

Management Functions of College Deans among State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Eastern Visayas

Lanie M. Pacadaljen, Ph.D.

Associate Professor, College of Education, Samar State University, Catbalogan City, Samar, Philippines

Email: laniepacadaljen126@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The success in management is gained through the accomplishment of mission, goals and objectives which eventually contribute to nation's socio-economic growth and sustainable development. Management depends upon modeling an organization. Modeling allows management to perform its distinctive information-processing activities such as monitoring, evaluation, prediction and control. Moreover, the functions of management are products of the interaction between a management system and its environment. This is a consequence of the way that management systems will tend to adapt to survive and grow in whatever specific context in which they are operating just like in educational system. This study assessed the management functions of college deans along planning, organizing, leading, and controlling particularly on the extent of knowledge, importance and implementation. The researcher employed expert- validated questionnaire and triangulation method to gather vital information. Results revealed that College deans are doing well along the four management functions however the extent to which these functions are exercised still depend on how knowledgeable they are as managers, how they give importance in the exercise of their functions, and how they implement these functions to carry out the mission, goals and objectives of the college where they belong. Thus, managerial skills of deans can be improved by crafting a management program that will prepare them to a higher position in the future which focuses on performance management, managing teams, leadership process, and the like.

Keywords

management functions, planning, organizing, leading, controlling

Article Received: XX Xxx 2021, Revised: XX Xxx 2021, Accepted: XX Xxx 2021

Introduction

The success in management is gained through the accomplishment of mission, goals and objectives which eventually contribute to nation's socio-economic growth and sustainable development. Clearly, the management functions are in some sense definitive of modern societies. Management depends upon modeling an organization. Modeling allows management to perform its distinctive information-processing activities such as monitoring, evaluation, prediction and control. The purpose to which these activities are directed defines the functions of management such as planning, organizing, controlling, budgeting, staffing, monitoring and decision-making (Baltazar, et al., 2005).

The abovementioned functions of management are products of the interaction between a management system and its environment. This is a consequence of the way that management systems will tend to adapt to survive and grow in whatever specific context in which they are operating just like in educational system. Education just like any other enterprise needs to change so that it can reap fruits for the investors and educational

community. To a great extent, the performance of the manager hinges on his ability to anticipate these environmental changes basically through forecasting and planning. In fact, most of the manager's short- and long -run decisions more often are based on his readings and analysis of present and future environmental events (Baltazar, et al., 2005). Thus, managers must be trained for they are responsible for motivating their people to achieve the goals of the organization. However, they should be trained not only to maximize the knowledge of stakeholders, but also to perform their social responsibility as well (Fajardo, 2006). Problems which challenge the capability and ingenuity of the managers of the tertiary educational institutions are evident (Cabada, 2008). Political instability and macroeconomic problems that led to minor institutional problems form a backdrop within which the development of an institution and country in general must be accomplished. Managers of the educational institutions must be of the highest quality if an institution wants to become effective and efficient in the delivery of services to their target clientele (Rodriquez and Echanis, 2001).

In the Philippines, the higher education system is a key player in the educational and integral formation of competent, service-oriented, principled and productive citizens. It has four-fold functions of instruction, research, extension and production. Through these, it becomes the prime mover to the nation's socio-economic growth and sustainable development. (Cabada, 2008). The mission of the higher educational system is to educate and train Filipinos for enhanced labor productivity and responsible citizenship in an environment where educational access is equitable, at the same time inculcating nationalism and patriotism in the hearts and minds of the students and graduates. More particularly, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) is mandated to accelerate the development of high-level professionals ready to meet international competitions and to serve as Centers for Research and Development. The CHED recognizes the enormous contribution of higher education institutions in the growth, and the prominence of tertiary education in the country and in the Asia-Pacific. It is responsible for formulating and implementing policies, plans and programs for the development and efficient operation of the system of higher education in the country. Along this line, the Commission on Higher Education acknowledged the deteriorating quality education of tertiary education which can be attributed to the critical areas of concern, including the lack of overall vision, framework, plan and the limited access to higher education by which senior leaders usually fail to address (Lasan, 2002).

In a recent survey of Asia's Best Universities, the most prestigious schools in the country could not make it to the top 20. University of the Philippines , however , took pride in having been ranked 35th out of 79 state universities in the Asia-Pacific Region in 2001, showing according to its newsletter , a 13-step improvement on its 2000 ranking of 48th in the field of 75, and on its median ranking of 27 in the 1999 survey (Lasan, 2002). Three leading private universities in the Philippines placed 71st, 76th, and 78th via ranking based on academic reputation (20.00 percent), research output (20.00 percent), and financial resources (10.00 percent). In the light of these realities, the (CHED) should be clothed with more authority to implement rules and regulations vis-à-vis its responsibility of safeguarding the standards of higher education. For its part, the CHED

carries on faithful compliance of its constitutional mandate to supervise and oversee the effective delivery of quality education institutions of the country through enhancing quality and excellence, ensuring relevance and responsiveness, improving efficiency and effectiveness, and broaden access and equity in higher education to steadfastly incise the local Filipino. Moreover, the Commission on Higher Education acknowledged the deteriorating quality education for tertiary education which can be attributed to the critical areas of concern, including the lack of overall vision, framework, plan and the limited access to higher education by which administrators usually fail to address (Lasan, 2002).

In a survey conducted by Castano as cited by Cabada (2008) that assessed the efficiency of 59 State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the Philippines from 1999-2003, using Data Envelopment Analysis-Productivity Model, empirical results show that SUCs ranked high in managerial efficiency, 49 (83.00 percent) out of 59 SUCs of the educational institutions are efficient. However, it is alarming to note that six (10.17 percent) out of 59 SUCs are showing technological progress. In terms of total factor productivity, SUCs have an index score of 1.002 which implies a positive productivity growth. The main source of productivity growth is due to technical efficiency rather than innovation. In general, SUCs show a 5.2 percent technological regression over the time period. Furthermore, technical efficiency has an average of 95.4 percent compared with 96.6 percent (variable returns to scale). Finally, the SUCs obtain a below frontier efficiency score.

