

How to Cite:

Palencia, R. S. (2022). Executive leadership traits and the organizational culture of selected higher education institutions in region 08, Philippines: A cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S6), 8765–8778.
<https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS6.12346>

Executive leadership traits and the organizational culture of selected higher education institutions in region 08, Philippines: A cross-sectional survey

Redentor S. Palencia

Samar State University

*Corresponding author email: redentor.palencia@ssu.edu.ph

Abstract---The productivity of each institution is determined by executive leadership of its administration. This study employed a descriptive correlational research design which aims to determine the interplay of the respondents' profile variables, leadership styles, and organizational culture among SUCs in Region VIII in the Philippines. The respondents of the study were the 338 chief executives and second level executives of the ten (10) State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) of Region VIII (Eastern Visayas Region) in the Philippines. Along the educational attainment held by the respondents, it is significantly correlated with the Culture of Inclusion and Culture of excellence among. Respondents' number of search engines used posted a significant relationship with the Culture of Inclusion, Culture of Wondering, and Culture of developing. The respondents' leadership styles posted highly significant correlations with all the dimensions of organizational culture except for the Laissez-faire leadership factor and Culture of Reinvention which only posted significant correlation. Since all posted positive correlations, they denoted that the higher the perceived score on a particular dimension of leadership style, the higher is the perceived score on a particular dimension of organizational culture. The result also showed that except for the Laissez-faire leadership factor, the respondents' leadership styles showed a significant difference across SUCs. The pairwise comparison using the Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference Test showed significant mean differences between and among SUCs.

Keywords---leadership styles, organizational culture, Philippines, SUC.

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. Leadership is a critical variable in shaping organizational effectiveness and it does not take in a vacuum. Every leader must deal with three important variables: the people who are being led, the task that the people are performing, and the environment in which the people and the task exist (Ivancevich et al., 2008).

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. A good leader leads the organization in developing relevant, exciting and viable institutional programs, succeeds in securing the required resources, organizes the institution well, and inspires the staff to implement the plan. 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 excuse. These institutions shall be the stronghold of leadership excellence for they are the foundation of the nation's competence and values. Salmi (2009) presents 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 to 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 the 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). Leaders indeed interplay with organizational culture in achieving organizational change and development as Pearce and Robinson (2011) put it:

Leaders spend considerable time shaping and refining their organizational structure and making it function effectively to accomplish strategic intent. Because leaders are

attempting to embrace change, they are often rebuilding or remaking their organization to align it with the ever-changing environment and needs of a new strategy (p.331).

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). These are all covered by the Public Higher Education Reform (PHER) Roadmap 2011-2016. With the pressing higher education roadmap initiated by the national government through the collaboration of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP), and the Philippine Association of State Universities and Colleges (PASUC), the top level executives are periodically attending rigorous executive development training programs to be the forerunners in the achievement of the roadmap by 2016, to wit: 1) the need to increase efficiency in the delivery of higher education; 2) the need to upgrade the quality of public higher education in the country; 3) the need to enhance access of all to quality higher education, and 4) the need to strengthen management of SUCs through the executive development. Bernardo (2009) capitalizes the primary role of the executives in SUCs, that goes:

For a college or a university to be successful on a yearly basis, its top management with the help of middle-level managers must plan, budget, and organize in a competent, systematic and rational manner so as to achieve expected results. But top administrators must be true leaders who establish and re-establish, when necessary, an appropriate direction for the future, align people toward it, and motivate employees to create change even when painful sacrifices are required (p.112).

The challenge to SUCs does not end in the 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) capitalizes strategies of establishing 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 improve performance (p.9).

Leadership is not the sole factor along establishing world-class universities, organizational enthusiasm is also a big factor, as Salmi (2009) explains:

Two complementary perspective need to be considered in examining how to establish new world-class universities. The first dimension, of an external nature, concerns on the role of government at the national, state, and provincial levels and the resources that can be made available to enhance the stature of the institutions. The second dimension is internal. It has to do with individual institutions themselves and the necessary evolution and steps that they need to take to transform themselves into world-class institutions (p. 7).

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 the 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 critical partners 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 a 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.

Another definitive factor of organizational success is culture. Leadership and organizational culture are two concepts interplaying in organizational success. Glaser (2005) capitalizes 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 the 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 systems approach involving strong-willed leadership, alignment of practices and structures, continuous training, and evaluating of culture. Thus, this paper is conducted.

