



BUWANANG MANCOMUSTAHAN

A Monthly School Management Committee Meeting as an Application of Servant Leadership

CHRISTOPHER DC. FRANCISCO, PhD

Principal I

Namayan Elementary School

christopher.francisco004@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This research-based application examined BUWANANG MANCOMUSTAHAN, a proposed monthly School Management Committee dialogue designed to translate servant leadership into routine school practice. The intervention creates a structured venue for school heads to listen to teachers, non-teaching personnel, learners, parents, School Governance Council members, and barangay representatives; respond to concerns; and jointly identify actions supporting school sustainability.

The report used a descriptive-evaluative action research framework. The source document specified the Servant Leadership Scale 28, School Culture Survey, and Organizational Trust Inventory as pre- and post-intervention measures. It also provided a six-month implementation plan from April to September 2024, monitoring through QATAME-aligned tools, and documentary outputs such as attendance, minutes, survey forms, and accomplishment reports.

Results available in the source document indicate a clear organizational need for more systematic stakeholder voice, shared problem solving, ethical communication, and support for personnel growth. The underlying study narrative further reported that servant leadership behaviors, particularly empowerment, emotional healing, ethical conduct, community value creation, and concern for subordinates' growth, were associated with stronger collaborative culture and organizational trust. The intervention is therefore logically aligned with the

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



identified needs. However, the attachment did not include numerical baseline, posttest, attendance, or inferential statistics; no unreported values were generated for this paper.

The paper concludes that monthly structured dialogue is a feasible mechanism for applying servant leadership, provided that implementation fidelity, confidentiality, response tracking, and pretest-posttest analysis are completed. The recommended evaluation uses descriptive statistics, paired-samples testing, effect sizes, and qualitative coding of stakeholder concerns.

Keywords: *servant leadership, collaborative school culture, organizational trust, stakeholder engagement, school management committee*

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

School leadership increasingly requires more than technical administration. School heads must coordinate instruction, manage resources, comply with accountability requirements, and sustain relationships among employees, learners, families, and community partners. When communication is irregular or primarily top-down, concerns may remain unresolved, participation may weaken, and teachers may experience school improvement work as an additional burden rather than a shared responsibility.

Servant leadership offers a relevant response because it begins with service to others and gives priority to follower growth, ethical behavior, empowerment, emotional healing, and community value creation. Liden et al. (2008) operationalized the construct through seven dimensions: conceptual skills, empowering, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, behaving ethically, emotional healing, and creating value for the community. These dimensions fit a school setting in which leaders are expected to support personnel while keeping learning and public service at the center.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



BUWANANG MANCOMUSTAHAN was developed as an application of this leadership approach. The name combines monthly management consultation with the Filipino practice of asking how others are doing. Its theme, Put Out into the Deep, emphasizes attentive listening and deeper engagement with stakeholder experience. Instead of treating consultation as an occasional activity, the intervention establishes a regular forum where concerns, suggestions, responsibilities, and follow-through can be documented.

The intervention is especially relevant to Marcelo H. del Pilar National High School because the source proposal identified heavy managerial and instructional demands, ancillary work assigned to teachers, and the need for greater openness between school heads and stakeholders. The initiative seeks to convert these concerns into shared decisions and visible action.

Conceptual and Empirical Foundations

Servant leadership is a multidimensional form of leadership in which influence is exercised through service, stewardship, ethical conduct, and development of others. Validation studies show that servant leadership is distinguishable from transformational leadership and contributes to outcomes such as commitment, performance, community citizenship, well-being, and trust (Liden et al., 2008; van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

Collaborative school culture refers to patterns of shared leadership, teacher collaboration, professional learning, unity of purpose, collegial support, and learning partnerships. The School Culture Survey organizes these elements into six dimensions. Strong school cultures are also characterized by trust and respect, professional learning communities, academic emphasis, and student support, which are associated with sustainable school improvement (Lee & Louis, 2019).

Organizational trust includes beliefs and intentions concerning the reliability, honesty, and goodwill of colleagues and leaders. In schools, trust supports communication, risk taking, cooperation, and collective action. A monthly dialogue can strengthen trust when leaders listen

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



consistently, explain decisions, act on commitments, and provide feedback. It can weaken trust if consultation is symbolic, confidential matters are exposed, or reported concerns receive no response.

