

CULTURE AND LEADERSHIP OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES (SUCS) IN EASTERN VISAYAS, PHILIPPINES

Redentor S. Palencia

Samar State University, Philippines

reden_palencia@rocketmail.com

Abstract

Leaders define the blueprint of any organization and their actions in most cases are governed or influenced by the organizational culture. Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ5x) and the Organizational Culture Questionnaire, the relationship between characteristics of leaders and employees, the leadership styles and organizational culture of SUCs in Eastern Visayas, Philippines were determined. The study revealed that majority of the three groups of respondents practiced transformational leadership especially along Inspirational Motivation and Intellectual Stimulation. Along organizational culture, majority of the three groups of respondents highly observed a We-Centric Culture especially along Culture of Sharing, Reinvention and Appreciation. Correlation results revealed that respondents' demographic and professional characteristics posted significant and highly significant relationships with the leadership factors. The Eta correlation between the respondents' affiliation in an organization and the Culture of Inclusion is observed to be weak, but significant. The correlations between the respondents' leadership styles and perceived organizational culture posted highly significant correlations with all the dimensions of organizational culture except for the Laissez-faire leadership factor and Culture of Reinvention which posted a significant correlation. The pairwise comparison using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference Test showed significant mean difference between and among SUCs along organizational culture.

Keywords: organizational culture, executive leaders, SUC Presidents, higher education institutions, leadership influences

I. INTRODUCTION

Leaders define the blueprint of any institution. The achievements and vulnerabilities of the institution primarily depend on the abilities, values, and the vision of the leaders. Pearce and Robinson (2011) define a leader as the standard bearer, the personification, the ongoing embodiment of the culture or the new example of what it should become. The

successes and failures of any organization are most likely linked towards leadership.

Bernardo (2006) avers that in any human organization, the most fundamental resource is the people, and the most important factor that determines the fate of the organization is leadership. The leadership styles of leaders in an organization then define the organizational culture. Pearce and Robinson (2011) reveal that an organization's culture is similar to an individual's personality – an intangible yet

ever present theme that provides meaning, direction, and the basis for action in any organization. How the leader behaves and emphasizes those aspects of being a leader become what all the organization sees are "important things to do or value."

Leadership in higher learning institutions is no exception. These institutions shall be the stronghold of leadership excellence for they are the foundation of the nation's competence and values. Salmi (2009) states that tertiary education helps countries build globally competitive economies by developing a skilled, productive, and flexible labor force and by creating, applying, and spreading new ideas and technologies. These state colleges and universities are enacted by law in pursuit of higher education for national development (Bernardo, 2006). This premise on higher learning institutions poses a great challenge to leaders of State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) of the country. The increasingly competitive scenarios in higher education in the country confront the abilities of leaders to meet the given standards. This is an era of educational breakthroughs and reforms where leaders need to be change agents. As change agents, they need to bring a different perspective to the situation and challenge the status quo. The success of any change program rests heavily on the quality and workability of the relationship between the change agent and the key decision makers within the organization (Ivancevich *et al.*, 2011). Organizational culture then is one of the key factors to consider if a leader is to implement institutional changes. Organizational culture is said to be an organization's DNA, not easily seen by the naked eye but a powerful template that shapes what happens in the workplace (Presbitero, 2008).

Confronted with educational reforms in higher education, chief executives and second-tier executives of SUCs need to revisit their leadership styles appropriate enough to match with their respective

organizational cultures. These taxing educational reforms in higher education include the rationalization of program offerings and resource utilization, strengthening quality assurance, upgrading institutions to international standards, modernizing of facilities, strengthening student financial assistance programs, intensifying research and development programs, and the amalgamation or the Regional University System (RUS).