Purposes of the Study

Generally, the study assessed the leadership styles of administrators and the organizational culture of SUCs vis-à-vis their profile characteristics with a view to provide inputs for an improved organizational leadership. More specifically, the study answered the following questions: 1) Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' profile variates and their leadership styles? 2) Is there a significant relationship between the schools' organizational culture and each of the following? 3) Are there significant differences on the leadership styles of respondents when grouped by SUC? 4) Are there significant differences on the organizational culture among SUCs?

Methods

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research study using correlation and comparative analyses which aims to determine the respondents' profile variates, leadership styles, and organizational culture among SUCs in Region VIII.

Respondents of the Study

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). Region VIII is composed of six provinces namely: Province of Leyte, Province of Southern Leyte, Province of Biliran, Province of Northern Samar, Province of Samar, and Province of Eastern Samar. 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. In total, there were 338 respondents participated in the study.

Research Instruments

Determining the respondents' profile, leadership styles and organization culture of every SUC, the study utilized a survey questionnaire composing of three parts. Part I determines the profile of the respondents. Part II and Part III assess the leadership styles of the respondents and the organizational culture of every SUC.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher asked permission from the SUC President for the fielding of the questionnaires. Upon approval, the researcher personally distributed the said questionnaires to the identified respondents. The researcher hired research assistants from each SUC to facilitate in the retrieval of the said questionnaires. The fielding of the questionnaires was done in the first week of March 2014.

Statistical Treatment

The 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, a triangulation through a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was conducted. Two sets of FGDs were conducted. One was conducted on March 22, 2014 at the Leyte Normal University, Tacloban City participated in by Leyte, Southern Leyte, and Biliran SUCs. Another set of FGD was conducted on March 29, 2014 at the Samar State University, Catbalogan City participated in by Samar, Eastern Samar, Northern Samar SUCs. Through simple random sampling, one faculty and one support was considered per SUC to join the FGD.

Results

Correlation Between the Respondents' Profile Variates and Leadership Styles

The respondents' profile along marital status posted a significant relationship the leadership factors Inspirational Motivation and Individual Consideration. In terms of the academic degree of the respondents, they highly correlated with leadership factors along Idealized Influence and Management-by-Exception. The affiliation of respondents to professional organization posted a highly significant relationship under transformational leadership factors as Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration. The number of innovation of respondents revealed a significant relationship with Individual Consideration. Along the number of paper presented of the respondents, it posted a highly significant relationship with Intellectual Stimulation. Leadership factor Management-by-Exception had a significant relationship with the profile of respondents along the number of cited publications with. The number of scholarship granted to respondents also revealed a significant relationship with Intellectual Stimulation.

A highly significant relationship posted between the respondents profile along the number of search engines used and the leadership factors along Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individual Consideration, and Contingent Reward. The number of social networks subscribed by the respondents correlated significantly with the Laissez-faire leadership factor. Summing up, the respondents' profile variables along marital status, academic degrees, affiliation in professional organizations, number of innovations, numbers of papers presented and number of cited publications posted a significant and highly significant relationships with the their leadership styles.

Table 4
Correlations 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; ** Highly Significant

Correlations Between the Respondents' Profile Variates and Perceived Organizational Culture

Respondents' affiliation to professional organization significantly correlated with Culture of Inclusion, Culture of Wondering, and Culture of Reinvention. The number of paper presented by the respondents proved to have a significant relationship with the Culture of Appreciation and Culture of Sharing. In terms of the number of awards received by the respondents, it significantly correlated with the Culture of Striving and Culture of Reinvention. Along the scholarship held by the respondents, it significantly correlated with the Culture of Inclusion and Culture of Developing. Respondents' number of search engines used posted a significant relationship with the Culture of Inclusion, Culture of Wondering, and Culture of developing.

Table 6.1
Correlations Between Perceived Organizational Culture and Profile Variables of Managers

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; ** Highly Significant

Correlations Between the Respondents' Leadership Styles and Perceived Organizational Culture

The correlation between the respondents' leadership styles and perceived organizational culture is gleaned in Table 6.2. The respondents' leadership styles posted highly significant correlations with all the dimensions of organizational culture except for the Laissez-faire leadership factor and Culture of Reinvention which only posted significant correlation. Since all posted positive correlations, they denoted that the higher the perceived score on a particular dimension of leadership style, the higher is the perceived score on a particular dimension of organizational culture.