Input	Process	Expected result
Servant leadership principles; stakeholder concerns; survey data	Monthly facilitated dialogue; issue documentation; joint action planning; feedback and monitoring	Improved servant leadership practice, collaborative culture, and organizational trust
Validated instruments; meeting records; QATAME-aligned monitoring	Pretest, six monthly sessions, posttest, statistical and thematic analysis	Evidence for program refinement and continuation

The framework assumes that repeated, respectful, and accountable interaction is the mechanism linking servant leadership behavior with collaboration and trust. The monthly meeting is therefore not the outcome itself; its quality and follow-through determine whether improvement occurs.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS SIGNIFICANCE AND SCOPE

This study aimed to examine BUWANANG MANCOMUSTAHAN as an application of servant leadership and as a mechanism for strengthening collaborative school culture and organizational trust.

Research Questions

What organizational needs and leadership gaps support the implementation of BUWANANG MANCOMUSTAHAN?

How is the intervention designed and implemented in terms of participants, schedule, activities, outputs, and monitoring?

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



What results are documented regarding servant leadership, collaborative school culture, and organizational trust?

What evidence is still required to determine the intervention's effectiveness through pretest-posttest comparison?

Significance. The study may guide school heads in institutionalizing stakeholder listening and shared problem solving. Teachers and non-teaching personnel may benefit from clearer avenues for raising concerns and proposing solutions. Learners, parents, School Governance Council members, and barangay partners may gain more meaningful participation in school sustainability. The Schools Division may use the framework as a model for evidence-informed leadership development.

Scope and Delimitations. The report focuses on the application plan for Marcelo H. del Pilar National High School and on the stakeholder groups named in the source document. It covers the proposed April-to-September 2024 cycle. Because the attachment does not provide respondent counts, completed survey datasets, meeting attendance, or test statistics, the Results section reports only documented findings and implementation evidence and identifies the analyses still needed.

METHODS

Research Design and Setting

The study followed a descriptive-evaluative action research design. The descriptive component identifies leadership and communication needs and presents the planned intervention. The evaluative component specifies how change in servant leadership, collaborative school culture, and organizational trust should be examined before and after six monthly dialogue sessions.

The setting was Marcelo H. del Pilar National High School in the Schools Division of City of Malolos, Bulacan. The intervention was situated within the School Management

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Committee and stakeholder-engagement structures of the school. Its design recognized that school improvement involves both internal stakeholders, who experience daily operations, and external stakeholders, who contribute community knowledge, resources, and accountability.

The unit of implementation was the monthly MANCOMUSTAHAN session. Each session was intended to provide a predictable cycle of listening, clarification, joint analysis, agreement on actions, and follow-up. The overall implementation period specified in the action plan was April to September 2024.

Phase	Purpose	Primary evidence
Baseline	Measure initial perceptions and identify priority concerns	Pre-survey; issue inventory
Monthly intervention	Practice servant leadership through structured dialogue	Attendance; minutes; action agreements; monitoring forms
Post-intervention	Measure change after six sessions	Post-survey; stakeholder feedback
Evaluation	Compare results and determine improvement needs	Descriptive statistics; paired test; effect sizes; thematic summary

The design is appropriate for continuous school improvement because it connects diagnosis, action, evidence, reflection, and revision. It does not support causal attribution unless implementation and alternative explanations are carefully considered.

Participants and Research Instruments

Participants. The source document identified school heads, teachers, non-teaching personnel, School Governance Council members, learner representatives, parents or guardians, and barangay officials as participants. These groups represent both implementers and intended beneficiaries. The total population, achieved sample, response rate, and

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



subgroup distribution were not included in the attachment and must be reported before inferential analysis.