The measurement of organizational performance and efficiency is an essential part of the reform for the general welfare of all groups as well as the country. By measuring efficiency, it is possible to evaluate the performance of an organization by comparing it with the standard of the international best practice. Educational progress and modern education depend to a great extent on the quality of our country's human workforce stock particularly those who ran the organization- a workforce that is highly prepared, competitive and sensitive to the demands of a rapidly transforming world. Filipinos can compete in the global arena to sustain the dynamism of the Asia-Pacific region if they give primary attention in the development

of human resources. It is in this premise that educational managers are expected to perform their tasks, role and responsibilities in an outstanding fashion to achieve the best things in their respective institution.

Review of Related Literature

Covey (1991) pointed out that there are seven habits of highly effective people. They are as follows: 1) Proactivity- which is more than being aggressive or assertive. It is both taking initiative and responding to outside stimuli based on one's principle. Proactive people and organizations are self-aware; accept responsibility for their own actions; work continuously within their circle of influence, and develop themselves first in order to have greater influence with others; 2) The principle of leadership and mission. Leadership focuses more on people than on things; on the long term rather than the short term; on developing relationships rather than on equipment; on values and principles rather than on activities; on mission, purpose and direction rather than on methods, techniques and speed; 3) Managing time and priorities around roles and goals. Most people and organizations approach time management within the context of prioritizing one's schedules. It embraces the principle of implementing one's action plans to achieve worthy purposes; 4) The principle of seeking mutual benefit. In any interdependent relationship thinking win-win is essential to long term effectiveness. It requires an abundance mentality, an attitude that says, "There is enough for all". It cultivates the genuine desire to see the other party win as well, the orientation that any relationship should seek mutual benefit for all concerned; 5) The principle of emphatic communication. The most powerful principle of human interaction is by genuinely seeking to understand another deeply before being understood in return. At the root of all interpersonal problems in failure to thoroughly understand each other. True emphatic communication shares faithfully not only words, ideas and information, but also feelings, emotions and sensitivities; 6) The principle of creative cooperation. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts. This is usually attained through synergy, fostered and nurtured through empowering management styles and supportive structures and systems. In an environment of trust and open

communication, people working interdependently are able to generate creativity, improvement and innovation beyond the total of their individual but separate capacities; 7) The principle of continuous improvement. People and organizations have four major needs or characteristics as follows: a) physical or economic; b) intellectual or psychological; c) social or emotional; and d) spiritual or holistic. Developing within human beings and organizations consistent commitment and continued performance in refining and expanding their abilities in these four areas is the key to overall continuous improvement in all other areas. According to Fayol (2002), managerial functions involved the personal supervision of subordinates and involved inspiring them to put forth unified effort to achieve objectives. He emphasized the importance of managers and leaders' understanding for people who worked for them, setting a good example, treating subordinates in a manner consistent with the rules and policies of an institution. As managers, everything should be looked into so that everything occurs within the parameters of the plan and accompanying principles. In this way, if everything goes wrong, a corrective action will be undertaken.

Fayol added that management is a distinct intellectual activity consisting of several functions. The process theorists believe that all managers regardless of their industry, organization or level of management became a dominant paradigm for studying management and the functions of management became the most common way of describing the nature of managerial work. Moreover, according to the words of Andres (1995), a professional manager is a humane leader, a specialist in the work of planning, organizing, executing and controlling. He is one who subscribes to the standard of practice and code of ethics established by a recognized body and common vocabulary and can realize higher individual, family and organizational goals and objectives. He added that achievement of objectives and results requires action, and effective action requires a plan. Success in work necessitates planning one's work and then working one's plan.

Another important aspect in the field management is production. According to Martinez (2004), production is the act of utilizing efficiently and effectively available economic resources in the

manufacturing of products to satisfy human wants. Production managers are concerned with the design and implementation of systems and processes for getting work done. They are responsible for transforming input resources into desired outputs of some specified quality at a minimum cost. They must examine the objectives of the firm and the work within the constraints of the system to operate most effectively and efficiently. Increasingly, optimization-systems-oriented (total organization) measures are being used to evaluate production managers. The production manager's aim is to create the end-product in the market in the right quantity, of the right quality at the right time economically. To achieve this objective, a manager must involve himself in product planning, production planning and control, and quality control. To meet the economic objective, the manager is concerned with such things as methods improvement and work measurement, physical facilities management, materials management, and personnel management. The aspect of the production manager's work referred to as production control includes: 1) scheduling the required work; 2) giving the go signal to start and providing the necessary instructions to the different manufacturing sectors ; and 3) checking on the progress and initiating corrective measures to ensure the effective and efficient use of the various factors of production.

Not all management occurs in the form of an organizational system. Management may be a single human individual. Thus, a Dean in particular, who leads a certain College in a University, manages not only himself but his faculty members as well. Management functions of this Dean should be utilized to an extent that everybody in the organization benefits his management. Management success is gained through accomplishment of mission, goals and objectives. However, accomplishing mission, goals and objectives is not sufficient. Success requires both effectiveness and efficiency on the part of the Dean. Recognizing the importance of the College Deans' role in the educative process and in the organization, this study was conceived to assess management functions of College Deans among State Universities and Colleges in Eastern Visayas.