Table 6.2
Pearson Correlations Between Perceived Leadership Styles of Managers and
Perceived Organizational Culture (n = 293 to 321)

Leadership Style	Organizational Culture						
	Culture of Inclusion	Culture of Appreciation	Culture of Striving	Culture of Sharing	Culture of Wondering	Culture of Developing	Culture of Reinvention
Idealized Influence	.50**	.40**	.46**	.42**	.42**	.40**	.37**
Inspirational Motivation	.47**	.41**	.47**	.43**	.46**	.41**	.31**
Intellectual Stimulation	.47**	.39**	.42**	.41**	.46**	.39**	.33**
Individual Consideration	.45**	.37**	.45**	.40**	.47**	.39**	.37**
Contingent Reward	.44**	.45**	.45**	.44**	.46**	.45**	.37**
Management by Exception	.36**	.36**	.38**	.35**	.37**	.37**	.26**
Laissez-faire Leadership	.24**	.20**	.22**	.20**	.24**	.20**	.12*

* significant; ** Highly Significant

Difference Between the Leadership Styles of Respondents by SUC

The result showed that except for the Laissez-faire leadership factor, the respondents' leadership styles showed a significant difference across SUCs. Leadership factors as Idealized Influence and Contingent Reward posted a significant difference while Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Simulation, Individual Consideration, and Management-by-Exception showed a highly significant correlation. Based on the means of Dimension of Leadership Styles shown in Table 7.1, the respondents exhibited moderate to high level in all factors of leadership styles across SUCs. Respondents from NWSSU generally showed moderate levels of leadership styles on all dimensions from among SUCs.

The pairwise comparison using Tukey's Honestly significant Difference Test showed significant mean difference between and among SUCs. Along Idealized Influence, there was a significant difference between NWSSU and ESSU. The leadership styles of respondents along Inspirational Motivation significantly differed between the respondents from EVSU and UEP. In Intellectual Simulation, the leadership styles of respondents from NWSSU significantly differed from EVSU, UEP, SLSU, VSU, NSU, and ESSU but not with LNU, UEP, and PIT. As to Individual Consideration, the leadership styles of respondents from NWSSU differed significantly with SSU, EVSU, SLSU, VSU, and NSU but not with LNU, UEP, and PIT. Leadership styles of respondents from NWSSU along Contingent Reward still differed significantly with SSU, NSU, and ESSU but not with LNU, EVSU, UEP, PIT, SLSU and VSU. Along Management-by-Exception, respondents from VSU significantly differed their leadership styles with respondents from SSU and ESSU but not with the rest of SUCs. The Laissez-faire leadership style showed no significant difference among the respondents from the ten SUCs.

Table 7.2
One Way Analysis of Variance for Leadership Style by SUC

Dimension of Leadership Style	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P-value
Idealized Influence	SUC	50.973	9	5.664	2.299	.016*
	Error	746.605	303	2.464		
	Total	797.578	312			
Inspirational Motivation	SUC	70.781	9	7.865	2.961	.002**
	Error	828.563	312	2.656		
	Total	899.345	321			
Intellectual Stimulation	SUC	97.810	9	10.868	4.177	<.001**
	Error	816.940	314	2.602		
	Total	914.750	323			
Individual Consideration	SUC	79.104	9	8.789	3.200	.001**
	Error	856.912	312	2.747		
	Total	936.016	321			
Contingent Reward	SUC	57.147	9	6.350	2.179	.023*
	Error	891.520	306	2.913		
	Total	948.668	315			
Management by Exception	SUC	89.929	9	9.992	3.719	<.001**
	Error	797.980	297	2.687		
	Total	887.909	306			
Laissez-faire Leadership	SUC	52.196	9	5.800	1.719	.084ns
	Error	998.775	296	3.374		
	Total	1050.971	305			

** Highly Significant; * Significant; ns – not significant

Differences Between the Organizational Culture by SUC

Table 8.2 presents the One Way ANOVA for the organizational culture by SUC. The pairwise comparison using the Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference Test showed significant mean differences between and among SUCs. In terms of Culture of Inclusion, NWSSU differed significantly with UEP, SSU, VSU and ESSU but not with rest of the SUCs. As to the Culture of Wondering, NWSSU differed significantly with SLSU, VSU and ESSU but not with the rest of the SUCs. Along with the Culture of Reinvention, still NWSSU differed significantly with SSU, SLSU, NSU and ESSU but not with the rest of the SUCs. Dimensions along Culture of Appreciation, Culture of Striving, and Culture of Sharing posted no significant differences among SUCs.