Instrument	Construct and dimensions	Source specification
Servant Leadership Scale 28	Conceptual skills, empowerment, helping subordinates grow, putting subordinates first, ethical behavior, emotional healing, community value creation	28 items; Liden et al. 2008
School Culture Survey	Collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, professional development, unity of purpose, collegial support, learning partnerships	35 items; Gruenert and Valentine 1998
Organizational Trust Inventory	Affective state, cognitive judgment, and behavioral intention	62 items; Cummings and Bromiley 1996
Monitoring records	Participation, issues raised, action agreements, responsible persons, completion status, and stakeholder feedback	QATAME-aligned monthly documentation

The instruments should be administered using consistent instructions and matching anonymous codes so that baseline and post-intervention responses can be paired without disclosing identities. Permission and scoring guidance from instrument owners should be observed. Reliability should be recalculated for the local sample rather than relying only on coefficients reported elsewhere.

For stakeholder groups not suited to all three standardized surveys, short feedback forms or interviews may be used. Their responses should be analyzed separately and should not be combined with teacher survey scores unless the measures and constructs are equivalent.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Intervention and Data Collection Procedure

The intervention consisted of six monthly MANCOMUSTAHAN sessions. Each meeting was designed to model servant leadership by placing stakeholder experience at the beginning of the conversation and by requiring leaders to respond with empathy, ethical clarity, empowerment, and accountable action.

Step	Facilitation activity	Required record
1 Opening and safeguards	Explain purpose, norms, confidentiality, and respectful participation	Agenda and attendance
2 Kumustahan	Invite concise accounts of experiences, needs, and positive developments	Issue and strength log
3 Deep listening	Clarify concerns without blame; identify affected groups and evidence	Clarification notes
4 Joint analysis	Separate root causes, constraints, and controllable actions	Problem analysis
5 Action agreement	Assign task, responsible person, support needed, and deadline	Action tracker
6 Closing feedback	Summarize commitments and invite process feedback	Minutes and evaluation form
7 Follow-through	Report progress at the next session and close or escalate items	Updated action tracker

Procedure. A baseline survey was planned for April 2024, followed by monthly sessions from April through September. The post-intervention survey was scheduled for September, after which the accomplishment report would be prepared. Monitoring was to be conducted monthly using a tool aligned with the Division monitoring and evaluation process.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Safeguards. Participation should be voluntary where research data are collected. Sensitive personnel or learner matters must be redirected to appropriate confidential channels. Reports should summarize themes and actions without naming individuals unless disclosure is authorized and operationally necessary.

Data Analysis and Quality Assurance

For each scale and subscale, item responses should be checked, reverse-coded when required, and summarized using means, standard deviations, and valid response counts. Internal consistency should be estimated for the local sample. Baseline and post-intervention results should be compared only for respondents with matched codes.

Research purpose	Analysis	Reporting requirement
Describe initial and final levels	Mean, standard deviation, frequency, and descriptive category	Report n for every table and define cutoffs
Test pre-post change	Paired-samples t test; Wilcoxon signed-rank test if assumptions are not met	Report test statistic, degrees of freedom, p value, confidence interval
Estimate practical importance	Cohen d for paired data or rank-based effect size	Interpret effect size with uncertainty
Examine relationships	Correlation or regression if sample size is adequate	Report assumptions, coefficients, confidence intervals, and model fit
Analyze dialogue content	Code concerns, strengths, decisions, and unresolved items	Theme definitions, frequency, examples, and action status

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Research purpose	Analysis	Reporting requirement
Assess implementation	Attendance, session completion, action completion, participant feedback	Compare planned and achieved delivery

The proposal's five-point descriptive ranges may be retained for continuity, but raw means and variability should also be shown. Statistical significance should not be treated as the only evidence of success; practical change, participation quality, completion of agreed actions, and stakeholder explanations are equally important.

Quality assurance should include data cleaning, preservation of an audit trail, separate storage of identifying information, double-checking of computed scores, and review of conclusions against the actual tables. Missing data and nonattendance must be reported rather than silently excluded.

RESULTS

Documented Needs and Leadership Gaps

The source document identified a recurring leadership challenge: school heads carry extensive managerial and instructional responsibilities, while teachers may be asked to assist with reports, performance documentation, research, School-Based Management evidence, and other ancillary tasks. This arrangement can create uncertainty about roles, limited opportunity to express concerns, and dependence on informal communication.