The challenge to SUCs does not end with national educational reforms. Because of globalization, institutions of higher learning need also to be competitive in the international level. In the 2013 Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) Asian University Ranking, the University of the Philippines (UP), the premier SUC in the country, got the 67th place just one spot higher than last year of 68th place. Along world comparability, UP got the 348th spot of the 2012 QS World University Ranking; it slipped 16 spots from 332nd place in 2011 (<http://www.topuniversities.com/asian-rankings>). The QS university ranking uses the following criteria as academic peer review (40.00 percent), faculty student ratio (20.00 percent), citations per faculty (20.00 percent), recruiter review (10.00 percent), and international orientation (10.00 percent). Basing on these performance-based results on the flagship university of the country, SUCs need to double their efforts along reshaping its leadership and governance to uplift their international comparability making them world-class universities. Salmi (2009) cites strategies for establishing a world-class university, as he explains:

The establishment of a world-class university requires, above all, strong leadership, a bold vision of the institution's mission and goals, and a clearly articulated strategic plan to translate the vision into concrete targets and programs. Universities that aspire to

better results engage in an objective assessment of their strengths and areas for improvement, set new stretch goals, and design and implement a renewal plan that can lead to improved performance (p.9).

If a university only works to respond to existing needs and demands, it is not fulfilling its proper function which has to go beyond the present and the superficial. A major role of any university is to use reason to test and challenge the status quo, to search out ways of doing things better and to find ways to view the world in new and more informative ways (Group of Eight, 2013). Speaking of challenging the status quo, Schwartzman (2005) avers that the missing element is the absence of the vision of excellence to challenge it and transform the university.

This premise of a university poses a big challenge to university executives. With the world becoming more complex and ever dynamic, professional and leadership potentials of chief executives are challenged. This time, the role of the university is to become a critical partner in economic development and global competitiveness. Universities are innovation accelerators, key players in the generation of entrepreneurs, conveyors of “seed money” for exploratory research, and generators of new and applied scientific knowledge (ICF Consulting, 2002). These concepts then of present university system need to have leaders who by themselves are researchers, innovators, and entrepreneurs. Goodall (2006) points out that the best performing institutions have leaders who combine good managerial skills and successful research career. A study conducted by Goodall (2010) entitled, “Why Socrates Should Be in the Boardroom in Research University” argued that in knowledge-intensive organizations, such as research universities, where the core workers are experts, hiring leaders who are

also experts may improve organizational performance. A study about Philippine SUC Presidents with similar premise to the study showed that most of the Philippine SUC Presidents do not possess the scholarship qualities fitted for a Higher Education Institution identified by Goodal, (Orale, 2014).

Another definitive factor of organizational success is culture. Leadership and organizational culture are two concepts interplaying in organizational success. Glaser (2005) articulates some reasons why leaders, especially the executives, fail in their respected institutions, to wit: 1) Lack of shared focus, shared purpose, and shared vision; 2) Lack of organizational ambition and strategic approach; 3) Lack of respect for others within the organization; 4) Failure to tap resources and inner talent, creativity and responsibility; 5) Failure to break down walls between divisions; 6) Lack of team cohesion and failure to develop team agreement, rules of engagement, and decision-making process; and 7) Lack of hope and spirit.

The foregoing concepts on leadership and organizational culture affecting organizational performance and development provide the following significant reasons in conducting the present study: 1) To provide guidance to policy-makers on the leadership styles appropriate to the organizational culture; 2) To provide differentiated leadership training and development courses to maximize the leaders’ potentials in leadership and governance; 3) To point out the factors that contribute to the different leadership styles in SUCs vis-à-vis organizational culture to appropriately train them based on their leadership potentials that may contribute to development, and 4) To provide training program in building and reshaping organizational culture.

Building and reshaping organizational culture definitely is a tough advocacy. It

involves a systems approach involving strong-willed leadership, alignment of practices and structures, continuous training, and evaluating of culture. Thus, this research study is conducted. This paper assessed the relationship among the respondents' profile, leadership styles and organizational culture and the significant differences among leadership styles and organizational culture among SUCs.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study used mixed methods. It is a descriptive and inferential research using quantitative and qualitative approaches. In data gathering it made use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ5x) by Bass and Avolio (1985) and the Organizational Culture Questionnaire adopted from Tiu (2010) and administered it to the respondents to determine their profile variates, leadership styles, and organizational culture among SUCs in Region VIII. The respondents of the study were the chief executives and second-tier executives of the ten State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) of Region VIII (Eastern Visayas Region). Chief executives referred to the ten college/university presidents while the second-tier executives referred to the vice-presidents and college deans of every SUC. Lower level executives referred to the Heads and Chairmen.

