—it is obviously through a community-motivated contingency model.

Table 3. Matrix of Community-Motivated Leadership Style Grounded from the CM

Leadership	Types of Situations	Contingency Model (CM) Applied to the
------------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

Style		Projected Face-to-Face Classes in an HEI
Community-Motivated (grounded theory)	Leader-Member Relations Task Structure Position Power	1. Identify Leadership Style 2. Assess the Situation 3. Decide on Your Leadership Role 4. Consider Delegating Roles in Leadership 5. Change the Situation <i>with the Community</i>

Note: The steps in the CM, applied into the Projected Face-to-Face Classes in an HEI, come with decision making and course of actions 'with' the learning community.

Out of the simultaneous data gathering and analysis, the matrix only highlighted a grounded theory on Community-Motivated Leadership Style. This also involves the core of the types of situations necessary for an academic leader to come up with decisions from leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. Through all these processes, the highlight of this CM is changing the situation *with* the community of learning and not for it. This simply indicates a participatory consultation with stakeholders—learners, parents, industries, etc. Also, institutional leaders have leaned toward this leadership style to be more sensitive to the favorable situations of their clients who must master learning competencies, skills, and other dispositions in order to survive the field of work and the demands of life in the 21st century landscape.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The cornerstones of Contingency Theory and its Model provide a better understanding of the life of institutional leaders and exemplify the group situations of a Higher Education Institution or HEI. Leader-member relations, task structure, and position power guide the structure of the academic leadership style and interact in dynamic ways that may contribute to the success of the implementation of the limited face-to-face classes for college students.

The implications of this study of Contingency Model or CM and the sentiments, views and insights from institutional leaders have underscored many areas including administrative practice, academic programs in the new normal, and future research in the resumption of classes in HEIs. Campus administrators and college deans must

continually reflect on the situational favorableness that drives their leadership styles while examining the ways in which they can create a sense of community in terms of their

relationship with their constituents, lay out plans and strategies for guidelines to be implemented as a task structure, and communicate their position of power toward their intention to open schools for a limited face-to-face instruction.

As a model for institutional leaders in the academe, campus administrators and college deans should engage the CM cornerstones while encouraging such action among the students, teachers, parents, and the whole learning community. In academic leadership, successful, community-responsive models should be highlighted and revered as the norm in the new normal HEIs. School administrators and policy makers may also draw out from this academic endeavor and these cornerstones may be utilized as an evaluative or reflective tool for professional development efforts and curricular reform and development among institutional leaders. The sprout of the community-based leadership style as a fundamental practice is pivotal on the one-size fits all practices that do not take into account the local communities wherein the HEI is located or has risen to its existence. In other words, there is no single formula or path for a CM that focuses on community-motivated leadership but it has a multi-sectoral nature of situational processes that involve tacit leadership style of institutional leaders. This would simply mean that this grounded theory on the type of leadership for a targeted face-to-face instruction during a pandemic is non-prescriptive but a source of a flexible and continuously evolving academic leadership.

The advancement of the contingency theory into a community-responsive leadership style necessitates a dynamic and open mindset on administering an HEI. Moreover, this grounded theory is just one of the many attempts in the research arena to inform institutional leaders on how to foster learning community-responsive decisions. This new set of group situations fosters diversity in the communities wherein our learners, parents, and other stakeholders