Documented issue	Leadership implication	Intervention response
Heavy managerial and instructional demands	Leaders need accurate information about workload and implementation barriers	Monthly stakeholder listening and prioritization

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Documented issue	Leadership implication	Intervention response
Ancillary responsibilities carried by teachers	Empowerment must include role clarity, support, and fair distribution of work	Joint problem analysis and action assignment
Limited routine venue for stakeholder voice	Concerns may surface late or remain unresolved	Predictable MANCOMUSTAHAN schedule
Need for stronger collaboration and trust	Decisions require transparency and visible follow-through	Minutes, action tracker, progress reporting
Servant leadership not yet emphasized in development activities	Leadership practice may focus on compliance more than service behaviors	Use seven servant leadership dimensions as reflection criteria

The needs analysis supports the relevance of the intervention. Each identified problem has a corresponding mechanism within the monthly dialogue: listening addresses information gaps; joint analysis encourages shared ownership; action tracking strengthens accountability; and follow-up demonstrates reliability. This alignment is a program-design result, not yet proof of outcome improvement.

The source narrative also reports that servant leadership qualities, especially empowerment, emotional healing, ethical behavior, community value creation, and support for subordinate growth, positively influence collaborative culture and organizational trust. Exact coefficients and sample statistics were not included in the attachment and therefore cannot be reproduced here.

Intervention Structure and Expected Evidence

The action plan produced a coherent six-month sequence beginning with baseline measurement, continuing through six monthly sessions, and ending with post-intervention measurement and an accomplishment report. The plan assigned the proponent and school

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



heads as principal human resources and identified attendance, minutes, monitoring results, completed survey questionnaires, and the final report as documentary outputs.

Schedule	Planned activity	Specified output
April 2024	Baseline survey and first MANCOMUSTAHAN	Completed questionnaires, attendance, minutes, monitoring result
May 2024	Second monthly session	Attendance, minutes, monitoring result
June 2024	Third monthly session	Attendance, minutes, monitoring result
July 2024	Fourth monthly session	Attendance, minutes, monitoring result
August 2024	Fifth monthly session	Attendance, minutes, monitoring result
September 2024	Sixth session, post-survey, and report preparation	Meeting records, post-survey, accomplishment report

The structure demonstrates continuity and provides repeated opportunities for leaders to practice the target behaviors. It also creates a documentary trail that can show whether issues were heard, translated into actions, assigned, and completed. These features strengthen evaluability.

Implementation status. The attached document lists planned activities and outputs but does not contain completed attendance sheets, minutes, QATAME ratings, action-completion summaries, or dated accomplishment evidence. Accordingly, the table above reports the documented plan rather than asserting that every activity occurred.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Outcome Evidence and Data Status

The available document supports conclusions about relevance, design alignment, and intended measurement, but it does not support numerical claims of pretest-posttest improvement. The distinction between documented evidence and data still required is summarized below.

Outcome area	Evidence present in attachment	Result that may be stated	Evidence still required
Servant leadership	Dimensions, instrument, rationale, and narrative finding	The intervention targets observable servant leadership behaviors	Baseline and post means, SDs, paired test, effect size
Collaborative school culture	Six survey dimensions and literature-based link	Monthly dialogue is aligned with collaboration mechanisms	Completed survey data and subgroup results
Organizational trust	Three trust dimensions and narrative finding	Transparency and follow-through are plausible trust-building mechanisms	Matched pre-post scores and confidence intervals
Stakeholder engagement	Participant groups and monthly forum specified	The design broadens opportunities for stakeholder voice	Attendance, representation, speaking opportunities, satisfaction
Implementation fidelity	Six-session schedule and required records specified	The program is monitorable and time bounded	Actual dates, minutes, completed actions, deviations, reasons

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Result summary. The strongest current finding is that BUWANANG MANCOMUSTAHAN is conceptually and operationally aligned with the identified needs and with the dimensions of servant leadership, collaboration, and trust. The current evidence is insufficient to determine the magnitude or statistical significance of change. Completing the planned measurement is therefore part of the research result, not a minor administrative step.

No numerical values were inferred from reliability coefficients, descriptive ranges, or literature findings. Such values describe instruments or prior studies and cannot substitute for the school's own respondent data.