The study used statistical tools that included frequency count, percentage, mean, standard deviation, Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r), Phi-Coefficient/Cramer's V, Eta Correlation, and One-Way Analysis of Variance. The FGD results were analyzed through content analysis using NVivo 10 Software. It utilized the word frequency query where the most frequently used words in the discussion were analyzed through a word cloud tab and cluster analysis. The word cloud analysis displays in varying font sizes, where frequently occurring words are in bigger fonts. On the other hand, the cluster analysis

tab displays up to 100 words as a horizontal dendrogram, where words that co-occur are clustered together.

In this study, the descriptive design was used to determine the following variables: leader-respondents' profile, leadership styles as transformational, transactional and passive/avoidant and the organizational culture as Culture of Inclusion, Culture of Appreciation, Culture of Striving, Culture of Sharing, Culture of Wondering, Culture of Developing, and Culture of Reinvention.

Correlational design was utilized in this study to investigate the relationship between 1) respondents' leadership styles and their profile variates, and 2) organizational culture and the following: a) leader-respondent's profile; and b) leadership styles.

This design was used to compare the 1) leadership styles among the leader-respondents, 2) organizational cultures among the SUCs, and 3) organizational culture among SUCs by level and category.

The data gathered were tabulated and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science Research (SPSS). To improve the quality of data, to check accuracy of the researcher's interpretation, and to establish validity of results, triangulation through a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was conducted.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Leaders, indeed, define the blueprint of any organization. Fiedler's Contingency Theory (1964) emphasizes that in any given leadership situation, success is determined primarily by the degree to which the task being performed by the followers is structured, the degree of position power possessed by the leader, and the type of relationship that exists between the leader and the followers. Leaders then, especially

the executives, have the power to define the future of their organization.

3.1 On Respondents' Profile

Majority of the respondents are family oriented leaders. Sixty-one or 18 percent of the respondents belong to the 56 to 60 years age bracket, and 58 or 17.2 percent of them are in the 51 to 55 years age bracket. Close to 50 percent of the respondents are holders

of a doctorate degree, and a little over one-third are master's degree holders. Moreover, one-fourth of them are post-graduate degree holders.

Though majority of the respondents are graduates of master's and doctorate degrees, only few of them have cited online publications, with H-index, utility models, and inventions. Less than five percent of the respondents have inventions and utility

Table 1. Leadership Styles of Respondents

Dimension	Chief Executive		Second Tier Executives		Lower Level Managers		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
<i>Idealized Influence</i>								
Low	0	0	1	1.9	0	0	1	0.6
Moderate	2	22.2	10	19.2	35	28.7	47	25.7
High	7	77.8	41	78.8	87	71.3	135	73.8
Total	9	100	52	100	122	100	183	100
<i>Inspirational Motivation</i>								
Low	0	0	0	0	1	.8	1	.5
Moderate	2	22.2	6	11.1	25	20.8	33	18.0
High	7	77.8	48	88.9	94	78.3	149	81.4
Total	9	100	54	100	120	100	183	100
<i>Intellectual Stimulation</i>								
Low	2	22.2	0	0	0	0	2	1.0
Moderate	2	22.2	7	12.7	37	29.6	46	24.4
High	5	55.6	48	87.3	88	70.4	141	74.6
Total	9	100	55	100	125	100	189	100
<i>Individual Consideration</i>								
Low	0	0	0	0	1	.8	1	.5
Moderate	3	33.3	8	14.8	38	30.4	49	26.1
High	6	66.7	46	85.2	86	68.8	138	73.4
Total	9	100	54	100	125	100	188	100
<i>Contingent Reward</i>								
Low	2	22.2	0	0	1	.8	3	1.6
Moderate	2	22.2	9	16.7	23	18.9	34	18.4
High	5	55.6	45	83.3	98	80.3	148	80.0
Total	9	100	54	100	122	100	185	100
<i>Management by Exception</i>								
Low	1	11.1	0	0	0	0	1	.6
Moderate	2	22.2	13	25.5	31	25.8	46	25.6
High	6	66.7	38	74.5	89	74.2	133	73.8
Total	9	100	51	100	120	100	180	100
<i>Laissez-faire Leadership</i>								
Low	0	0	2	4.0	0	0	2	1.1
Moderate	4	44.4	19	38.0	52	43.3	75	41.9
High	5	55.6	29	58.0	68	56.7	102	57.0
Total	9	100	50	100	120	100	179	100

models. Majority of the respondents have active accounts in social networking like Facebook and Yahoo Mail with a minority who access Google Scholar, American Search, and Scopus as search engines. Along scholarship grants, the percentage of scholarship grantees is very low. It is noted then that about 85 percent of the respondents might have financially borne their graduate schooling themselves.