Table 8.2
One Way Analysis of Variance for Organizational Culture by SUC

Dimension of Organizational Culture	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P-value
Culture of Inclusion	SUC	656.961	9	72.996	2.125	.027*
	Error	10820.731	315	34.352		
	Total	11477.692	324			

Culture of Appreciation	SUC	563.932	9	62.659	1.781	.071ns
	Error	11117.776	316	35.183		
	Total	11681.709	325			
Culture of Striving	SUC	482.906	9	53.656	1.367	.202ns
	Error	12637.636	322	39.247		
	Total	13120.542	331			
Culture of Sharing	SUC	452.223	9	50.247	1.333	.219ns
	Error	12139.006	322	37.699		
	Total	12591.229	331			
Culture of Wondering	SUC	796.942	9	88.549	2.154	.025*
	Error	13075.009	318	41.116		
	Total	13871.951	327			
Culture of Developing	SUC	585.004	9	65.000	1.475	.156ns
	Error	13789.621	313	44.056		
	Total	14374.625	322			
Culture of Reinvention	SUC	671.394	9	74.599	1.960	.043*
	Error	11834.370	311	38.053		
	Total	12505.763	320			

* Significant; ns – not significant

Discussion

Difference Between the Leadership Styles of Respondents by SUC

The pairwise comparison using Tukey's Honestly significant Difference Test showed significant mean difference between and among SUCs. Along Idealized Influence, there was a significant difference between NWSSU and ESSU. It denotes that leaders from these two SUCs differ in the emotional component of leadership. These leaders vary their standards of moral and ethical conduct. Also, one group of leaders maybe charismatic in nature but not the others. The leadership styles of respondents along Inspirational Motivation significantly differed between the respondents from EVSU and UEP. From this result, it can be implied that leaders in both SUCs differ in the way they inspire their subordinates. One SUC may strongly advocate teamwork and the other does not. In Intellectual Stimulation, the leadership styles of respondents from NWSSU significantly differed from EVSU, UEP, SLSU, VSU, NSU, and ESSU but not with LNU, UEP, and PIT. This result revealed that leaders from these SUCs vary when it comes to innovation and creativity. They differ on how they apply new approaches and innovative ways with organizational issues.

As to Individual Consideration, the leadership styles of respondents from NWSSU differed significantly with SSU, EVSU, SLSU, VSU, and NSU but not with LNU, UEP, and PIT. Leaders from these SUCs differ on the way they show their support to one another. Each SUC has a distinct support climate or mechanism that is observed and implemented. The leadership styles of respondents from NWSSU along Contingent Reward still differ significantly with SSU, NSU, and ESSU but not with LNU, EVSU, UEP, PIT, SLSU and VSU. The implication of this result is that leaders from these SUCs differ on the way they practice the reward systems. The way these leaders negotiate with their subordinates on achieving a goal

differs from each SUC. Along Management-by-Exception, respondents from VSU significantly differed their leadership styles with respondents from SSU and ESSU but not with the rest of SUCs. It can be implied from this result that leaders from these SUCs differ with the way they give corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement

Differences Between the Organizational Culture by SUC

In terms of Culture of Inclusion, NWSSU differed significantly with UEP, SSU, VSU and ESSU but not with rest of the SUCs. This result implied that these SUCs differed in their involvement in any endeavor conducted by the institution. These SUCs also differed on how they consider accountabilities as leaders. These SUCs vary when it comes to communication flow and mechanisms. As to the Culture of Wondering, NWSSU differed significantly with SLSU, VSU and ESSU but not with the rest of the SUCs. From this finding, it can be denoted that these SUCs vary when it comes to innovation. The way leaders advocate innovation for development differed among these SUCs. Along with the Culture of Reinvention, still NWSSU differed significantly with SSU, SLSU, NSU and ESSU but not with the rest of the SUCs. This result implied that these SUCs differed on how they nurture the atmosphere of ongoing homage and accomplishments. They vary also on how they work together in moving towards the future.