interact and produce a collective goal for the development of their lives through a quality and needs-based education.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher would like to express an immense gratitude to the participants for sharing their expertise and vivid descriptions on the anticipated face-to-face classes in an HEI. The research received no external funding. Hence, the author declares no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Aytaç, T. (2020). The problems and opinions of school administrators during COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study from Turkey. *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(4), 57-79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/ejes.v7no4a5>
2. Babbar, M. & Gupta, T. (2021). Response of educational institutions to COVID-19 pandemic: An inter-country comparison. *Policy Features in Education*, 0(0), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F14782103211021937>
3. Bennett, N., & Lemoine, J. (2014). What VUCA really means for you. *Harvard Business Review*, 92(1/2). <https://hbr.org/2014/01/what-vuca-really-means-for-you>
4. Bonner, E. & Adams, T. (2012). Culturally responsive teaching in the context of mathematics: a grounded theory case study. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education* 15(1), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10857-011-9198-4>
5. Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory, A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
6. Charmaz, K. 2014. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications.
7. CHED. (2021). CHED-DOH-Joint-Memorandum-Circular-No.-2021-001-Guideline: Guidelines on the gradual reopening of campuses of higher education institutions for limited face-to-face classes during the COVID-19 pandemic. <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/CHED-DOH-Joint-Memorandum-Circular-No.-2021-001-Guidelines-on-the-Gradual-Reopening-of-Campuses-of-Higher-Education-Institutions-for-Limited-Face-to-Face-Classes-during-the-COVID-19-Pandemic.pdf>
8. Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Strategies for qualitative data analysis. Basics of Qualitative Research. Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*, 3(10.4135). <https://doi.org/9781452230153>.
9. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
10. Dumulescu, D. & Muțiu, A. (2021). Academic leadership in the time of COVID-19—Experiences and perspectives. *Elsevier Public Health Emergency Collection*, 13(10), 1306–1311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2021.07.001>
11. El Said, G. (2021). How did the COVID-19 pandemic affect higher education learning experience? An empirical investigation of learners' academic performance at a university in a developing country. *Advances in Human-Computer Interaction*, 2021, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6649524>
12. El-Amin, A. (2020). Andragogy: A theory in practice in higher education. *Journal of Research in Higher Education*, 4(2), 54-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24193/JRHE.2020.2>.
13. Fiedler, F. (1964). A Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 149-190. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60051-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60051-9).
14. George, B. (2017, February 17). VUCA 2.0: A strategy for steady leadership in an unsteady world. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/hbsworkingknowledge/2011/02/17/vuca-2-0-a-strategy-for-steady-leadership-in-an-unsteady-world/19970> lac 13d8

15. Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
16. Hsu, C. L., & Chen, M. C. (2018). How does gamification improve user experience? An empirical investigation on the antecedences and consequences of user experience and its mediating role. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 132, 118-129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.01.023>
17. Karpouza, E. & Emvalotis, A. (2018): Exploring the teacher-student relationship in graduate education: A constructivist grounded theory. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 24(2), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2018.1468319>
18. Kezar, A. (2021). The Impact of COVID-19 on Academic Leadership and Decision Making. <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/resource/26061/Kezar%20-%20FINAL.pdf>
19. Klofsten, M., Fayolle, A., Guerrero, M., Mian, S., Urbano, D., & Wright, M. (2019). The entrepreneurial university as driver for economic growth and social change-Key strategic challenges. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 141, 149-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.12.004>
20. Kraaijenbrink, J. (2018, December 19). What does VUCA really mean? *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jeroenkraaijenbrink/2018/12/19/what-does-vuca-really-mean/#7fa5b3ab17d6>
21. Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
22. Mills, J., Bonner, A. & Francis, K. (2006). Adopting a constructivist approach to Grounded Theory: Implications for research design. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 12 (1), 8–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-172X.2006.00543.x>
23. Mishra, L., Gupta, T., & Shree, A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 1(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.10.0012>
24. Pokhrel, S., & Chhetri, R. (2021). A literature review on impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on teaching and learning. *Higher Education for the Future*, 8(1), 133–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631120983481>
25. Siason Jr., N. (2022). Flexible Learning Experiences (Flex) during a Pandemic: Transactional Distance and Pedagogical Approaches of Faculty in a Higher Education Institution, *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 5(2), 56-65. <https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijsm s-v5i2p107>
26. Singh, J., Steele, K., & Singh, L. (2021). Combining the best of online and face-to-face learning: Hybrid and blended learning approach for COVID-19, post vaccine, & post-pandemic world. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 50(2), 140–171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395211047865>
27. Strauss, A., and J. Corbin. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
28. Sutton, M. J., & Jorge, C. F. B. (2020). Potential for radical change in Higher Education learning spaces after the pandemic. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 3(1), 124-128. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2020.3.1.20>
29. Thomas, C. (2020). Coronavirus and challenging times for education in developing countries. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/education-plus-development/2020/04/13/coronavirus-and-challenging-times-for-education-in-developing-countries/>
30. UN. (2020). Shared responsibility, global solidarity: Responding to the socio-economic impacts of COVID-19. <https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/file>

- s/sg_report_socio-economic_impact_of_covid19.pdf
31. UNESCO. (2022). The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education: international evidence from the Responses to Educational Disruption Survey (REDS). International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, 60, 244. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380398>
 32. Wang, M. & Kang, M. (2006). Cybergogy for engaged learning: A Framework for creating learner engagement through Information and Communication Technology. *Engaged Learning with Emerging Technologies*, 225-253. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3669-8_11
 33. Willig, C. 2013. *Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 3rd ed. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.