Statement of Objectives

This study aimed to assess the management functions of college deans along knowledge, importance, and implementation.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the socio-economic profile of the College Deans among SUCs in Eastern Visayas as to:
 - 1.1 age and sex;
 - 1.2 civil status;
 - 1.3 educational attainment;
 - 1.4 academic rank;
 - 1.5 teaching experience;
 - 1.6 administrative experience;
 - 1.7 relevant in-service training;
 - 1.8 performance rating, and
 - 1.9 monthly income?
2. To what extent do College Deans, Associate Deans/Department Heads, and faculty have knowledge, importance, and implementation with respect to the following management functions?
 - 2.1 planning;
 - 2.2 organizing;
 - 2.3 leading, and
 - 2.4 controlling?
3. Are there significant differences on the extent of knowledge and implementation of management functions of the College Deans by group of respondents?

Significance of the Study

Hopefully, the result of this study would contribute to the realization of an effective and efficient university/ college thereby bringing out quality education in tertiary education. It is hoped that the findings of the study would provide the CHED officials some insights on what areas in the field of management need immediate attention. Hence, it will be the basis to make further planning for innovations and change of leadership and managerial paradigm in the implementation of CHED programs and projects.

Moreover, the findings of the study would give the Board of Regents the opportunity to formulate plans, programs and actions for the betterment of tertiary education in the country which caters the needs and demands of its society. For the college deans, this study may serve as mirror of their leadership, management and production capability in their respective College. It is hoped that

through this study, they could adapt and adjust the best management functions suited to the organization where they are in. Hence, this would make them aware of their present capability and strive to improve on them. They will be given the opportunity to upgrade themselves and be fully equipped with the relevant and needed managerial functions as College administrators. In addition, the result of the study will give them the will to strive for excellence not only in instruction, research, extension but in production as well.

The outcome of this study would provide inputs in the management of other universities/tertiary schools in the Philippines especially the nature, practices and scope of leadership, management, and productivity.

Methodology

The study employed the descriptive quantitative research to determine the extent of knowledge, importance and implementation of management functions such as planning, organizing, leading and controlling. Questionnaire-checklists, documentary analysis, and personal interviews were employed. There are 38 deans and 52 department heads who were chosen through total enumeration, and 261 faculty members who were selected through simple random sampling.

The first part of the instrument for the College Deans gathers data on the professional profile. It includes age and sex, civil status, educational attainment, academic rank, teaching experience, administrative experience, relevant in-service trainings attended, performance rating and monthly income. Moreover, the second part of the questionnaire gathered data relative to College Deans perceptions in terms of management functions such as planning , organizing , leading, and controlling with the use again of a five-point Likert scale as follows: 5-Very Much Knowledgeable (VMK)/very much important (VMI)/very much implemented (VMIImpl), 4-Much knowledgeable (MK)/ much important(MI)/much implemented (MImpl), 3-Knowledgeable (K)/Important(I)/Implemented (Impl), 2-Slightly Knowledgeable (SLK)/slightly important (SLI)/slightly implemented (SImpl) and 1-Not Knowledgeable (NK)/not important(NI)/not implemented (NImpl) .

Documentary analysis was also employed by the author to gather data relative to the number of college deans, associate deans/department heads

and number of faculty members for each College. Inasmuch as the questionnaire was researcher-made, the said instrument was validated to ensure the accuracy of data gathered. Two validation techniques were utilized— expert validation and try-out of the questionnaire. Try-out was conducted to one of the colleges of a state university in Samar Island.

Results and Discussions

2.1 Profile of the College Deans

The average age of the College Deans was 51.61 years indicating that the college deans from the respondent-SUCs in Eastern Visayas were in their early 50's. Majority of the college deans were females with 26 or 68.42 percent out of 38 respondents and only 12 or 31.58 percent were males. Most of them were married and around 29 or 76.32 percent have post-graduate degree in Ph.D./DM/Ed.D and 5 or 13.16 percent were master's degree holders with doctoral units and 4 or 10.53 percent were master's degree holders. In addition, majority of them enjoy the academic rank positions of Professor III and Professor IV with an average teaching experience of 25.61 years which means that they have spent most of their time in the SUC where they are currently affiliated as also evidenced by their average length of administrative experience as College deans which is 7.82 years. Along seminars/trainings attended, the average number of hours of attendance in international level is 26 hours with a performance rating of very satisfactory for the last three years. Their average income was pegged at Php41,775.45.

2.2 On Knowledge, Importance and Implementation of Four Management Functions

The extent to which college deans, department heads, and faculty have the knowledge, importance and implementation of the management functions are presented by table. Based on the assessment made by the college deans to themselves, they are very much knowledgeable along planning, organizing and controlling while both department heads and faculty members have rated the four functions as much knowledgeable/much important/much implemented. Meanwhile, along organizing, leading and controlling functions, the college deans rated these functions as “very much important” and “much implemented” as opposed

to the department heads and faculty members' ratings.

Table 1. Extent to which College Deans, Department Heads, and Faculty Possessed Knowledge, Importance and Implementation of the Management Functions

Management Functions	Respondent's Category					
	Deans		Dept Head		Faculty	
	Xw/Interpretation	Xw/Interpretation	Xw/Interpretation	Xw/Interpretation	Xw/Interpretation	Xw/Interpretation
Planning						
Knowledge	4.52	VMK	4.32	MK	4.15	MK
Importance	4.50	MI	4.27	MI	4.15	MI
Implementation	4.48	MImpl	4.27	MImpl	4.16	MImpl
Organizing						
Knowledge	4.46	VMK	4.26	MK	4.16	MK
Importance	4.49	VMI	4.27	MI	4.16	MI
Implementation	4.53	VMIImpl	4.27	MImpl	4.16	MImpl
Leading						
Knowledge	4.48	MK	4.31	MK	4.13	MK
Importance	4.51	VMI	4.27	MI	4.12	MI
Implementation	4.53	VMIImpl	4.27	MImpl	4.13	MImpl
Controlling						
Knowledge	4.55	VMK	4.31	MK	4.10	MK
Importance	4.56	VMI	4.34	MI	4.10	MI
Implementation	4.54	VMIImpl	4.39	MImpl	4.10	MImpl