As to the respondents' active account in social networking, most of them have Facebook and Yahoo Mail active accounts. The present study revealed that these respondents attended more training programs in the national level. For salary grade, 21.3 percent or 72 respondents have the salary grade 19 to 22. Twenty-one respondents or 6.2 percent disclosed having the salary grade 27 to 30. A number of 65 respondents or 19.2 percent have the salary grade 15 to 18.

3.2 On Leadership Styles of Respondents

As gleaned in Table 1, it presents the leadership styles of the respondents. Leadership style consists of the behavior pattern of a person who attempts to influence others (Northouse, 2013). As presented in the results, generally the respondents practice the transformational leadership style exhibiting highly along the factors Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individualized Consideration (IC). These leaders tend to practice transactional leadership as they highly exhibit the dimension Contingent Reward (CR). Laissez-faire leadership is also practiced by these respondents having a higher percentage than the Idealized Influence (II) factor under the transformational leadership style.

As stated by Northouse (2013), Inspirational Motivation (IM) is descriptive of leaders who communicate high expectations to followers, inspiring them through

motivation to become committed to and be part of the shared vision in the organization. In this leadership factor, the respondents use symbols and emotional appeals to their followers to achieve the goals and objectives of the organization. They are leaders who serve as inspiration to their co-workers. As transformational leaders, they are leaders with clear vision, considered as social architects, people who create trust in the organization, and leaders who used creative deployment of self through positive self-regard (Bennis and Nanus, 1985).

As gleaned in Figure 1, the faculty and support staff in the present study shared the vision of their leaders for the institution. The cluster analysis presents the vision of these leaders for the institution like achieving quality to become a premier university in the country.



Figure 1. Cluster Analysis of Leaders' Vision

Intellectual Stimulation as a leadership factor is also highly practiced by all groups of respondents in the study. Northouse (2013) defines it as leadership that stimulates followers to be creative and innovative and to challenge their own beliefs and values as well as those of the leader and the organization. Figure 2 shows the word cloud analysis as to how the leaders inspire the staff. The word cloud denotes that the leaders inspire the staff in many ways. They are inspired because these

leaders introduce change in the institution and are organized leaders. The inspiration they derive from their leaders motivated them to embrace new approaches and paradigms. As gleaned in the analysis, generally, they are inspired by their leaders because these leaders want change in the organization. Also, these respondents are inspired by their leaders because they are organized and they are learning from them.



Figure 2. Word Cloud on How Leaders Inspire

Below is a sharing from a faculty from a Leyte SUC:

“Well, as a personal experience, he would speak with us. He would stay with the ‘common tao.’ He doesn’t stay with the officials all the time but stays at the back during programs. Sometimes, he would stay at the back and mingle with us. He got the chance to talk with us, in fact he personally requested me, because he said please to proceed to my doctoral degree. And he said that’s my way of helping him achieve his goal for ASEAN 2015.”

Individualized Consideration as a leadership factor is also highly practiced by all groups of respondents. According to Northouse (2013), Individualized Consideration is representative of leaders who provide a supportive climate in which they listen carefully to the individual needs of followers. When leaders observe this leadership factor they tend to act as coach to their subordinates. The respondents’

answers to the question “What support do your leaders show especially towards innovation and new approaches” are analyzed through a word cloud shown in Figure 3. The word cloud capitalized the word ‘changes,’ a term to denote innovation. The advocacy towards organizational change is emphasized by the leaders through innovation. It was also revealed that the leaders support the staff in their pursuit of innovation and further studies.



Figure 3. Word Cloud on How Leaders Support Faculty and Staff

The following is a sharing of one faculty member from a Leyte SUC:

“As I have observed that there are young people who are now studying doctoral level. That’s a new and a good approach, investing with the young people, not like before I’ve observed that the old President that they are investing with the old. It’s a waste of money because they retire after two years. There should be a return of investment. I remember the philosophy of Dr. X, she said that “A fat cow gives good milk compared to a thin cow.” If people are not given well, of course they will not work. In the course of the conversation, another faculty member shared the following:

“The leaders in our University always support innovation but they cannot stand it. They are only good in

talking but not walk their talk. It's NATO – No Action; Talk Only.