Organizational culture varies from one institution to another. Organizational culture is a multi-faceted concept that needs to be disentangled through the examination of the levels of culture. As Schein (1992) adapted by Hoy and Hoy (2009) presents that these levels of culture range from the very intangible and tangible aspects that are concrete to deeply held, basic assumptions that are unconscious, tacit, and abstract. A comprehensive understanding of culture requires the knowledge of its four levels. It means that to understand the culture of the organization, one must comprehend the meanings and the shared orientations of the organization: its artifacts, norms, values, and basic assumptions. From the light of these findings and assumptions, it is recommended that leaders should act as role models to every personnel in valuing and respecting artifacts, norms, and values of the institution. Leaders witnessing on the institution's core values should be observed and felt by the followers for the followers to be inspired and motivated.

Differences in Organizational Culture By SUC Level

The results posted a highly We-Centric level in all organizational dimensions across SUC Levels. The results projected that SUC Leveling in Region VIII indicate no difference in terms of organizational culture dimensions with strongly We-Centric culture. From the light of this finding, it can be implied then that these SUCs transform members of the institution to be the best of what they are. They nurture an atmosphere of unity where leaders and members work hand in hand in the achievement of their vision and mission. A noteworthy result revealed that along Culture of Developing and Reinvention, SUC Level II posted higher means of 44.2 and 44.0 than SUC Level IV with 42.7 and 42.3 respectively. Although this SUC is on the early stage of development, its observance on the Culture of Developing and Reinvention is prominent compared from the rest of the SUCs.

The culture of expression and celebration of accomplishment in this SUC is dominantly observed from the rest of the SUCs in Region VIII. The kind of leaders this SUC has is reflect the culture the institution currently observes and practices.

Conclusion

Summing up, the respondents' profile variables along marital status, academic degrees, affiliation in professional organizations, number of innovations, numbers of papers presented and number of cited publications posted a significant and highly significant relationships with the their leadership styles. Along the scholarship held by the respondents, it significantly correlated with the Culture of Inclusion and Culture of Developing. Respondents' number of search engines used posted a significant relationship with the Culture of Inclusion, Culture of Wondering, and Culture of developing. The respondents' leadership styles posted highly significant correlations with all the dimensions of organizational culture except for the Laissez-faire leadership factor and Culture of Reinvention which only posted significant correlation. Since all posted positive correlations, they denoted that the higher the perceived score on a particular dimension of leadership style, the higher is the perceived score on a particular dimension of organizational culture. The result also showed that except for the Laissez-faire leadership factor, the respondents' leadership styles showed a significant difference across SUCs. The pairwise comparison using the Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference Test showed significant mean differences between and among SUCs.

References

- Bernardo, B.A. (2006). *Management of colleges and universities of science and technology*. Laguna: UPLB Foundation, Inc. and SEARCA.
- Commission on Higher Education. (2007). *CHED Memorandum Order No. 60, Series of 2007 (Issuance of the SUC Leveling Result)*. Quezon City: CHED Website.
- Department of Budget and Management and Commission on Higher Education. (2003). *Joint Circular No. 1-A, Series of 2003 (SUC Leveling Instrument and Guidelines for the Implementation Thereof)*. Quezon City: CHED Website.
- 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/>.
- Group of Eight (2013). *The role and importance of research intensive universities in the contemporary world*. Retrieved from www.go8.edu.au
- Hoy, A.W., & Hoy, W.K. (2009). *Instructional leadership: A research-based guide to learning in schools*. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- ICF Consulting (2003). *California's future: UC's contributions to economic growth, health, and culture*. Retrieved from http://s3.amazonaws.com/zanran_storage/www.universityofcalifornia.edu/

- 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
- Mediastari, A. A. P. A. (2020). Local wisdom traditional medicine for the health and beauty of postpartum mother in Denpasar City, Bali Province, Indonesia. *International Journal of Health & Medical Sciences*, 3(1), 65-71. <https://doi.org/10.31295/ijhms.v3n1.149>
- Nadiradze, T. (2020). Growth-development peculiarities of some rare and endangered plants in nature and culture. *International Journal of Life Sciences*, 4(1), 37-41. <https://doi.org/10.29332/ijls.v4n1.390>
- Pearce, J. A. & Robinson, R. B. III (Eds) (2011). *Strategic management*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Presbitero, A. A., Jr. (2008). Building organizational culture: The unilab experience. *Leading Philippine organizations in a changing world: Research and best practices* (pp. 127-138). Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- 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.
- Suryasa, I. W., Rodriguez-Gámez, M., & Koldoris, T. (2021). The COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 5(2), vi-ix. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v5n2.2937>