Legend:

4.51 - 5.00 Very Much Knowledgeable (VMK)/Very Much Important (VMI)/Very Much Implemented (VMIImpl)

3.51 - 4.50 Much Knowledgeable (MK)/Much Important (MI)/Much Implemented (MImpl)

2.51 - 3.50 Knowledgeable (K)/Important (I)/Implemented (Impl)

1.51 - 2.50 Slightly Knowledgeable (SK)/Slightly Important (SI)/Slighly Implemented (SImpl)

1.0- 1.50 Not Knowledgeable (NK)/Not Important (NI)/Not Implemented (NImpl)

2.3 Comparison on the Extent of Knowledge and Implementation of the Management Functions of the College Deans by Group of Respondents

The data relative to the comparison on the extent of knowledge and implementation of the management functions of college deans by group of respondents are presented in the succeeding pages.

The data revealed that the responses of the three groups of respondents between groups are significant and greatly vary based on how they perceived the capability of their deans. As gleaned from the table, the College deans gave the highest overall rating of 4.50 or "much knowledgeable" followed by the department heads and faculty members with area means of 4.32 and 4.15 , respectively which means "much knowledgeable". To determine whether the observed differences among the means were significant, the one-way analysis of variance was

applied, where the mean squares between groups was posted at 0.350 and the mean squares within groups was 0.005. This led to the rejection of the hypothesis which states that, "There is no significant differences among the perceptions of the three groups of respondents relative to the extent of knowledge of college deans on the management functions along planning". This indicated that the assessments given by the college deans, department heads and faculty members differed.

To find out which among the three paired means differed significantly, Scheffe's test was undertaken and shown in Table 2. As gleaned from the said table, the following were the observed differences: 0. 21 for the college deans and department heads, and 0.37 for college deans and faculty members and 0.16 for department heads and faculty members. equal to 2. Thus, the abovementioned differences were

significant. This indicated that the college deans perceived that the extent of knowledge of college deans on the management functions along

planning was “very much knowledgeable” than as perceived by the department heads and faculty members of the respondent-SUCs.

Table 2. Comparison on the Extent of Knowledge of the College Deans’ Management Functions Along Planning by Group of Respondents

SUMMARY							
Respondents	n	Sum	Mean/Inter-pretation		Variance		
College Deans	10	45.04	4.50	MK	0.0109		
Department Heads	10	43.22	4.32	MK	0.0024		
Faculty Members	10	41.51	4.15	MK	0.0007		
ANOVA							
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit	Decision
Between Groups	0.62	2	0.312	66.73	4E-11	3.35	Significant
Within Groups	0.13	27	0.005				
Total	0.79	29	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Posteriori Analysis (Scheffe's Test)</i>							
Pair	Diff. in Means		F'comp	p-value	Evaluation/Decision		
College Deans & Depart Heads	0.18		32.4	0.00	Significant		
College Deans & Faculty Members	0.35		122.5	0.01	Significant		
Depart Heads & Faculty Members	0.17		28.9	0.04	Significant		

Legend:

- 4.51 - 5.00 Very Much Knowledgeable (VMK)/Very Much Important (VMI)/Very Much Implemented (VMIImpl)
- 3.51 - 4.50 Much Knowledgeable (MK)/Much Important (MI)/Much Implemented (MImpl)
- 2.51 - 3.50 Knowledgeable (K)/Important (I)/Implemented (Impl)
- 1.51 - 2.50 Slightly Knowledgeable (SK)/Slightly Important (SI)/Slightly Implemented (SImpl)
- 1.00 - 1.50 Not Knowledgeable (NK)/Not Important (NI)/Not Implemented (NImpl)

The data revealed that the responses of the three groups of respondents between groups are significant and greatly vary based on how they perceived the capability of their deans on the extent of implementation along the Planning function. As gleaned from the table, the College deans gave the highest overall rating of 4.49 or “much implemented” followed by the department heads and faculty members with area means of 4.28 and 4.17, respectively which also means “much implemented”. To determine whether the observed differences among the means were significant, the one-way analysis of variance was applied, where the mean squares between groups was posted at 0.205 and the mean squares within groups was 0.004. This led to the rejection of the hypothesis which states that, “There is no significant differences among the perceptions of the three groups of respondents relative to the extent of implementation of college deans on the

management functions along planning”. This indicated that the assessments given by the college deans, department heads and faculty members also differed.

To find out which among the three paired means differed significantly, Scheffe's test was undertaken and shown in Table 3. As gleaned from the said table, the following were the observed differences: 0.21 for the college deans and department heads, and 0.32 for college deans and faculty members and 0.16 for department heads and faculty members. equal to 2. Thus, the abovementioned differences were significant. This indicated that college deans perceived that the extent of knowledge of college deans on the management functions along planning was “very much knowledgeable” than as perceived by the department heads and faculty members of the respondent-SUCs.

Table 3. Comparison on the Extent of Implementation of the College Deans’ Management Functions

Along Planning by Group of Respondents

SUMMARY						
Respondents	n	Sum	Mean/Inter-pretation	Variance		
College Deans	8	35.89	4.49	MImpl		
Department Heads	8	34.22	4.28	MImpl		
Faculty Members	8	33.37	4.17	MImpl		
ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.41	2	0.205	51.72	8E-09	3.47
Within Groups	0.08	21	0.004			
Total	0.49	23	-	-	-	-
<i>Posteriori Analysis (Scheffe's Test)</i>						
Pair	Diff. in Means		F'comp	p-value	Evaluation/Decision	
College Deans & Depart Heads	0.21		44.1	0.00	Significant	
College Deans & Faculty Members	0.32		102.4	0.00	Significant	
Depart Heads & Faculty Members	0.11		12.1	0.00	Significant	

Legend:

4.51 - 5.00 Very Much Knowledgeable (VMK)/Very Much Important (VMI)/Very Much Implemented (VMI_{Impl})

3.51 - 4.50 Much Knowledgeable (MK)/Much Important (MI)/Much Implemented (MImpl)

2.51 - 3.50 Knowledgeable (K)/Important (I)/Implemented (Impl)

1.51 - 2.50 Slightly Knowledgeable (SK)/Slightly Important (SI)/Slightly Implemented (SImpl)

1.00 - 1.50 Not Knowledgeable (NK)/Not Important (NI)/Not Implemented (NImpl)

Table 4 showed the data relative to the responses of the three groups of respondents between groups which are significant and greatly vary based on how they perceived the capability of their deans along the organizing function. As gleaned from the table, the College deans gave the highest overall rating of 4.48 or "much knowledgeable" followed by the department heads and faculty members with area means of 4.31 and 4.13 , respectively which means "much knowledgeable". To determine whether the observed differences among the means were significant, the one-way analysis of variance was applied, where the mean squares between groups was posted at 0.305 and the mean squares within groups was 0.003. This led to the rejection of the hypothesis that states that, "There is no significant differences among the perceptions of the three groups of respondents relative to the extent of knowledge of the college deans on the management functions along organizing". This indicated that the assessments given by the college deans, department heads and faculty members differed.

To find out which among the three paired means differed significantly, Scheffe's test was undertaken and shown in Table 4. As gleaned from the said table, the following were the observed differences: 0. 17 for the college deans and department heads, and 0.35 for college deans and faculty members and 0.18 for department heads and faculty members. Thus, the abovementioned differences were significant. This indicated that the college deans perceived that the extent of knowledge of college deans on the management functions along organizing was "very much knowledgeable" than as perceived by the department heads and faculty members of the respondent-SUCs.

Table 4. Comparison on the Extent of Knowledge of the College Deans on the Management Function Along Organizing by Group of Respondents

SUMMARY					
Respondents	n	Sum	Mean/Inter-pretation	Variance	
College Deans	10	44.8	4.48	MK	0.0048
Department Heads	10	43.1	4.31	MK	0.0029
Faculty Members	10	41.31	4.13	MK	0.0015
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value
Between Groups	0.61	2	0.305	98.5	4E-13
Within Groups	0.08	27	0.003		
Total	0.66	23	-	-	-

Posteriori Analysis (Scheffe's Test)

Pair	Diff. in Means	F'comp	p-value	Evaluation/Decision
College Deans & Depart Heads	0.17	48.17	0.00	Significant
College Deans & Faculty Members	0.35	204.17	0.00	Significant
Depart Heads & Faculty Members	0.18	54	0.01	Significant

Legend:

4.51 - 5.00 *Very Much Knowledgeable (VMK)/Very Much Important (VMI)/ Very Much Implemented (VImpl)*

3.51 - 4.50 *Much Knowledgeable (MK)/Much Important (MI)/Much Implemented (MImpl)*

2.51 - 3.50 *Knowledgeable (K)/Important (I)/Implemented (Impl)*

1.51 - 2.50 *Slightly Knowledgeable (SK)/Slightly Important (SI)/Slightly Implemented (SImpl)*

1.00 - 1.50 *Not Knowledgeable (NK)/Not Important (NI)/Not Implemented (NImpl)*

The data shown in Table 5 pertaining to the responses of the three groups of respondents between groups are significant and greatly vary based on how they perceived the capability of their deans on the extent of implementation along the organizing function. As gleaned from the table, the College deans gave the highest overall rating of 4.51 or “very much implemented” followed by the department heads and faculty members with area means of 4.27 and 4.12 , respectively which also means “much implemented”. To determine whether the observed differences among the means were significant, the one-way analysis of variance was applied, where the mean squares between groups was posted at 0.398 and the mean squares within groups was 0.002. This led to the rejection of the hypothesis which state that, “There is no significant differences among the perceptions of the three groups of respondents relative to the extent of implementation of college deans on the management functions along organizing”. This indicated that the assessments given by the college

deans, department heads and faculty members also differed.

To find out which among the three paired means differed significantly, Scheffe's test was undertaken and shown in Table 3. As gleaned from the said table, the following were the observed differences: 0.24 for the college deans and department heads, and 0.39 for college deans and faculty members and 0.15 for department heads and faculty members. Thus, the abovementioned differences were significant. This indicated that the college deans perceived that the extent of implementation of college deans on the management functions along organizing was “very much implemented” than as perceived by the department heads and faculty members of the respondent-SUCs.

Table 5. Comparison on the Extent of Implementation of the College Deans' Management Function Along Organizing by Group of Respondents

SUMMARY					
Respondents	n	Sum	Mean/Inter-pretation	Variance	
College Deans	10	45.12	4.51	VMImpl	
Department Heads	10	42.67	4.27	MImpl	
Faculty Members	10	41.17	4.12	MImpl	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value
Between Groups	0.8	2	0.398	159.79	1E-15
Within Groups	0.07	27	0.002		
Total	0.86	29	-	-	-
<i>Posteriori Analysis (Scheffe's Test)</i>					
Pair	Diff. in Means		F'comp	p-value	Evaluation/Decision
College Deans & Depart Heads	0.24		96	0.00	Significant
College Deans & Faculty Members	0.39		253.5	0.01	Significant
Depart Heads & Faculty Members	0.15		37.5	0.00	Significant

Legend:

4.51 - 5.00 Very Much Knowledgeable (VMK)/Very Much Important (VMI)/Very Much Implemented (VMImpl)

3.51 - 4.50 Much Knowledgeable (MK)/Much Important (MI)/Much Implemented (MImpl)

2.51 - 3.50 Knowledgeable (K)/Important (I)/Implemented (Impl)

1.51 - 2.50 Slightly Knowledgeable (SK)/Slightly Important (SI)/Slightly Implemented (SImpl)

1.00 - 1.50 Not Knowledgeable (NK)/Not Important (NI)/Not Implemented (NImpl)

The data revealed that the responses of the three groups of respondents between groups are significant and greatly vary based on how they perceived the capability of their deans along the extent of knowledge of the leading function. As gleaned from the table, the College deans gave the highest overall rating of 4.51 or “very much knowledgeable” followed by the department heads and faculty members with area means of 4.27 and 4.12 , respectively which means “much knowledgeable”. To determine whether the observed differences among the means were significant, the one-way analysis of variance was applied, where the mean squares between groups was posted at 0.398 and the mean squares within groups was 0.002. This led to the rejection of the hypothesis which states that, “There is no significant differences among the perceptions of the three groups of respondents relative to the extent of knowledge of college deans on the management functions along leading”. This indicated that the assessments given by the college deans, department heads and faculty members differed.

To find out which among the three paired means differed significantly, Scheffe's test was undertaken and shown in Table 6. As gleaned from the said table, the following were the observed differences: 0. 24 for the college deans and department heads, and 0.39 for college deans and faculty members and 0.15 for department heads and faculty members. equal to 2. Thus, the abovementioned differences were significant. This indicated that the college deans perceived that the extent of knowledge of college deans on the management functions along leading was “very much knowledgeable” than as perceived by the department heads and faculty members of the respondent-SUCs.

Table 6. Comparison on the Extent of Knowledge of the College Deans' Management Functions Along Leading by Group of Respondents

SUMMARY

Respondents	n	Sum	Mean/Inter-pretation	Variance
College Deans	10	46.04	4.60	VMK
Department Heads	10	43.22	4.32	MK
Faculty Members	10	41.51	4.15	MK
ANOVA				
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	0.62	2	0.312	66.73
Within Groups	0.13	27	0.005	
Total	0.79	29	-	-
<i>Posteriori Analysis (Scheffe's Test)</i>				
Pair	Diff. in Means	F'comp	p-value	Evaluation/Decision
College Deans & Depart Heads	0.18	32.4	0.00	Significant
College Deans & Faculty Members	0.35	122.5	0.01	Significant
Depart Heads & Faculty Members	0.17	28.9	0.04	Significant

Legend:

4.51 - 5.00 *Very Much Knowledgeable (VMK)/Very Much Important (VMI)/ Very Much Implemented (VMIImpl)*

3.51 - 4.50 *Much Knowledgeable (MK)/Much Important (MI)/Much Implemented (MImpl)*

2.51 - 3.50 *Knowledgeable (K)/Important (I)/Implemented (Impl)*

1.51 - 2.50 *Slightly Knowledgeable (SK)/Slightly Important (SI)/Slightly Implemented (SImpl)*

1.00 - 1.50 *Not Knowledgeable (NK)/Not Important (NI)/Not Implemented (NImpl)*

The data shown in Table 7 relative to the responses of the three groups of respondents between groups are significant and greatly vary based on how they perceived the capability of their deans on the extent of implementation along the leading function. As gleaned from the table, the College deans gave the highest overall rating of 4.53 or “very much implemented” followed by the department heads and faculty members with area means of 4.27 and 4.13 , respectively which also means “much implemented”. To determine whether the observed differences among the means were significant, the one-way analysis of variance was applied, where the mean squares between groups was posted at 0.402 and the mean squares within groups was 0.003. This led to the rejection of the hypothesis which states that, “There is no significant differences among the perceptions of the three groups of respondents relative to the extent of implementation of college deans on the management functions along leading”. This indicated that the assessments given by the college deans, department heads and faculty members also differed.

To find out which among the three paired means differed significantly, Scheffe’s test was

undertaken and shown in Table 3. As gleaned from the said table, the following were the observed differences: 0.24 for the college deans and department heads, and 0.39 for college deans and faculty members , and 0.15 for department heads and faculty members. Thus, the abovementioned differences were significant. This indicated that the college deans perceived that the extent of implementation of college deans’ management functions along leading was “very much implemented” than as perceived by the department heads and faculty members of the respondent-SUCs.

Table 7. Comparison on the Extent of Implementation of the College Deans’ Management Function Along Leading by Group of Respondents

SUMMARY

Respondents	n	Sum	Mean/Inter-pretation	Variance
College Deans	10	45.26	4.53	VMImpl
Department Heads	10	42.74	4.27	MImpl
Faculty Members	10	41.3	4.13	MImpl
ANOVA				
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	0.8	2	0.402	157.94
Within Groups	0.07	27	0.003	
Total	0.86	29	-	-

Posteriori Analysis (Scheffe's Test)

Pair	Diff. in Means	F'comp	p-value	Evaluation/Decision
College Deans & Depart Heads	0.26	112.67	0.01	Significant
College Deans & Faculty Members	0.40	266.67	0.00	Significant
Depart Heads & Faculty Members	0.14	32.67	0.00	Significant

Legend:

4.51 - 5.00 *Very Much Knowledgeable (VMK)/Very Much Important (VMI)/Very Much Implemented (VMImpl)*

3.51 - 4.50 *Much Knowledgeable (MK)/Much Important (MI)/Much Implemented (MImpl)*

2.51 - 3.50 *Knowledgeable (K)/Important (I)/Implemented (Impl)*

1.51 - 2.50 *Slightly Knowledgeable (SK)/Slightly Important (SI)/Slightly Implemented (SImpl)*

1.00 - 1.50 *Not Knowledgeable (NK)/Not Important (NI)/Not Implemented (NImpl)*

The data revealed that the responses of the three groups of respondents between groups are significant and greatly vary based on how they perceived the capability of their deans along the extent of knowledge of the controlling function. As gleaned from the table, the College deans gave the highest overall rating of 4.55 or “much knowledgeable” followed by the department heads and faculty members with area means of 4.31 and 4.10 , respectively which means “much knowledgeable”. To determine whether the observed differences among the means were significant, the one-way analysis of variance was applied, where the mean squares between groups was posted at 0.456 and the mean squares within groups was 0.002. This led to the rejection of the hypothesis which states that, “There is no significant differences among the perceptions of the three groups of respondents relative to the extent of knowledge of college deans on the management functions along controlling”. This indicated that the assessments given by the college deans, department heads and faculty members differed.

To find out which among the three paired means differed significantly, Scheffe's test was undertaken and shown in Table 8. As gleaned from the said table, the following were the observed differences: 0. 24 for the college deans and department heads, and 0.45 for college deans and faculty members and 0.21 for department heads and faculty members. Thus, the abovementioned differences were significant. This indicated that the college deans perceived that the extent of knowledge of college deans on the management functions along controlling was “very much knowledgeable” than as perceived by the department heads and faculty members of the respondent-SUCs.

Table 8. Comparison on the Extent of Knowledge of the College Deans' Management Functions Along Controlling by Group of Respondents

SUMMARY

Respondents	n	Sum	Mean/Inter-pretation	Variance
College Deans	9	40.92	4.55 VMK	0.0022
Department Heads	9	38.82	4.31 MK	0.0048
Faculty Members	9	36.87	4.1 MK	0.0004

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit	Decision
Between Groups	0.91	2	0.456	185.42	3E-15	3.4	Significant
Within Groups	0.06	24	0.002				
Total	0.97	26	-	-	-	-	-

Posteriori Analysis (Scheffe's Test)

Pair	Diff. in Means	F'comp	p-value	Evaluation/Decision
College Deans & Depart Heads	0.24	86.4	0.02	Significant
College Deans & Faculty Members	0.45	303.75	0.00	Significant
Depart Heads & Faculty Members	0.21	66.15	0.01	Significant

Legend:

- 4.51 - 5.00 Very Much Knowledgeable (VMK)/Very Much Important (VMI)/ Very Much Impl (VMImpl)
 3.51 - 4.50 Much Knowledgeable (MK)/Much Important (MI)/Much Implemented (MImpl)
 2.51 - 3.50 Knowledgeable (K)/Important (I)/Implemented (Impl)
 1.51 - 2.50 Slightly Knowledgeable (SK)/Slightly Important (SI)/Slightly Implemented (SImpl)
 1.00 - 1.50 Not Knowledgeable (NK)/Not Important (NI)/Not Implemented (NImpl)

The data shown in Table 9 relative to the responses of the three groups of respondents between groups are significant and greatly vary based on how they perceived the capability of their deans on the extent of implementation along the leading function. As gleaned from the table, the College deans gave the highest overall rating of 4.53 or “very much implemented” followed by the department heads and faculty members with area means of 4.27 and 4.13 , respectively which also means “much implemented”. To determine whether the observed differences among the means were significant, the one-way analysis of variance was applied, where the mean squares between groups was posted at 0.402 and the mean squares within groups was 0.003. This led to the rejection of the hypothesis which states that, “There is no significant differences among the perceptions of the three groups of respondents relative to the extent of implementation of college deans on the management functions along leading”. This indicated that the assessments given by the college deans, department heads and faculty members also differed.

To find out which among the three paired means differed significantly, Scheffe's test was

undertaken and shown in Table 9. As gleaned from the said table, the following were the observed differences: 0.15 for the college deans and department heads, and 0.44 for college deans and faculty members and 0.29 for department heads and faculty members. Thus, the abovementioned differences were significant. This indicated that the college deans perceived that the extent of implementation of college deans’ management functions along controlling was “very much implemented” than as perceived by the department heads and faculty members of the respondent-SUCs.

Table 9. Comparison on the Extent of Implementation of the College Deans’ Management Functions Along Controlling by Group of Respondents

SUMMARY

Respondents	n	Sum	Mean/Inter-pretation	Variance
College Deans	9	40.85	4.54	VMImpl
Department Heads	9	39.48	4.39	MImpl
Faculty Members	9	36.87	4.1	MImpl

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit	Decision
Between Groups	0.91	2	0.454	108.71	9E-13	3.4	Significant
Within Groups	0.1	24	0.004				
Total	1.01	26	-	-	-	-	-

Posteriori Analysis (Scheffe's Test)

Pair	Diff. in Means	F'comp	p-value	Evaluation/Decision
College Deans & Depart Heads	0.15	33.75	0.01	Significant
College Deans & Faculty Members	0.44	290.4	0.02	Significant
Depart Heads & Faculty Members	0.29	126.15	0.01	Significant

Legend:

4.51 - 5.00 *Very Much Knowledgeable (VMK)/Very Much Important (VMI)/Very Much Impl (VMImpl)*

3.51 - 4.50 *Much Knowledgeable (MK)/Much Important (MI)/Much Implemented (MImpl)*

2.51 - 3.50 *Knowledgeable (K)/Important (I)/Implemented (Impl)*

1.51 - 2.50 *Slightly Knowledgeable (SK)/Slightly Important (SI)/Slightly Implemented (SImpl)*

1.00 - 1.50 *Not Knowledgeable (NK)/Not Important (NI)/Not Implemented (NImpl)*

Conclusions and Recommendations

Generally, the college deans are very much knowledgeable along planning and controlling as part of the exercise of their management functions while the department heads and faculty members view the college deans as much knowledgeable on their academic management functions. The department heads and faculty members rated "much important" on the deans academic management functions while the college deans rated "very much important" along leading and controlling. The college deans view themselves "very much implemented" along organizing, leading and controlling. However, both the department heads and faculty members rated "much implemented" on the said functions. There are significant differences of perceptions of the college deans, department heads and faculty members on the extent of knowledge, importance and implementation of the college deans' management functions.

On the other hand, it is recommended that college deans must be provided with ample information on leadership styles, management functions and productivity to improve their leadership, management and productivity skills. They should be encouraged to actively involve themselves in research, extension and income generation so as to

meet the goals and objectives set by the institution. The Office of the Human Resource Management may conduct and develop a program such as a Succession Plan that will benefit all employees and not only deans and department heads. The program should focus on performance management, managing teams, leadership process, refining leadership styles and continuous improvement process.

References

- [1] Anderson, P. and M. Pulich. (2002). "Managerial Competencies Necessary in Today's Dynamic Health Care Environment", Health Care Manager, 21, No.2, 1-11.
- [2] Andres, Tomas D. (1992). Managing Schools of Filipino Values. Philippines: Divine Word Publications.
- [3] Andres, Tomas D. (1995). The Effective Manager. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- [4] Ahn T. and Seiford LM. Sensitivity of DEA models and variable sets in a hypothesis test Setting: The Efficiency of University Operations. Creative and Innovative Approaches to the Science of Management. Westpoint CT: Quorum Books, 191-208.
- [5] Andres, Tomas Quintin D. (2001). Production Management in the Philippine Setting. 1st edition. Quezon City: Rex printing Company, Inc.

- [6] Aquino, Gaudencio V. (2005). *Managing to Excel: A Guide to Managers and Entrepreneurs*. Metro Manila: Navotas Press.
- [7] Attner, Raymond F and Jim Lee Morgan. (1986). *Introduction to Management*. 2nd Edition. Massachusetts: Kent Publishing Company.
- [8] Baltazar, Jose D., et al. (2005). *Management in the Philippine Setting*. Mandaluyong City: National Bookstore, Inc.
- [9] Bateman, Thomas S. (1993). *Management Function and Strategy*. Second Edition.
- [10] Breu , TM and Raab RL. Efficiency and Perceived Quality of the Nation's Top 25 national Universities and National Liberal Arts Colleges: An Application od data envelopment analysis to higher education. *Socio-economic planning sciences*; 28 (1): 33-145. 1994.
- [11] Brittell, Lester R. and John W. Newstrom. (1993). *What Every Supervision Should Know*. 6th Edition. Gregg Division: Mc Graw-Hill Publishing Company.
- [12] Cabada, Emilyn C. (2008). *Performance Management: Application of Data Envelopment Analysis in the Philippine Setting*. UST Publishing House: Manila.
- [13] Calmorin, Laurentina P. (1994). *Educational Research, Measurement and Evaluation*. 2nd edition. Metro Manila: 24K printing Company,Inc.
- [14] Carroll, Stephen J. (1980). "The Classical Management Functions Useful in Describing Managerial Work", *Academy of Management Review*, 12, No.1,38-5.
- [15] Coelli, T. (1996). Assessing the performance of Australian Universities nursing data envelopment analysis . Center for efficiency and productivity analysis, University of new England NSW.
- [16] Cribbin, S.J. (1982). *Leadership Strategies for Organizational effectiveness*. New York: AMACOM.
- [17] Drucker, Peter F. (1978). *Management Tasks, responsibilities and Practices*. New York, Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.
- [18] Ebel, Robert L. (1965). *Measuring Educational Achievement*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- [19] Fajardo, Feliciano R. (2006). *Management*. 1st Edition. Manila: Rex Bookstore, Inc.
- [20] Fayol, Henri. (2002). *General and Industrial Administration*. London: Sir Isaac Pittman and Sons.
- [21] Fiedler, Fred E. (1970). " Leadership Experience and Leader Performance - Another Hypothesis Shot to Tell", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*.
- [22] Higgins , James. (1994). *The Management Challenge*. Second Edition. Macmillan.
- [23] Katz, Robert L. (1974). "Skills of an Effective Administrator", *Harvard Business Review*, 52.
- [24] Koontz, Harold and Cyril O' Donnell. (1955). *Principles of Management: An Analysis Managerial Functions*. New York : McGraw Hill Book Company.
- [25] Lamond , David. (2004). "A Matter of Style: Reconciling Henri and Henry Management Decision", 42, No.3 , 330-356.
- [26] Lasan, Dolores. "Governance of Universities: Trends and Issues. *The Philippine Women's University System*. September 10, 2002.
- [27] Maddala, G.S. and Miller, Ellen. (1989). *Microeconomics: Theory and Applications*. New York: Mc-Graw Hill Book Company.
- [28] Martinez, Concepcion R. (1999). *Human Resource Management Principles and Practices*. 3rd edition. Quezon City: Kalayaan Press Marketing Enterprises, Inc.
- [29] Master Survey Instrument for Accrediting Agencies of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines.
- [30] Maynard Smith, Szathmary. (1995). *The Major Transitions in Management Evolution* Freeman, Oxford.
- [31] Mintzberg, Henry. (1973) *The Nature of Managerial Work*. New York: Harper and Row Publications.
- [32] Robbins, Stephen P. and Mary Coulter. (2004). *Management*. Upper Saddle River. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [33] Rodriquez, Rafael A. and Erlinda S. Echanis (2001). *Fundamentals of Management Text and Philippine Cases*. Metro Manila : Diwata Publishing, Inc.
- [34] Stoner, James, et al. (2005). *Management*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.