(Somebody butted in and said, "A dog that barks but does not bite.")

Table 2 presents the correlations between perceived leadership styles and profile variables of the respondents. The respondents' profile variables of marital status, academic degrees, affiliation in professional organizations, number of innovations, number of papers presented and number of cited publications posted significant and highly significant relationships with their leadership styles. Except for the Laissez-faire leadership factor, the respondents' leadership styles showed significant differences across SUCs. Leadership factors as Idealized Influence

and Contingent Reward posted a significant difference while Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individual Consideration, and Management-by-Exception showed a highly significant correlation with the other variates included in the study.

3.3 On Organizational Culture

As shown on Table 3, the three groups of respondents observed a strongly We-Centric orientation in all dimensions of organizational culture. The Culture of Sharing is most of the time observed by the SUCs. Along this culture, the respondents exhibited a strongly We-Centric level, bearing the highest mean among the seven cultures. In this culture, employees explore

Table 2. Correlation Between Perceived Leadership Styles and Profile Variables of Respondents

Profile Variable	Leadership Style						
	Idealized Influence	Inspirational Motivation	Intellectual Stimulation	Individual Consideration	Contingent Reward	Management by Exception	Laissez-faire Leadership
Age	.07	.04	.04	.08	.04	.02	.04
Marital Status	.07	.15*	.09	.15*	.09	.12	.11
Academic Degree	.19**	.10	.05	.10	.09	.19**	.04
Affiliation in an Organization	.16**	.18**	.17*	.20**	.12	.10	.11
Number of Innovations	.09	.07	.11	.17*	.09	.10	.12
Number of Papers Presented	.05	.12	.19**	.12	.07	.10	.10
Number of Publications	.02	.04	.09	.04	.08	.05	.11
Number of Cited Publications	.06	.06	.03	.01	.06	.12*	.03
Number of H_Index	.07	.01	.07	.01	.003	.002	.02
Number of Awards Received	.06	.04	.04	.08	.04	.04	.07
Number of Scholarships Held	.03	.02	.16*	.02	.12	.09	.08
Number of Search Engines Used	.10	.18**	.19**	.20**	.19**	.12	.13
Number of Social Networks Subscribed	.03	.02	.10	.13	.09	.12	.14*
Number of Trainings Attended For the Past Three Years	.02	.08	.07	.06	.04	.01	.03
Number of Additional Remunerations	.06	.01	.07	.10	.09	.03	.04

*significant @ p value < 0.05

**significant @p-value < 0.01

Table 3. Perceived Organizational Culture

Dimension	Chief Executive		Second Tier Executive		Lower Level Manager		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
<i>Inclusion</i>								
Strongly I-Centric	1	11.1	0	0	0	0	1	.5
Moderately I Centric	0	0	1	1.9	5	3.9	6	3.2
Moderately WE-Centric	3	33.3	10	18.9	36	28.4	49	25.9
Strongly WE-Centric	5	55.6	42	79.2	86	67.7	133	70.4
Total	9	100	53	100	127	100	189	100
<i>Appreciation</i>								
Strongly I-Centric	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moderately I Centric	2	22.2	0	0	1	.8	3	1.6
Moderately WE-Centric	0	0	9	16.7	49	38.6	58	30.5
Strongly WE-Centric	7	77.8	45	83.3	77	60.6	129	67.9
Total	9	100	54	100	127	100	190	100
<i>Striving</i>								
Strongly I-Centric	0	0	0	0	1	.8	1	.5
Moderately I Centric	2	22.2	0	0	2	1.6	4	2.1
Moderately WE-Centric	0	0	10	18.5	41	32.0	51	26.7
Strongly WE-Centric	7	77.8	44	81.5	84	65.6	135	70.7
Total	9	100	54	100	128	100	191	100
<i>Sharing</i>								
Strongly I-Centric	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moderately I Centric	2	22.2	0	0	6	4.7	8	4.2
Moderately WE-Centric	0	0	7	12.7	37	28.9	44	22.9
Strongly WE-Centric	7	77.8	48	87.3	85	66.4	140	72.9
Total	9	100	55	100	128	100	192	100
<i>Wondering</i>								
Strongly I-Centric	0	0	0	0	1	.8	1	.5
Moderately I Centric	2	22.2	1	1.8	3	2.4	6	3.1
Moderately WE-Centric	0	0	10	18.2	39	30.7	49	25.7
Strongly WE-Centric	7	77.8	44	80.0	84	66.1	135	70.7
Total	9	100	55	100	127	100	191	100
<i>Developing</i>								
Strongly I-Centric	0	0	0	0	1	.8	1	.5
Moderately I Centric	2	22.2	0	0	4	3.1	6	3.1
Moderately WE-Centric	0	0	11	20.4	48	37.5	59	30.9
Strongly WE-Centric	7	77.8	43	79.6	75	58.6	125	65.4
Total	9	100	54	100	128	100	191	100
<i>Reinvention</i>								
Strongly I-Centric	0	0	0	0	1	.8	1	.5
Moderately I Centric	2	22.2	0	0	4	3.2	6	3.2
Moderately WE-Centric	2	22.2	7	13.2	36	28.6	45	23.9
Strongly WE-Centric	5	55.6	46	86.8	85	66.4	136	72.3
Total	9	100	53	100	126	100	188	100

and learn from others and are exposed to diverse resources and ways of thinking. They are able to ask others within the department and across divisions for guidance in making headway toward common goals.

Figure 4 shows that the personnel are engaged in knowledge sharing conversations where each department is duly represented.

Below is a sharing from a faculty member from Samar SUC:

“During annual planning, the Research Office will conduct seminar-workshop, in-house reviews. So that’s the time we share our ideas from the different departments. Each department is represented.”

One faculty from Leyte SUC said:

“Well, it happens in our meetings in our department. If you have a good insight or even a suggestion, our Dean will give credit to that.”

The culture can also be seen through its celebrations such as occasion when the institutions get recognition for accomplishing targets or receiving awards. Below is a sharing from one faculty member of a Leyte SUC:

“In our school we give the awards during the University Days with plaque and monetary counterpart and with the pin.”

Here are comments from two faculty members of Leyte SUCs:

“It’s the Dayao Awards in our school.”

“In our school, we have the Mt. Panasugan Award given to deserving employees.”



Figure 4. Word Cloud on the Involvement of Personnel in Knowledge-sharing Conversation

Of the seven cultures, the Culture of Reinvention is the one with the highest percentage of the moderately We-Centric culture. This is the organizational culture that exhibited the lowest percentage on a strongly We-Centric level. The Culture of Reinvention creates an atmosphere of ongoing homage, accomplishment, and evolution so that everyone pulls together to move toward the future. It may be noted that a significant number of leaders tended to be moderately nurturing the atmosphere of unity where leaders and members work hand in hand in the achievement of their goals; when the faculty and staff were asked about how their institutions celebrate accomplishments, they all agreed that the faculty and staff are recognized and given the rewards they deserved. The cluster analysis in Figure 5 reflects that their respective institutions recognize personnel achievements during foundation days and other significant events.



Figure 5. Cluster Analysis on How the Institution Celebrate Accomplishment

Majority of the three groups of respondents showed a strongly WE-Centric Culture of Inclusion. This culture projects an open communication where people feel included, involved in strategy, engaged in the work, and accountable for results. When the faculty and staff were consulted on their involvement in the decision-making of the school, they were open in saying that they are consulted during departmental meetings. As can be deduced in Figure 6, analysis showed that the faculty and staff are

involved on matters that require decision making.



Figure 6. Word Cloud on the Involvement of Faculty and Staff in Decision Making



Figure 7. Word Cloud on the Knowledge of the Faculty and Staff on Vision-Making

One manifestation of the faculty and support staff's involvement is their knowledge of the vision and mission statements of their institutions. Area I of the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACUP) evaluation is the Institutional Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives (VMGO). When these faculty and staff were asked if they know their vision and mission statements, they all shared the idea that they are contextually aware of their VMGO. Their sharing revealed that they are told to memorize the vision-mission statements for accreditation purposes as gleaned in Figure 7. They are consulted and involved in the revisit or modification of their vision-mission

statements. Along this dimension, it is shown that majority of the respondents have the We-centric orientation. These results denote that they work hand-in-hand in the achievement of their mission.

Table 4 presents the correlation between the respondents' profile variates and organizational culture. With respect to the correlations between the respondents' profile variates and perceived organizational culture, the Eta correlation between the respondents' affiliation in an organization and the Culture of Inclusion is observed to be weak, but significant. The mean score of officers on Culture of Inclusion and Culture of Wondering is higher compared to those who are simply members or non-members in an organization. The respondents who are officers of professional organizations are engaged and accountable for their responsibilities and as officers, they nurture innovation that leads to noteworthy endeavors. However, those who are non-members in organizations have higher mean scores on Culture of Reinvention than those who are members or officers in organizations. These results imply that these respondents create an atmosphere of ongoing homage, accomplishment, and evolution so that everyone pulls together to move towards the future.

The mean scores of Culture of Appreciation and Culture of Sharing were higher for respondents who presented their papers in international and national levels, higher than those with local and regional presentations. These respondents create a climate that celebrates diversity and uniqueness and respect for individual talents. The opportunities to present their research papers in these venues expose them to diverse resources and ways of thinking. Meanwhile, the mean scores on Culture of Inclusion and Culture of Developing tended to be higher for those who had more scholarship grants than those with less or no scholarship grants at all. This result implies that the respondents always

consider their accountabilities as scholars. They speak up and take risks for personal, professional, and organizational development.

Finally, the mean scores on Culture of Inclusion and Culture of Developing tended to be higher for those who used more search engines than those who use a lesser number of search engines. The result depicts that the leaders who use more search engines in writing their research and technical papers build confidence in themselves about what they write and report. Using more engines makes them more accountable to what they write.

The significant correlation between the respondents' profile characteristics and organizational culture showed that the

development of any organization greatly depends on the competence, vision, values, and leadership styles of leaders.

Organizational culture can be managed and changed (Lussier, 1993). Organizations use a variety of methods to change cultures. The general purpose of changing is to increase productivity and to achieve institutional vision and mandate.

The correlations between the respondents' leadership styles and perceived organizational culture posted highly significant correlations with all the dimensions of organizational culture except for the Laissez-faire leadership factor and culture of reinvention. All posted positive correlations denote that the higher the score on a particular dimension of leadership style, the higher is the score on a particular

Table 4. Correlation Between Perceived Organizational Culture and Profile Variables of SUC Leaders

Profile Variable	Organizational Culture						
	Culture of Inclusion	Culture of Appreciation	Culture of Striving	Culture of Sharing	Culture of Wondering	Culture of Developing	Culture of Reinvention
Age	.06	.01	.04	.08	.08	.07	.04
Marital Status	.04	.03	.01	.03	.02	.04	.05
Academic Degree	.11	.14	.09	.08	.11	.11	.12
Affiliation in an Organization	.18*	.11	.12	.12	.14*	.12	.15*
Number of Innovations	.10	.10	.09	.05	.06	.06	.08
Number of Papers Presented	.17	.20*	.16	.18*	.16	.17	.10
Number of Publications	.04	.00	.01	.01	.03	.04	.02
Number of Cited Publications	.04	.02	.01	.01	.04	.04	.05
Number of H_Index	.02	.02	.02	.02	.04	.06	.07
Number of Awards Received	.13	.14	.17*	.17	.16	.17	.19*
Number of Scholarships Held	.18*	.11	.13	.15	.15	.16*	.11
Number of Search Engines Used	.20*	.16	.14	.15	.17*	.18*	.15
Number of Social Networks Subscribed	.15	.16	.12	.13	.14	.13	.15
Number of Trainings Attended For the Past Three Years	.03	.03	.02	.03	.04	.08	.06
Number of Additional Remunerations	.09	.06	.07	.07	.07	.13	.09

*significant @ p value < 0.05

**significant @p-value < 0.01

dimension of organizational culture. These findings are in conformity with those in the study of Smith (2009) entitled, "The Relationship Between Organizational Culture, Societal Culture, and Leadership Styles." It was revealed that there were significant relationships among leadership styles, organizational culture, and organizational effectiveness outcomes. The study also found out that organization, leadership determines culture in relatively predictable ways.

The leadership styles of leaders are defining factors of organizational culture. The kind of culture an organization has reflects its kind of leaders. The shaping of organizational culture depends on the leaders. The leader is the standard bearer, the personification, the ongoing embodiment of the culture or the new example of what it should become (Pearce and Robinson, 2011). The organizational leader plays a critical role in developing, sustaining, and changing organizational culture. Leaders start to shape organizational culture by the passion they bring to their role, and their choice and development of young managers and future leaders.

Ling (2008) presented findings on leadership through her study entitled, "Sustaining Organizational Change Through Faith-Based Leadership." It revealed that faith in leadership provides an intentional driving force as well as a determining factor in defining the overall organizational practices, cultural behaviors and responses to change at all levels of the school. From these findings, leaders may be considered then as the one who define the culture of any organization.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Leading higher learning institutions, like SUCs, needs to have leaders who have a bold vision, excellent professional qualifications, which have strong personal and spiritual values.

Organizational culture of SUCs should speak of their mandates as higher learning institutions.

Building organizational culture should be enriched and intensified through defining and articulating organizational values, engaging employees through participative decision-making and socialization, and evaluating culture-building efforts and programs.

REFERENCES

- Bass, B.M. (1991). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share a vision. www.ucdenver.edu (Accessed: August 2, 2015).
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1995). MLQ multifactor leadership questionnaire for research. Redwood City, CA. Mind Garden.
- Bernardo, B.A. (2006). Management of colleges and universities of science and technology. Laguna: UPLB Foundation, Inc. and SEARCA.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1964). A theory of effective leadership. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Glaser, J.E. (2005). Creating we: Creating I-thinking to we-thinking. Avon Massachusetts: Platinum Press.
- Goodall, A.H. (2006). Should research universities be led by top researchers, and are they?. *Journal of Documentation*, 62 (3):388-411.
- Goodall, A.H. (2010). Why Socrates should be in the boardroom in research universities. Retrieved from <http://cshe.berkeley.edu>. (Accessed: July 3, 2015)

- Group of Eight (2013). The role and importance of research intensive universities in the contemporary world. Retrieved from www.go8.edu.au
- ICF Consulting (2003). California's future: UC's contributions to economic growth, health, and culture. http://s3.amazonaws.com/zanran_storage/www.universityofcalifornia.edu/ (Accessed: July 4, 2015)
- Ivancevich, J.M., Konopaske, R. & Matteson, M. T. (2011). Organizational behavior and management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leadership Trait Questionnaire. Retrieved from www.sagepub.com
- Ling, C. M. (2008). Exploring a strengths-based leadership in higher education: A case study. Retrieved from www.search.proquest.com/pqcentral/
- Lussier, R.N. (Eds) Human relations in organizations. USA: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Northhouse, P.G. (2013). Leadership. USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Orale, R.L. (2014). Is Socrates in the Boardroom of the Philippine State Universities and Colleges? *Countryside Development Research Journal*, 2(01), 89-92.
- Pearce, J. A. & Robinson, R. B. III (Eds) (2011). Strategic management. Singapore: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Salmi, J. (2009). The challenges of establishing world-class universities. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Schwartzman, S. (2005). Brazil's leading university: Between intelligentsia, world standard and social inclusion. Retrieved from www.schwartzman.org.br/simon/worldclass.pdf (Accessed: August 3, 2015)
- Sloan, R. H. (2009). A quantitative study of the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles and strategic change within the state university of New York. www.search.proquest.com/pqcentral/ (Accessed: July 3, 2015).
- Smith, E. E. (2009). The relationship between organizational culture, societal culture and leadership styles. www.search.proquest.com/pqcentral/ (Accessed: August 3, 2015).
- Tipu, S. A. A. et. al. (2012). Transformational leadership in Pakistan: An examination of the transformational leadership to organizational culture to innovation and propensity. www.search.proquest.com/pqcentral/ (Accessed: June 21, 2015).
- Tiu, R.R. (2010). Organizational culture, job stress and performance of teachers at the science and technology oriented (esep) high schools of eastern visayas. (Unpublished master's thesis). Leyte Normal University, Tacloban City, Philippines.