DISCUSSION

BUWANANG MANCOMUSTAHAN translates an abstract leadership philosophy into a repeated organizational routine. This is important because servant leadership is demonstrated through behavior rather than through a leader's stated intention. A monthly meeting can make empowerment, listening, ethical conduct, emotional support, and community stewardship visible to stakeholders.

The intervention's logic is consistent with Liden et al. (2008), whose multidimensional model emphasizes follower growth, ethical conduct, emotional healing, and community value. It is also consistent with evidence that strong school culture depends on trust, professional collaboration, shared responsibility, and respectful relationships (Lee & Louis, 2019). By inviting both internal and external stakeholders, the program extends collaboration beyond faculty interaction to the broader school community.

The design has three notable strengths. First, regular scheduling reduces dependence on crisis-driven consultation. Second, an action tracker connects dialogue with accountability. Third, the use of validated measures enables structured evaluation. These strengths will be realized only if meetings are psychologically safe, participation is balanced, and leaders report what happened to recommendations.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Several risks require attention. Power differences may discourage honest feedback. Large meetings may favor outspoken participants. Confidential matters may be raised inappropriately. Participants may lose trust if recurring concerns are recorded but not acted upon. Facilitators should therefore use clear norms, anonymous channels, small-group techniques, transparent escalation procedures, and status updates.

The source document's narrative claims of positive relationships among servant leadership, collaborative culture, and organizational trust are theoretically credible. Nevertheless, the absence of the underlying numerical tables limits verification. Future reporting should present respondent characteristics, reliability estimates, pretest and posttest results, test assumptions, effect sizes, and implementation evidence. This would allow the school to distinguish program promise from demonstrated impact.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The documented organizational needs justify a structured monthly forum for listening, shared analysis, and accountable follow-through. BUWANANG MANCOMUSTAHAN is well aligned with servant leadership because it creates repeated opportunities to empower stakeholders, support growth, respond with empathy, act ethically, and create value for the school community. Its six-month design, named participant groups, validated instruments, and monitoring outputs form a workable evaluation framework. However, the attachment does not contain the numerical or documentary outcome data necessary to claim measured improvement.

Recommendations

Complete and report the baseline and post-intervention datasets using matched anonymous respondent codes.

Present sample size, response rate, subgroup composition, means, standard deviations, paired-test results, confidence intervals, and effect sizes.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VIII, Issue I

August 2026

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Maintain an action tracker showing the issue, agreed response, responsible person, deadline, status, and feedback to stakeholders.

Use anonymous submission and small-group discussion to reduce the effect of hierarchy on honest participation.

Separate confidential personnel or learner concerns from matters appropriate for open committee discussion.

Assess implementation fidelity through attendance, representation, session completion, speaking opportunities, satisfaction, and action-completion rates.

Recalculate instrument reliability for the local sample and document permissions, scoring procedures, and any adaptations.

Continue, revise, or scale the program only after considering both measured outcomes and stakeholder explanations.

The intervention should be regarded as a promising and testable school-improvement mechanism. Its credibility will depend on whether listening is followed by fair decisions, visible action, and transparent evaluation.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



References

- Cummings, L. L., & Bromiley, P. (1996). The Organizational Trust Inventory OTI. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 302-330). SAGE.
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111-132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004>
- Focht, A., & Ponton, M. (2015). Identifying primary characteristics of servant leadership: Delphi study. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 9(1), 44-61.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Gruenert, S., & Valentine, J. (1998). *School Culture Survey*. Middle Level Leadership Center, University of Missouri.
- Lee, M., & Louis, K. S. (2019). Mapping a strong school culture and linking it to sustainable school improvement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 81, 84-96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.02.001>
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>
- Ohlson, M., Swanson, A., Adams-Manning, A., & Byrd, A. (2016). A culture of success: Examining school culture and student outcomes via a performance framework. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(1), 114-127.
- Seto, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2016). Servant leadership influence on trust and quality relationship in organizational settings. *International Leadership Journal*, 8(3), 23-33.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VIII, Issue I

August 2026

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2015). Faculty trust in the principal: An essential ingredient in high-performing schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(1), 66-92.

van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), 249-267. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1>



Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza
