

# EXPLORING THE LEADERSHIP SKILLS OF ADMINISTRATORS FROM SELECTED STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES (SUCs): BASIS FOR A DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

LORNA L. ACUAVERA\*

Associate Professor, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba Campus, Iba, Zambales, Philippines.  
Corresponding Author Email: acuaveralorna@gmail.com

## Abstract

Leadership skills of administrators are vital in every task and endeavor, particularly in coping with issues such as globalization, government regulations, increased competition, new trends, and sophisticated technology. The main thrust of this study is to determine the leadership skills of administrators with the result of developing and enhancing the leadership skills of administrators through a proposed Development Program. Using the quantitative method of research design to achieve the breadth of understanding of the study, the investigation involved 149 respondents, 17 of whom were administrators while 132 were faculty members. Likewise, these respondents were working in the different SUCs in Region III, Philippines. To gather the relevant data, the self-rating of the administrators and assessment of faculty of their administrators' leadership skills were determined through a four-point rating scale. In particular, the administrators' self-rating was higher compared to the faculty rating. On this account, the need to address this finding is truly evident. Hence, the results of this study will be utilized as basis for a Leadership Skills Development Program. With the developed and enhanced skills, administrators will be able to address the most pressing issues efficiently and effectively in the 21st century educational system especially in leading the school's human resources.

**Keywords:** administrators, continuous improvement, development program, leadership skills, SUCs

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Numerous educational changes in the 21<sup>st</sup> century due to globalization, government regulations, increased competition, new trends, and sophisticated technology are among the issues and concerns the education leaders will face during their career (Brown, 2011). It is imperative for the leaders to gain appropriate skills that are necessary to cope with these changes and eventually influence their subordinates to strive even harder and perform much better in their jobs. The essence of good leadership will thrive and progress in this rapidly changing world especially in the field of education.

The leadership skills of administrators are vital given the complex challenges facing higher education. According to Ganta and Manukonda (2014), leadership is a kind of power where one person can influence or change the values, beliefs, behavior, and attitudes of another person. A person with strong leadership ability will be a good example or role model to their employees because the leader who is able to effectively achieve some good results or achievement gains the trust and admiration of their employees, and inadvertently changes their values, beliefs, behavior, and attitudes, for mimicry is the sincerest form of flattery (Grint, 2007). This statement is also supported by Northhouse (2017), who stated that leaders who possess strong leadership have the strength to influence others to achieve the goals and

objectives of the organization. This statement reiterates that leadership skills can impact faculty performance through coaching, empowering, motivating, persuading, and influencing them to perform better in their jobs.

Similarly, Yukl (2010) stressed that leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives.

Northouse (2017) defines leadership as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal.” The leadership skills of administrators are vital given the complex challenges facing higher education. These challenges are due to quality assurance systems, new rules and regulations, external accreditation of degree programs, and the improvement and maintenance of global rankings. This highlights the findings of Dilanco and Borabo (2014) that leadership skills of the administrators are central to the operational success of the learning institutions. Evidently, Guthrie and Scheurmann (2010) find support that quality leadership is an essential component of successful schools.

On the other hand, Wasim, and Imran (2010) have another way to define a leader who has a strong leadership. For them, an effective leader is somebody who can give a clear direction to their employees, leading them to commit to their jobs and capable of working as a group to achieve the organization’s goals and objectives. Good leaders usually have a clear vision for the company and can easily identify the problems and obstacles that currently stand between them and the aims of the organization. In this way, they can efficiently and effectively bring about the necessary reforms that will bring the organization into the future while keeping abreast with contemporary changes in education.

Meanwhile, Guthrie and Schuermann (2010) further reiterate that quality leadership is an essential component of successful schools. The utilization of thoughtful and appropriate ways to develop and assess school leaders has an important influence on the quality of educational leadership and ultimately the quality of education in the nation’s schools. As such, practical and focused leadership evaluation holds great promise for providing educators with valuable information that can be used to improve leadership practice. Recognizing the decisive role played by administrators, there have been multiple attempts to establish standards for school leaders. These standards seek to establish consensus within the field of educational administration regarding the common body of knowledge and set of competencies, skills, dispositions, and language that will ensure quality preparation and development of school leaders. The aforementioned statements support the importance of leadership standards in education particularly in the higher education sector.

Leaders need to be attuned to the situation and vary their leadership behaviors to meet the needs of the organizations they lead (DeMeuse, Dai, & Hallenbeck, 2010). This idea suggests that leading should meet the needs of situation which is also the purpose of this investigation. Leadership skills is essential as a means of achieving the organizations’ goals and objectives. It is in this juncture that this study was conducted.

## 2. OBJECTIVE

The study aimed to explore the leadership skills of the administrators from selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Region III with the result of proposing a Leadership Skills Development Program (LSDP) for continuous improvement.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents according to the following:
  - 1.1 sex;
  - 1.2 age;
  - 1.3 highest educational attainment;
  - 1.4 number of years in the present position; and
  - 1.5 academic rank?;
2. How are the leadership skills of the administrators described in terms of:
  - 2.1 technical;
  - 2.2 interpersonal;
  - 2.3 decision-making;
  - 2.4 administrative; and
  - 2.5 conceptual?
3. Are there significant differences in the leadership skills when respondents are grouped according to their profile?
4. Are there significant differences between the leadership skills of the administrators based on their self-rating and faculty rating? and
5. What enhancement or development program may be proposed after the study is done?

## 3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### a. Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative research design. This method placed primary emphasis on generalizability. It quantified the responses of the respondents on the survey questionnaire.

### b. Respondents and Location

The researcher targeted all the deans as well as the program chairs and all faculty members of the SUCs in Region III as respondents. Out of the 166 total population, only 149 composed of 17 deans and program chairs and 132 faculty members were involved as respondents.

### **c. Sampling Technique**

Population frame was employed in this study. Since, there was only a limited number of deans and program chairs as well as faculty in the College of Teacher Education, the researcher targeted all the population, but only those who signed in the consent form and present during the survey were included as samples. Out of the 166 total population, only 149 composed of 17 deans and program chairs and 132 faculty members were involved as respondents.

### **d. Research Instrumentation**

In this study, the researcher employed the Leadership Skills Questionnaire (LSQ) adapted from SAGE Publications to determine and assess the leadership skills of school administrators. The researcher used the questionnaire with permission from the author. Specifically, the instrument has 18 items divided into administrative, interpersonal, and conceptual skills. Twelve (12) items were also added from the concepts of Yukl which are included in the technical and decision-making skills. Overall, there were 30 items that assessed the leadership skills of the administrators.

### **e. Data Gathering Procedure**

An endorsement letter from the Regional Director was sought to ease the distribution and administration of questionnaires to all selected SUCs. A formal request of permission to conduct the research from the Presidents of selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) was also sought. The researcher personally handed the survey instrument to the participating institutions. Additionally, the survey questionnaires were left to the campus directors and were requested to distribute them to the concerned respondents.

The distribution and retrieval of the survey instrument was done by the researcher with the help of the campus directors to get a more reliable and valid data aside from getting one hundred percent retrieval. Likewise, a documentary analysis of the Faculty Evaluation Instrument or the Qualitative Contribution Evaluation (QCE) of the faculty was utilized to determine their instructional performance for the school year 2017-2018.

### **f. Statistical Treatment of Data**

The utilization of different statistical tools for data analysis was employed to examine the leadership skills of the administrators and instructional performance of the faculty members. The data were analyzed and statistically treated to obtain answers to the proposed questions. To provide clearer understanding of the data that were gathered, the researcher utilized the following statistical measures:

To determine the extent of the leadership skills of the administrators, the weighted mean and standard deviation were used. Specifically, the distribution interpretation of the weighted mean is as follows:

Options	Weighted Scale	Verbal Interpretations
4	3.51 - 4.00	Excellent (E)
3	2.51 - 3.50	Very Satisfactory (VS)
2	1.51 - 2.50	Satisfactory (S)
1	1.00 - 1.50	Fair (F)

Meanwhile, to determine the differences on the assessment on the levels of the leadership skills of the administrators, t-test and f-test were both employed. Additionally, to describe the instructional performance of the faculty, weighted mean and standard deviation were utilized. In particular, the distribution interpretation of the weighted mean is as follows:

Options	Weighted Scale	Verbal interpretations
5	4.21 – 5.00	Outstanding
4	3.41 - 4.20	Very Satisfactory
3	2.61 - 3.40	Satisfactory
2	1.81 - 2.60	Fair
1	1.00 - 1.80	Poor

Accordingly, the t-test was employed to determine the differences between the leadership skills of the administrators based on their self-rating and faculty rating.

#### g. Ethical Consideration

To establish sound and ethical research, the researcher considered various ethical procedures in acquiring, analyzing, and accomplishing the data to be gathered.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Profile of the Respondents

1.1 Sex. Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents in terms of sex.

**Table 1: Sex of the Respondents**

Sex	Faculty		Administrators		Total	
	F	%	F	%	f	%
Female	75	56.8	11	64.7	86	57.7
Male	57	43.2	6	35.3	63	42.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>100</b>

As seen in Table 1, 75 or 56.8 percent of the faculty-respondents were female while 57 or 43.2 percent were male. On the other hand, among the administrator respondents, 11 or 64.7 percent were female and 6 or 35.3 percent were male.

Of the total respondents, 86 or 57.7 percent were female and 63 or 42.3 percent were male. It implies that the faculty members in the teacher education are dominated by females. In the Philippines, the dominance of the female teachers has been observed many, many years back.

This finds support to the study of Parker (2015) in the United States on the dominance of women in higher education. The investigation found out that today's faculty workforce in education has evolved with some interesting turns and twists compared years back that it was dominated by male educators. Fluctuations in women's participation rate have been influenced by the economy's history and society's expectations of females.

**1.2 Age.** Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents in terms of Age.

**Table 2: Age of the Respondents**

Age	Faculty		Administrators		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
30 and below	51	38.6	2	11.8	53	35.6
31-35	10	7.6	2	11.8	12	8.1
36-40	10	7.6	3	17.6	13	8.7
41-45	15	11.4	3	17.6	18	12.1
46-50	16	12.1	3	17.6	19	12.8
51-55	14	10.6	3	17.6	17	11.4
56-60	12	9.1	1	5.9	13	8.7
61 and above	4	3.1	-	-	4	2.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>100</b>

As exhibited in Table 2, 51 or 38.6 percent of faculty respondents belonged to the age bracket of 30 years old and below; 10 or 7.6 percent were 31-35; 10 or 7.6 percent 36-40; 15 or 11.4 percent were 41-45; 16 or 12.1 percent were 46-50; 14 or 10.6 percent belonged to the 51-55; 12 or 9.1 percent were 56-60 and 4 or 3.1 percent were 61 years old and above. It can be noted from the data that young educators comprised the roster of faculty in Teacher Education in state universities and colleges.

These findings corroborate with the study of Medina (2006) highlighting that it is in this career cycle that individuals establish themselves in a particular position in their chosen career. Inocian and Hermosa (2014) likewise rejoin support in this finding that those ages within the bracket of 30-40 "represent the most productive years of one's career."

Meanwhile, tabular data shows that 2 or 11.8 percent of the administrator respondents were both 30 and below; 2 or 11.8 percent belonged to the 31-35 years; 3 or 17.6 percent fell under the 36-40; 3 or 17.6 percent were 41-45 years old; 3 or 17.6 percent belonged to the age bracket of 46-50 years; 3 or 17.6 percent in the 51-55 years old; and 1 or 5.9 percent fell under the age bracket of 56-60 years of age. Based on the data, it can be gleaned that most administrators fell

under the ages 36-55 accordingly.

Evidently, Pricellas, Niez, Nierra, and Tubis (2016) found out that the opportunity of becoming a school administrator depends also on the age factor thus many are usually in the old age which denotes that the older someone is in the service, there is a tendency to serve much longer. Additionally, since 65 is the compulsory retirement age, it is normal that many to reach the old age among school administrators.

### 1.3 Highest Educational Attainment

Table 3 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents in terms of Highest Educational Attainment.

**Table 3: Highest Educational Attainment of the Respondents**

Highest Educational Attainment	Faculty		Administrators		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Bachelor's Degree	41	31.1	2	11.8	43	28.9
Master of Arts /Master of Science	58	43.9	6	35.3	64	43.0
Doctor of Philosophy/ Doctor of Education	33	25.0	9	52.9	42	28.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>100</b>

As shown in Table 3, 41 or 31.1 percent of the faculty respondents were Bachelor's Degree holders; 58 or 43.9 percent were holders of Master of Arts or Master of Science; and 33 or 25.0 percent finished their Doctoral Degrees. It can be noted that most of the faculty members continue to pursue graduate studies to enhance their knowledge and teaching competencies.

Evidently, completing a Master's degree is considered as a minimum requirement for regular permanent positions in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) particularly in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs). This is mandated by the joint Civil Service Commission (CSC) Memorandum Circular No. 22, s. 2016 and CHED Qualification Standards for Faculty Positions. Finishing Master's degree is meeting the minimum educational qualification set by CSC and CHED for their entry in the Philippine tertiary education. This implies that the faculty members aim for professional growth and development by finishing their advanced studies in line with their fields of specialization (Inocian & Hermosa, 2014).

Among the administrator respondents, 2 or 11.8 percent 35.3 percent were graduates of Bachelor's Degree; 6 or 35.3 percent were either Master of Science or Master of Arts graduates, and 9 or 52.9 percent finished either Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degrees.

This shows that the educational attainment is an important consideration in designating an employee to administrative positions as mandated in CMO No. 74 and 75 Series of 2017. Pursuing higher degree is also a better way of updating employees in their field and a requirement for promotion. Some employees are much motivated to pursue both Masters and

Doctorate degrees because of high salary equivalent and also a requirement for holding higher designations or positions in the organization. However, data show that there are two among the administrators who are graduates of Bachelor's degree. This is due to the vertical and lateral articulation of degree programs in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). These BS graduates were designated as program chairs due to faculty alignment and policies on typology and strictly observed based on CHED guidelines (Lapiz, 2015). These administrators are currently pursuing their Master's degree to meet the requirement and be more qualified in their position or designation.

Overall, there were 43 or 28.9 percent Bachelor's Degree holders; 64 or 43 percent Master of Science or Master of Arts graduates and 42 or 28.2 percent finished Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degrees respectively.

Educational attainment is pursued among several faculty members, not just for seeking for higher position and better salary, but for continuing professional stewardship (Inocian & Hermosa, 2014). Rojas, T., and Rojas, R. C. (2016) both confirm that preparation in academics and performance in career life highlights the importance of obtaining success in the public employment.

Attending in graduate school for advanced studies in any field of endeavor is a component of a lifelong process (Anuran, Buenviaje, Encio & Refozar, 2016). Hence, it is trending in the Philippines to proceed to graduate school to finish another degree in order to get a promotion in one's present job or meet the possibility of an increase of the current monthly salary.

**1.4 Number of Years in Service.** Table 4 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents in terms of Number of Years in Service.

As seen in the table, 50 or 37.9 percent of the faculty members were in the position for 1-5 years; 12 or 9.1 percent were 6-10 years; 14 or 10.6 percent were 11-15 years; 15 or 11.4 percent were 16-20 years; 18 or 13.6 percent were 21-25 years; 11 or 8.3 percent were 26-30 years; 3 or 2.3 percent were 31-35 years; and 9 or 6.8 percent were 36 years and above.

In terms of teaching experiences, the longer the number of years the members of the faculty stay in the teaching profession, there is a likelihood for teachers to hone their expertise in their fields from novitiate, advance beginning, competent performing, proficient performing, and to being an expert (Inocian & Hermosa, 2014). These projects the faculty members' rise from the ranks from the first day of employment until the last day of retirement.



**Table 4: Number of Years in Service of the Respondents**

Years in Service	Faculty		Administrators		Total	
	f	%	f	%	F	%
1- 5 years	50	37.9	15	88.2	65	43.6
6-10 years	12	9.1	2	11.8	14	9.4
11-15 years	14	10.6	-	-	14	9.4
16-20 years	15	11.4	-	-	15	10.1
21-25 years	18	13.6	-	-	18	12.1
26-30 years	11	8.3	-	-	11	7.4
31-35 years	3	2.3	-	-	3	2.0
36 years and more	9	6.8	-	-	9	6.0
Total	132	100	17	100	149	100

The table also showed that 15 or 88.2 percent of the administrator respondents were in their present position for 1-5 years while 2 or 11.8 percent were in the position for 6-10 years. It can be noted that the deans or program chairs came from 1-5 years for they were probably newly appointed in the position when this study was undertaken. It also implies developing and encouraging of more young leaders in the field of education.

In the past, years in service was one of the contributory factors in selecting a leader in an educational institution because of the belief that the longer the years in service, the more the experiences one has and the ability to lead was already honed by such experiences. On the contrary, Pricellas, Niez, Niera, and Tubis (2016) pronounced in their study that the sole criterion which is the length of service is no longer applicable to promote teacher to a high level. Managing the school really needs certain leadership skills for the school administrators to become efficient and effective.

Overall, 65 or 43.6 percent were in the position for 1-5 years; 14 or 9.4 percent has 6-10 years; 14 or 9.4 percent has 11-15 years; 15 or 10.1 percent has 16-20 years; 18 or 12.1 percent has 21-25 years; 11 or 7.4 percent has 26-30 years; 3 or 2 percent has 31-35 years; and 9 or 6.0 percent has 36 years and above. It can be noted that majority of the faculty were those hired or were given the regular position item through the creation of new positions from the additional funds released to the State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) by the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) in 2016.

### 1.5 Academic Rank

Table 5 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents in terms of Academic Rank.

**Table 5: Academic Rank of the Respondents**

Academic Rank	Faculty		Administrators		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Instructor	70	53.0	6	35.3	76	51.0
Assistant Professor	23	17.4	2	11.8	25	16.8
Associate Professor	30	22.7	8	47.1	38	25.5
Professor	9	6.8	1	5.9	10	6.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 9 reveals that among the faculty respondents, it can be noted that 70 or 53.0 percent of these respondents belonged to Instructor position; 23 or 17.4 percent were Assistant Professors; 30 or 22.7 percent were Associate Professors; and 9 or 6.8 percent were Professors. It implies that most of the faculty members are new in the teaching job. They have not yet earned higher academic rank through the National Budget Circular (NBC) 461 known as the Philippine Association of State Universities and Colleges (PASUC) Faculty Position Classification for SUCs.

On the other hand, about the administrator respondents, 6 or 35.3 percent were Instructors; 2 or 11.8 percent were Assistant Professors; 8 or 47.1 percent were Associate Professors and 1 or 5.9 percent was a full-fledged Professor.

Overall, there were 76 or 51.0 percent who belonged to the instructor position; 25 or 16.8 percent were Assistant Professors; 38 or 25.5 percent were Associate Professors and 10 or 6.7 percent were full-fledged Professors. It implies that academic rank is a consideration for holding administrative positions. The qualification for administrative positions as dean or department head is embedded in the CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) Nos. 74 and 75, s. 2017, Article VI, Sec. 13.

Academic rank is influenced by the number of years in service and highest educational attainment. This is further obtained through promotion and other merit system implemented in an institution. In the SUCs, this can be obtained through the evaluation known as the NBC 461. To be designated as Dean, one should be a graduate of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) irrespective of the academic ranks.

## 2. Leadership Skills

### 2.1 Level of Technical Leadership Skills of the Administrators

Table 5 shows the level of technical leadership skills of the administrators.

As seen on Table 6, in terms of the technical skills, the SUC A obtained a mean of 3.31 with a verbal interpretation of “Very Satisfactory”. In particular, they obtained the highest rating in “getting a task done by the deadline” as evidenced by the mean of 3.45.

**Table 6: Level of Technical Leadership Skills of the Administrators**

Technical Skills	Faculty			Administrators			TOTAL		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
Performs job using modern equipment and technology	3.41	.629	VS	3.53	.514	E	3.42	.617	VS
Works in a fast-paced environment	3.39	.626	VS	3.65	.493	E	3.42	.616	VS
Has a good grasp of the job, knowledge, and skills in leading the college	3.49	.671	VS	3.65	.493	E	3.51	.654	E
Conducts/initiates in-service training to update the personnel	3.36	.713	VS	3.47	.514	VS	3.38	.692	VS
Delegates to subordinates' responsibility and authority	3.40	.697	VS	3.53	.717	E	3.42	.698	VS
Gets a task done by the deadline	3.49	.612	VS	3.76	.437	E	3.52	.599	E
Overall	3.42	.504	VS	3.59	.323	E	3.44	.489	VS

As for the administrators in SUC B, they gave an overall “Very Satisfactory” rating as supported by the overall mean of 3.42. Specifically, the item on “having a good grasp of the job, knowledge and skills in leading the college,” got the highest mean of 3.54 interpreted as “Excellent.”

Moreover, SUC C administrators rated their technical skills “Very Satisfactory” as supported by an overall mean of 3.37. They excel in “performing their job using modern equipment and technology” which garnered the highest mean of 3.58.

Lastly, the administrators of SUC D outshine in various domains of the technical skills as evidenced by an overall mean rating of 3.57. They are particularly outperforming in their attribute of “having a good grasp of the job, knowledge and skills in leading the college” as this item obtained the highest mean of 3.68. Obviously, the abovementioned findings denote that the performances of the administrators from the four SUCs are on a high level.

## 2.2 Interpersonal Leadership Skills

Table 7 shows the interpersonal leadership skills.

As viewed therein, all administrators from SUCs A (Mean=3.26), B (Mean=3.29), and C (Mean=3.26) recorded an overall mean rating of “Very Satisfactory” while only those from SUC D had an “Excellent” rating (Mean=3.76).

**Table 7: Interpersonal Leadership Skills**

Interpersonal Skills	SUC A			SUC B			SUC C			SUC D		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
Usually knows ahead of time how people will respond to a new idea of proposal	3.34	.708	VS	3.25	.645	VS	3.35	.562	VS	3.53	.506	E
Understands that the social fabric of the organization is important	3.29	.732	VS	3.36	.621	VS	3.42	.578	VS	3.68	.526	E
Able to sense the emotional undercurrents in the group	3.42	.826	VS	3.18	.723	VS	3.12	.711	VS	3.58	.549	E
Uses emotional energy to motivate others	3.42	.858	VS	3.29	.763	VS	3.23	.652	VS	3.55	.552	E
Respects the opponent as the key to successful conflict resolution	3.24	.913	VS	3.21	.686	VS	3.27	.778	VS	3.65	.640	E
Works hard to find consensus in conflict situations	3.45	.795	VS	3.46	.693	VS	3.19	.895	VS	3.60	.496	E
Overall	3.36	.697	VS	3.29	.560	VS	3.26	.540	VS	3.76	1.155	E

Administrators from SUCs A and B both “work hard to find consensus in conflict situations” as this obtained the highest mean ratings of 3.45 and 3.46 respectively which were interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

The administrators from SUC C, on the other hand, were found to be good in “understanding that the social fabric of the organization is important” as this earned the highest mean of 3.42 with a verbal interpretation of “Very Satisfactory.”

Lastly, the SUC D administrators likewise excel in “understanding that the social fabric of the organization is important” as this earned the highest mean of 3.68.

The findings imply that the administrators composed of deans and program chairs do perform exemplary about their interpersonal skills. Significantly, this finding is well-supported by the experiences of their subordinates when asked to assess the deans as well as the program chairs.

Faculty A and D articulated with sincerity, “My dean and program chair manifest high interpersonal skills especially when it comes to emotional concerns.”

### 2.3 Decision-making Leadership Skills

Table 8 shows the Decision-making leadership skills.

As seen therein, three of SUCs, SUCs A, B and C garnered a “Very Satisfactory” ratings as evidenced by overall ratings of 3.34, 3.37 and 3.24 accordingly while SUC gave an “Excellent” rating in their decision-making skills as evidenced by an overall mean of 3.66.

**Table 8: Decision-making Leadership Skills**

Decision-Making Skills	SUC A			SUC B			SUC C			SUC D		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
Emphasizes fairness in decision-making	3.34	.708	VS	3.36	.621	VS	3.35	.797	VS	3.70	.516	E
Bases decisions on explicit objective criteria	3.18	.834	VS	3.32	.612	VS	3.08	.796	VS	3.63	.540	E
Undertakes appropriate consultation	3.37	.751	VS	3.43	.634	VS	3.23	.587	VS	3.63	.490	E
Makes appropriate decisions	3.42	.758	VS	3.43	.742	VS	3.31	.679	VS	3.68	.572	E
Does not allow the decisions to drift	3.29	.835	VS	3.29	.600	VS	3.15	.732	VS	3.63	.540	E
Overcomes barriers to get things done	3.42	.722	VS	3.39	.685	VS	3.31	.679	VS	3.70	.464	E
Overall	3.34	.648	VS	3.37	.535	VS	3.24	.580	VS	3.66	.399	E

In particular, the SUC A administrators gave a “Very Satisfactory” rating in the items “making appropriate decisions” as well as “overcoming barriers to get things done” as they both obtained the highest mean of 3.42. Meanwhile, the SUC B administrators gave a “Very Satisfactory” rating on the items as regards “undertaking appropriate consultation” and “making appropriate decisions” as they both recorded a mean of 3.43.

On the other hand, the administrators from SUC C earned a “Very Satisfactory” rating on the item “emphasizing fairness in decision-making” as evidenced by the mean rating of 3.35.

Surprisingly, the SUC D administrators outshine in “emphasizing fairness in decision-making” as well as in “overcoming barriers to get things done” as they both recorded a mean rating of 3.70. The findings denote that the deans and program chairs possess exemplary performance in decision-making skills.

Interestingly, Faculty A expressed with kindness during the interview, “My dean has bottom-up leadership. She listens to the faculty concerns before making decisions”.

Colakkadioglu and Celik (2016) put emphasis in their study the importance of the decision-making process. It can affect the course of life, life satisfaction, and the social relations of an activity. Thus, this should be developed to further enhance the critical cognitive process in every area of human life particularly the administrators.

In another study, Clemente (2007) recommended that the administrators of schools may consider the inclusion of decision making-skills and administrative skills development in the structure of a training program. She added that there is a need to conduct regular evaluation to assess principals’ management or leadership skills. This can also be applicable to middle managers particularly the deans and the program chairs in higher education institutions. This is to ensure improvement and sustainability of leadership skills specifically in the sector of education.

#### 2.4 Level of Administrative Leadership Skills of the Administrators

Table 9 shows the level of administrative leadership skills of the administrators.

**Table 9: Level of Administrative Leadership Skills of Administrators**

	Faculty			Administrators			TOTAL		
	Mean	SD	Level	Mean	SD	Level	Mean	SD	Level
Works well with the detailed aspects of the job	3.46	.623	VS	3.47	.514	VS	3.46	.610	VS
Encourages and supports others for professional growth	3.54	.647	E	3.76	.437	E	3.56	.629	E
Manages people and resources to achieve the organization’s goals and objectives	3.48	.659	VS	3.76	.437	E	3.52	.643	E
Responds to people’s requests and concerns	3.44	.680	VS	3.59	.507	E	3.46	.663	VS
Obtains and allocates resources for the college	3.43	.656	VS	3.82	.393	E	3.48	.643	VS
Outsources to support the programs of the college	3.47	.635	VS	3.35	.702	VS	3.46	.642	VS
Overall	3.47	.527	VS	3.63	.389	E	3.49	.514	VS

As exhibited therein, the item on “encouraging and supporting others for professional growth” was rated highest (Mean=3.54) verbally interpreted as “Excellent” while the item on “obtaining and allocating resources for the college” was rated lowest (3.43) with a verbal interpretation of “Very Satisfactory”.

Interestingly, the assessment of the latter item is in contrary with the self-rating given by the administrators wherein it earned the highest rating (Mean=3.82) which was described as “Excellent.”

Overall, the faculty members firmly believe that this component of leadership skills deserve a “Very Satisfactory” rating as evidenced by the overall mean of 3.47. On the other hand, the administrators’ self-rating was “Excellent” as supported by the overall mean of 3.63.

About their combined assessments, the item on “encouraging and supporting others for professional growth” was rated highest (Mean=3.56) and described as “Excellent” while the items on “working well with the detailed aspects of the job,” “responding to people’s requests and concerns,” and “outsourcing to support the programs of the college” were rated lowest (Mean=3.46) verbally interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

Overall, the combined assessments recorded an overall mean of 3.49 and described as “Very Satisfactory.”

The findings suggest that the administrators are supportive to the faculty and work hand-in-hand for the college. Faculty D disclosed that “Her dean is not only a good leader, but also a good manager. She manages people and resources to achieve the organization’s goals and objectives”.

Meanwhile, Amina and Alhakem (2015) in their article entitled, “The Relation between Component and Obstacles of the Administrative Creativity in Sudan Organizations” confirmed the importance of several personal skills and managerial skills of managers. The research found that there is a positive correlation between those skills and administrative creativity of Sudanese institutions which showed a high level of personal and administrative skills for managers to enjoy their skills in debate and dialogue; the power of persuasion; producing new ideas; making the right decisions at the right time, and a high level of efficiency in planning and coordination between administrative units; streamlining procedures and oversight and supervision. Further, it was revealed that there is a positive function correlation between those skills and creativity. Certainly, personal skills and managerial skills comprise administrative creativity which are skills that need to be developed among leaders.

In an early work of Yossef and Rakha (2017), they revealed a high level of personal and administrative skills and medium level of administrative creativity to Najran University administrative leaders as well as positive correlation between both personal and administrative variables and the levels of administrative creativity. Thus, personal, and administrative skills are related, and these are among the important competencies that leaders should develop.

## **2.5 Level of Conceptual Leadership Skills of the Administrators**

Table 10 shows the level of conceptual leadership skills of the administrators.

**Table 10: Level of Conceptual Leadership Skills of the Administrators**

Conceptual Skills	Faculty			Administrators			TOTAL		
	Mean	SD	Verbal	Mean	SD	Verbal	Mean	SD	Verbal
Deals and solve problems in a democratic way	3.48	.624	VS	3.59	.507	E	3.50	.611	E
When problems arise, immediate action is undertaken to address them	3.37	.681	VS	3.65	.702	E	3.40	.687	VS
Sees the big picture comes easily	3.38	.660	VS	3.29	.686	VS	3.37	.661	VS
Makes strategic plans for the college/institution	3.43	.690	VS	3.47	.717	VS	3.44	.691	VS
Discusses organizational values and philosophy	3.42	.678	VS	3.65	.493	E	3.45	.662	VS
Is flexible about making changes in the organization	3.45	.702	VS	3.35	.862	VS	3.44	.720	VS
Overall	3.42	.538	VS	3.50	.514	E	3.43	.534	VS

As presented therein, the item on “flexibility about making changes in the organization” was rated highest (Mean=3.45) with a verbal interpretation of “Very Satisfactory” while the item on “addressing and undertaking immediate action when problems arise” got the lowest rating (Mean=3.37) which was described as “Very Satisfactory”.

Surprisingly, the assessment of the latter item is in contrast with that of the administrators which was given the highest rating (Mean=3.65), with a verbal interpretation of “Very Satisfactory.” The overall mean rating of faculty was 3.42 described as “Very Satisfactory.”

On the other hand, about the self-ratings of the administrators, the item on “discussing organizational values and philosophy” was also rated highest (Mean=3.65) described as “Excellent,” while item on “seeing the big picture comes easily” was rated lowest (Mean=3.29) described as “Very Satisfactory.” Overall, the administrators gave an “Excellent” rating in this component as evidenced by the overall mean of 3.50.

In terms of the combined assessments of both faculty and administrator regarding conceptual skills, the item on “dealing and solving problems in a democratic” emerged as highest (Mean=3.50) and described as “Excellent” while item on “seeing the big picture comes easily” got the lowest rating (Mean=3.38) with a verbal interpretation of “Very Satisfactory.”

The combined assessment resulted to an overall mean of 3.43 verbally interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

The finding implies that the administrators apply a democratic way of leading the college. This is well-supported by the response of Faculty D when asked how she will describe her dean.

“I may describe him as democratic, because he shows fairness and flexibility in leading his



subordinates,” articulates Faculty D. Faculty rating is generally lower than self-rating in all the aspects of leadership skills as shown in the data. While there is no significant difference in the self-rating and faculty rating, there is more room for improvement in 4/5 indicators.

Motlaq, M. A., Motlaq, M. A., Dareke, and Rezaei, (2012) in their study revealed that the conceptual skills training only increased the managers’ job satisfaction and not their job performance. Conceptual skills training can be utilized to improve job satisfaction in women managers and organizational training. It is also a good basis in identifying the trainings that should be provided to school leaders.

## 2.6 Leadership Skills of Administrators by SUCs

**2.6.1 Technical Leadership Skills.** Table 11 shows the Leadership Skills of Administrators by SUCs in terms of Technical Leadership Skills.

**Table 11: Technical Leadership Skills**

Technical Skills	SUC A			SUC B			SUC C			SUC D		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
Performs job using modern equipment and technology	3.16	.679	VS	3.43	.634	VS	3.58	.578	E	3.53	.554	E
Works in a fast-paced environment	3.34	.708	VS	3.29	.659	VS	3.31	.471	VS	3.55	.597	E
Has a good grasp of the job, knowledge and skills in leading the college	3.34	.847	VS	3.54	.576	E	3.38	.637	VS	3.68	.526	E
Conducts/ initiates in-service training to update the personnel	3.26	.760	VS	3.46	.693	VS	3.31	.736	VS	3.43	.675	VS
Delegates to subordinates’ responsibility and authority	3.29	.732	VS	3.32	.723	VS	3.31	.736	VS	3.63	.586	E
Gets a task done by the deadline	3.45	.645	VS	3.46	.637	VS	3.38	.637	VS	3.63	.540	E
Overall	3.31	.583	VS	3.42	.479	VS	3.37	.477	VS	3.57	.435	E

As seen on Table 11, in terms of the technical skills, the SUC A obtained a mean of 3.31 with a verbal interpretation of “Very Satisfactory”. They obtained the highest rating in “getting a task done by the deadline” as evidenced by the mean of 3.45.

As for the administrators in SUC B, they gave an overall “Very Satisfactory” rating as supported by the overall mean of 3.42. Specifically, the item on “having a good grasp of the job, knowledge and skills in leading the college,” got the highest mean of 3.54 interpreted as “Excellent.” Moreover, SUC C administrators rated their technical skills “Very Satisfactory” as supported by an overall mean of 3.37. They excel in “performing their job using modern equipment and technology” which garnered the highest mean of 3.58.

Lastly, the administrators of SUC D outshine in various domains of the technical skills as evidenced by an overall mean rating of 3.57. They are particularly outperforming in their attribute of “having a good grasp of the job, knowledge and skills in leading the college” as this item obtained the highest mean of 3.68.

Obviously, the abovementioned findings denote that the performances of the administrators from the four SUCs are on a high level.

## 2.6.2 Interpersonal Leadership Skills

Table 12 shows the Leadership Skills of Administrators by SUCs in terms of Interpersonal Leadership Skills.

**Table 12: Interpersonal Leadership Skills**

Interpersonal Skills	SUC A			SUC B			SUC C			SUC D		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
Usually knows ahead of time how people will respond to a new idea of proposal	3.34	.708	VS	3.25	.645	VS	3.35	.562	VS	3.53	.506	E
Understands that the social fabric of the organization is important	3.29	.732	VS	3.36	.621	VS	3.42	.578	VS	3.68	.526	E
Able to sense the emotional undercurrents in the group	3.42	.826	VS	3.18	.723	VS	3.12	.711	VS	3.58	.549	E
Uses emotional energy to motivate others	3.42	.858	VS	3.29	.763	VS	3.23	.652	VS	3.55	.552	E

Respects the opponent as the key to successful conflict resolution	3.24	.913	VS	3.21	.686	VS	3.27	.778	VS	3.65	.640	E
Works hard to find consensus in conflict situations	3.45	.795	VS	3.46	.693	VS	3.19	.895	VS	3.60	.496	E
Overall	3.36	.697	VS	3.29	.560	VS	3.26	.540	VS	3.76	1.155	E

As viewed therein, all administrators from SUCs A (Mean=3.26), B (Mean=3.29), and C (Mean=3.26) recorded an overall mean rating of “Very Satisfactory” while only those from SUC D had an “Excellent” rating (Mean=3.76).

Administrators from SUCs A and B both “work hard to find consensus in conflict situations” as this obtained the highest mean ratings of 3.45 and 3.46 respectively which were interpreted as “Very Satisfactory.”

The administrators from SUC C, on the other hand, were found to be good in “understanding that the social fabric of the organization is important” as this earned the highest mean of 3.42 with a verbal interpretation of “Very Satisfactory.”

Lastly, the SUC D administrators likewise excel in “understanding that the social fabric of the organization is important” as this earned the highest mean of 3.68.

### 2.6.3 Decision-making Leadership Skills

Table 13 shows the Leadership Skills of Administrators by SUCs in terms of Decision-making Leadership Skills.

**Table 13: Decision-making Leadership Skills**

Decision-Making Skills	SUC A			SUC B			SUC C			SUC D		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
Emphasizes fairness in decision-making	3.34	.708	VS	3.36	.621	VS	3.35	.797	VS	3.70	.516	E
Bases decisions on explicit objective criteria	3.18	.834	VS	3.32	.612	VS	3.08	.796	VS	3.63	.540	E
Undertakes appropriate consultation	3.37	.751	VS	3.43	.634	VS	3.23	.587	VS	3.63	.490	E

Makes appropriate decisions	3.42	.758	VS	3.43	.742	VS	3.31	.679	VS	3.68	.572	E
Does not allow the decisions to drift	3.29	.835	VS	3.29	.600	VS	3.15	.732	VS	3.63	.540	E
Overcomes barriers to get things done	3.42	.722	VS	3.39	.685	VS	3.31	.679	VS	3.70	.464	E
Overall	3.34	.648	VS	3.37	.535	VS	3.24	.580	VS	3.66	.399	E

As seen therein, three of SUCs, SUCs A, B and C garnered a “Very Satisfactory” ratings as evidenced by overall ratings of 3.34, 3.37 and 3.24 accordingly while SUC gave an “Excellent” rating in their decision-making skills as evidenced by an overall mean of 3.66.

In particular, the SUC A administrators gave a “Very Satisfactory” rating in the items “making appropriate decisions” as well as “overcoming barriers to get things done” as they both obtained the highest mean of 3.42. Meanwhile, the SUC B administrators gave a “Very Satisfactory” rating on the items as regards “undertaking appropriate consultation” and “making appropriate decisions” as they both recorded a mean of 3.43.

On the other hand, the administrators from SUC C earned a “Very Satisfactory” rating on the item “emphasizing fairness in decision-making” as evidenced by the mean rating of 3.35.

Surprisingly, the SUC D administrators outshine in “emphasizing fairness in decision-making” as well as in “overcoming barriers to get things done” as they both recorded a mean rating of 3.70.

The findings denote that the deans and program chairs possess exemplary performance in decision-making skills.

Interestingly, Faculty A expressed with kindness during the interview, “My dean has bottom-up leadership. She listens to the faculty concerns before making decisions”.

Colakkadioglu and Celik (2016) put emphasis in their study the importance of the decision-making process. It can affect the course of life, life satisfaction, and the social relations of an activity. Thus, this should be developed to further enhance the critical cognitive process in every area of human life particularly the administrators.

In another study, Clemente (2007) recommended that the administrators of schools may consider the inclusion of decision making-skills and administrative skills development in the structure of a training program. She added that there is a need to conduct regular evaluation to assess principals’ management or leadership skills. This can also be applicable to middle managers particularly the deans and the program chairs in higher education institutions. This is to ensure improvement and sustainability of leadership skills specifically in the sector of education.

**2.6.4 Administrative Leadership Skills.** Table 14 shows the Leadership Skills of Administrators by SUCs in terms of Administrative Leadership Skills.

**Table 14: Administrative Leadership Skills**

Administrative Skills	SUC A			SUC B			SUC C			SUC D		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
Works well with the detailed aspects of the job	3.37	.751	VS	3.43	.573	VS	3.35	.562	VS	3.65	.533	E
Encourages and supports others for professional growth	3.53	.687	E	3.57	.573	E	3.23	.765	VS	3.73	.506	E
Manages people and resources to achieve the organization's goals and objectives	3.39	.679	VS	3.46	.693	VS	3.35	.745	VS	3.68	.526	E
Responds to people's requests and concerns	3.37	.786	VS	3.43	.690	VS	3.27	.667	VS	3.63	.540	E
Obtains and allocates resources for the college	3.32	.702	VS	3.43	.690	VS	3.38	.697	VS	3.58	.549	E
Outsources to support the programs of the college	3.37	.714	VS	3.50	.638	E	3.46	.647	VS	3.55	.552	E
Overall	3.39	.591	VS	3.47	.537	VS	3.34	.532	VS	3.63	.419	E

As viewed in Table 14, the administrators from SUCs A, B and C obtained a “Very Satisfactory” ratings in the administrative skills as evidenced by the overall mean ratings of 3.39, 3.47 and 3.34.

Meanwhile, only the administrators from SUC D garnered an “Excellent” rating in this component as supported by an overall mean of 3.63.

In particular, the item on “encouraging and supporting others for professional growth” emerged as the highest among the administrators from SUC A and B (Mean=3.53; Mean=3.57). On the other hand, SUC C administrators were found “Very Satisfactory” in “outsourcing to support the programs of the college” as this recorded a mean of 3.46.

Lastly, the item on “encouraging and supporting others for professional growth” emerged as the item with a highest mean (Mean=3.73) among the SUC D administrators verbally interpreted as “Excellent.”

The findings imply that the administrators’ administrative skills from the four SUCs are commendable. This finding can be validated from the response of the Faculty C who humbly expressed her comment for her dean, “Her sense of professionalism really radiates and knows how to develop the college.”

### 2.6.5 Conceptual Skills

Table 15 shows the Conceptual Skills of Administrators

**Table 15: Conceptual Skills**

Conceptual Skills	SUC A			SUC B			SUC C			SUC D		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
Deals and solves problems in a democratic way	3.47	.725	VS	3.39	.497	VS	3.27	.667	VS	3.70	.516	E
When problems arise, immediate action is undertaken to address them	3.26	.795	VS	3.29	.535	VS	3.27	.778	VS	3.60	.545	E
Sees the big picture comes easily	3.29	.835	VS	3.46	.693	VS	3.19	.402	VS	3.53	.554	E
Makes strategic plans for the college/institution	3.37	.819	VS	3.25	.701	VS	3.35	.629	VS	3.68	.526	E
Discusses organizational values and philosophy	3.21	.843	VS	3.43	.573	VS	3.35	.689	VS	3.68	.474	E
Is flexible about making changes in the organization	3.39	.718	VS	3.32	.723	VS	3.31	.884	VS	3.68	.474	E
Overall	3.33	.663	VS	3.36	.511	VS	3.29	.493	VS	3.64	.380	E

As exhibited in Table 15, the administrators from SUCs A, B, and C were rated Very Satisfactory in all items about conceptual skills as evidenced by the overall mean ratings of 3.33, 3.36 and 3.29 respectively. Surprisingly, the SUC D administrators excel in all items as supported by the overall mean of 3.64.

Specifically, the SUC A administrators were rated “Very Satisfactory” as it obtained the highest mean of 3.47 in “dealing and solving problems in a democratic way.” Meanwhile, the administrators of SUC B obtained the highest rating of “Very Satisfactory” in “seeing the big picture comes easily” as supported by a mean rating of 3.46.

On the other hand, the SUC C administrators garnered highest mean ratings (Mean=3.35) for both items such as “making strategic plans for the college/institution” and “discussing organizational values and philosophy” with a verbal interpretation of “Very Satisfactory.”

Finally, the administrators of SUC D outshine in “dealing and solving problems in a democratic way” as supported by the mean rating of 3.70. The data imply that the administrators’ conceptual skills are exemplary.

A study conducted by Motlaq, M. A., Motlaq, M. A., Dareke, and Rezaei (2012) revealed that the conceptual skills training can be used to improve job satisfaction in women managers and organizational training. Further, it can be a good basis in identifying what trainings should be provided to school leaders.

Katz (2002) in his article, “Skills of an Effective Administrator” emphasized the importance of management skills, human skills, conceptual, and technical skills which are very vital skills for leaders in leading subordinates.

### 3. Comparison of the Leadership Skills and the Demographic Profile

#### 3.1 Leadership Skills and Sex.

Table 16 shows the Comparison of the Leadership Skills when Respondents are Grouped According to Sex

**Table 16: Comparison of the Leadership Skills when Respondents are grouped According to Sex**

Leadership Skills	Sex	Mean	S.D.	t-value	p-value	Sig
Technical Skills	Male	3.540	.38066	2.179	P = 0.031 < 0.05	S
	Female	3.374	.54709			
Interpersonal Skills	Male	3.593	1.00526	1.897	P = 0.060 > 0.05	NS
	Female	3.341	.60710			
Decision-Making Skills	Male	3.532	.46841	1.775	P = 0.078 > 0.05	NS
	Female	3.368	.61150			
Administrative Skills	Male	3.527	.45908	.764	P = 0.446 > 0.05	NS
	Female	3.461	.55228			
Conceptual Skills	Male	3.487	.46306	1.077	P = 0.283 > 0.05	NS
	Female	3.392	.57948			

Table 16 shows that there is a significant difference on the assessment of the respondents regarding leadership skills particularly on technical skills when they are grouped according to sex as evidenced by the p-value of 0.031 which is less than 0.05 level of significance. Result further indicates that the male respondents gave a higher assessment in terms of the administrators' technical skills than the female. This may imply that technically, administrators perform their duties and responsibilities as stated in their terms of reference.

It is noted further that the interpersonal, decision-making, administrative, and conceptual skills yield no significant difference on the assessment of the respondents' regarding these skills when they are grouped according to sex as supported by the p-values of 0.060, 0.078, 0.446, and 0.283 respectively which are all greater than 0.05 level of significance. This finding implies that the respondents' assessments share the same insights in the abovementioned components of leadership skills when grouped according to their sex. A study conducted by Gorska (2016) found that leadership may be influenced by sex, where women act in a more supportive ways giving subordinate more freedom; less supervision and are more understanding and tolerant. Hence, women tend to be more democratic. Moreover, they treat rewards as motivational tool and organize work through lists. This finding supports the description of Faculty D of his administrator when asked how he will describe her. He simply uttered, "She is democratic."

Another study conducted by Bremen (as cited by Thompson, 2012) discovered that female leaders were much more likely than male leaders to believe they could leave a positive legacy behind.

### 3.2 Leadership Skills and Age

Table 17 shows the Comparison of the Leadership Skills when Respondents are Grouped According to Age.

**Table 17: Comparison of the Leadership Skills when Respondents are grouped According to Age**

Leadership Skills		Mean	S.D.	F-value	p-value	Sig
Technical Skills	30 and below	3.494	.43726			
	31-35	3.458	.37013			
	36-40	3.474	.39585			
	41-45	3.546	.39937	.532	P = 0.809 > 0.05	NS
	46-50	3.342	.52550			
	51-55	3.304	.71501			
	56-60	3.385	.63240			
	61 & above	3.458	.41667			
	Total	3.444	.48923			
Interpersonal Skills	30 and below	3.620	1.06186			
	31-35	3.583	.42935			
	36-40	3.436	.39988			
	41-45	3.352	.49800	.801	P = 0.588 > 0.05	NS
	46-50	3.307	.59645			



	51-55	3.186	.91644			
	56-60	3.333	.66319			
	61 & above	3.375	.47871			
	Total	3.447	.80657			
Decision-Making Skills	30 and below	3.509	.43291			
	31-35	3.500	.47673			
	36-40	3.526	.41859			
	41-45	3.343	.56439	.505	P = 0.830 > 0.05	NS
	46-50	3.421	.59153			
	51-55	3.265	.88987			
	56-60	3.397	.69568			
	61 & above	3.375	.47871			
	Total	3.437	.55968			
	Administrative Skills	30 and below	3.550	.44528		
31-35		3.611	.36469			
36-40		3.474	.37790			
41-45		3.528	.45103	.496	P = 0.837 > 0.05	NS
46-50		3.395	.61164			
51-55		3.373	.72536			
56-60		3.410	.67225			
Total		3.489	.51431			
Conceptual Skills	30 and below	3.509	.45104			
	31-35	3.597	.35858			
	36-40	3.462	.36103			
	41-45	3.343	.44455	.863	P = 0.537 > 0.05	NS
	46-50	3.333	.61111			
	51-55	3.226	.85176			
	56-60	3.449	.62132			
	Total	3.432	.53377			

Table 17 reveals that there is no significant difference on the assessment of the respondents regarding the leadership skills of the administrators when grouped according to age as denoted by the p-values which are all greater than the 0.05 level of significance.

Evidently, the results imply that the respondents share common insights as regards various leadership skills components across age categories. Boerrigter (2015) concluded in his study that older leaders are not better or worse than younger leaders in achieving effective leadership. Consequently, an investigation conducted by Bremen (as cited by Thompson, 2012) concluded that older leaders who believed they could leave behind a lasting legacy were frequently motivated and effective, while those who believed they would leave no legacy behind were often not as effective leaders.

On the other hand, research conducted by Thompson (2012) in Queensland, Australia with regard to the relationship between age and wisdom among older leaders found that despite the

correlation between wisdom and effective leadership, the study found no link between age and wisdom, or between age and leadership skills. Some older leaders demonstrated higher levels of wisdom and more effective leadership while others did not. Unfavorably, the study did not provide support for the idea that leaders become wiser with age.

### 3.2 Leadership Skills and Highest Educational Attainment

Table 18 shows the Comparison of the Leadership Skills when Respondents are Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment.

**Table 18: Comparison of the Leadership Skills when Respondents are grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment**

Leadership Skills		Mean	S.D.	F-value	p-value	Sig
Technical	Bachelor's Degree	3.501	.47797			
	Master of Arts/ Master of Science	3.376	.52918	.811	P = 0.447 > 0.05	NS
	Doctor of Philosophy/ Doctor of Education	3.411	.49322			
	Total	3.424	.50417			
Interpersonal	Bachelor's Degree	3.501	.47506			
	Master of Arts/ Master of Science	3.457	1.1259	.260	P = 0.771 > 0.05	NS
	Doctor of Philosophy/ Doctor of Education	3.364	.55817			
	Total	3.448	.83629			
Decision	Bachelor's Degree	3.569	.43934			
	Master of Arts/ Master of Science	3.345	.64274	2.109	P = 0.126 > 0.05	NS
	Doctor of Philosophy/ Doctor of Education	3.374	.52379			
	Total	3.422	.56188			
Administrative	Bachelor's Degree	3.577	.43954			
	Master of Arts/ Master of Science	3.405	.56205	1.309	P = 0.274 > 0.05	NS
	Doctor of Philosophy/ Doctor of Education	3.455	.55633			
	Total	3.471	.52684			
Conceptual	Bachelor's Degree	3.545	.41336			
	Master of Arts/ Master of Science	3.356	.61768	1.577	P = 0.210 > 0.05	NS
	Doctor of Philosophy/ Doctor of Education	3.389	.51144			
	Total	3.423	.53756			

As seen in Table 18, it was unveiled that there is no significant difference on the perceptions

of the respondents regarding the leadership skills of administrators when grouped according to highest educational attainment as supported by the p-values which are all greater than the 0.05 level of significance.

This implies that the respondents share the same insights in terms of the various components of leadership skills across highest educational attainment.

The findings support the idea that regardless of their educational attainment, enhancement or development to further improve their leadership skills is essential especially with regard to the items that were found weak among these respondents.

On the contrary, a study conducted by Besley, Montalvo and Querol (2011) in Europe revealed that educational attainment has a large and statistically significant effect and found out that additional schooling increases the quality of civic awareness among the leaders and educational attainment is important and that growth is enhanced by having leaders who are more highly educated.

**3.4 Leadership Skills and Years in the Present Position.** Table 19 shows the Comparison of the Leadership Skills when Respondents are Grouped According to Years in the Present Position.

**Table 19: Comparison of the Leadership Skills when Respondents are Grouped According to Years in the Present Position**

Leadership Skills		Mean	S.D.	F-value	p-value	Sig
Technical Skills	1-5	3.5641	.42153			
	6-10	3.3452	.30287			
	11-15	3.3810	.42077	1.601	p = 0.140 > 0.05	NS
	16-20	3.3444	.49788			
	21-25	3.4907	.57301			
	26-30	3.1364	.72960			
	31-35	3.4444	.34694			
	36 and more	3.2778	.64550			
	Total	3.4441	.48923			
Interpersonal Skills	1-5	3.6231	.97507			
	6-10	3.3810	.51236			
	11-15	3.3095	.45694			
	16-20	3.2000	.65526	.921	P = 0.492 > 0.05	NS
	21-25	3.4352	.72115			
	26-30	3.2121	.77850			
	31-35	3.2778	.34694			
	36 and more	3.2778	.70218			
	Total	3.4474	.80657			
Decision Skills	1-5	3.5590	.45399			
	6-10	3.3571	.57682			
	11-15	3.3690	.49862			

	16-20	3.2111	.55085	1.121	P = 0.353 > 0.05	NS
	21-25	3.4907	.72191			
	26-30	3.2879	.72300			
	3135	3.3333	.44096			
	36 and more	3.2778	.74536			
	Total	3.4374	.55968			
Administrative Skills	1-5	3.6205	.40879			
	6-10	3.4167	.51784			
	11-15	3.3214	.42599			
	16-20	3.4000	.51870	1.699	P = 0.114 > 0.05	NS
	21-25	3.5648	.64711			
	26-30	3.2879	.65443			
	3135	3.1667	.28868			
	36 and more	3.2593	.72701			
	Total	3.4888	.51431			
Conceptual Skills	1-5	3.5692	.42786			
	6-10	3.3333	.53509			
	11-15	3.3333	.44817			
	16-20	3.2444	.50343	1.347	P = 0.233 > 0.05	NS
	21-25	3.4352	.66701			
	26-30	3.2121	.80654			
	3135	3.3333	.33333			
	36 and more	3.3519	.67415			
		Total	3.4318	.53377		

As viewed therein, there is no significant difference on the assessment of the respondents regarding the leadership skills of administrators when grouped according to the years in the present position as evidenced the obtained p-values which are all greater than the 0.05 level of significance.

The results simply confirm that the respondents share insights in common as regards the various components of the administrators' leadership skills irrespective of their number of years of service in their current position.

### 3.4 Leadership Skills and Academic Rank

Table 20 shows the Comparison of the Leadership Skills when Respondents are Grouped According to Academic Rank.

As presented therein, there is no significant difference on the perceptions of the respondents regarding the leadership skills of administrators when grouped according to their academic ranks as denoted by the p-values which are all greater than 0.05 level of significance.

The results simply confirm that the respondents share insights in common as regards the various components of the administrators' leadership skills irrespective of their academic ranks.

Apparently, a study conducted by Amir, Kannan, Sharma and Veeriah (2016) concluded that

the success of the faculty members depends on the leadership behavior displayed by the deans and its effectiveness on their academic, scholarly, and developmental activities. It was also found that the deans with strong leadership are capable of spearheading changes by designing important, realistic, and achievable objectives as well as by implementing strategies leading to goal accomplishment.

**Table 20: Comparison of the Leadership Skills when Respondents are grouped According to Academic Rank**

Leadership Skills		Mean	S.D.	F-value	p-value	Sig
Technical Skills	Instructor	3.50	.446			
	Asst. Prof.	3.44	.369	.922	P = 0.432 > 0.05	NS
	Assoc. Prof.	3.36	.616			
	Professor	3.32	.539			
	Total	3.44	.489			
Interpersonal Skills	Instructor	3.58	.925			
	Asst. Prof.	3.44	.393	1.85	P = 0.141 > 0.05	NS
	Assoc. Prof.	3.23	.760			
	Professor	3.25	.625			
	Total	3.45	.807			
Decision Skills	Instructor	3.51	.475			
	Asst. Prof.	3.49	.383	1.7	P = 0.192 > 0.05	NS
	Assoc. Prof.	3.31	.762			
	Professor	3.23	.568			
	Total	3.44	.560			
Administrative Skills	Instructor	3.55	.465			
	Asst. Prof.	3.49	.345	1.10	P = 0.353 > 0.05	NS
	Assoc. Prof.	3.41	.646			
	Professor	3.30	.647			
	Total	3.49	.514			
Conceptual Skills	Instructor	3.50	.472			
	Asst. Prof.	3.43	.326	1.24	P = 0.296 > 0.05	NS
	Assoc. Prof.	3.32	.713			
	Professor	3.28	.578			
	Total	3.43	.534			

#### 4. Comparison of the Self-Rating and Faculty Rating of the Leadership Skills of the Administrators

It can be gleaned from Table 21 that there is no significant difference on the perceptions between the self-rating and faculty rating on leadership skills of the administrators as supported by the obtained p-values which are all higher than 0.05 level of significance.

**Table 21: Comparison of the Self-Rating and Faculty Rating of the Leadership Skills of the Administrators**

Leadership Skills	Groupings	Mean	S.D.	t-value	p-value	Sig
Technical Skills	Faculty	3.4242	.50417	-1.383	P = 0.169 > 0.05	NS
	Administrator	3.5980	.32306			
Interpersonal Skills	Faculty	3.4482	.83629	.034	P = 0.973 > 0.05	NS
	Administrator	3.4412	.53987			
Decision Skills	Faculty	3.4217	.56188	-.950	P = 0.343 > 0.05	NS
	Administrator	3.5588	.54308			
Administrative Skills	Faculty	3.4710	.52684	-1.182	P = 0.239 > 0.05	NS
	Administrator	3.6275	.38877			
Conceptual Skills	Faculty	3.4230	.53756	-.559	P = 0.577 > 0.05	NS
	Administrator	3.5000	.51370			

Overall, it was found that both respondents share common perspectives about the leadership skills of the school administrators.

### 5. Leadership Skills Development Program (LSDP)

The researcher crafted a Leadership Skills Development Program (LSDP) as an outcome of this study. It was based on the result obtained on the self-rating rating of the administrators as regards leadership skills wherein administrative, technical, decision-making, conceptual and interpersonal were rated highest to lowest respectively while for the faculty ratings - administrative, interpersonal, technical, conceptual, and decision-making skills were ranked first, second, third, fourth and fifth accordingly.

Though these abovementioned skills were rated “Very Satisfactory,” it is deemed recommended that a training program be proposed for further enhancement or development of leadership skills to address the current issues, concerns and trends in higher education.

### 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: 1) the leadership skills of the administrators in terms of technical, interpersonal, decision-making, administrative and conceptual are “Very Satisfactory.” Specifically, the following leadership skills of the administrators ranked first, second, third, fourth and fifth accordingly: administrative, technical, decision-making, conceptual, and interpersonal skills according to their self-assessment. On the other hand, the ratings of the faculty with regard to administrative, interpersonal, technical, conceptual and decision-making emerged as the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth respectively; 2) the study revealed that there are no significant differences in the leadership skills of the administrators when grouped according to their profile as evidenced

by the p-values which are greater than 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis ( $H_{01}$ ) was accepted; 3) it was found out that there are no significant differences between the leadership skills of the administrators' self-rating and the faculty rating as supported by the p-values of 0.169, 0.973, 0.343, 0.239 and 0.577 for technical, interpersonal, decision-making, administrative, and conceptual respectively which are all greater than 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis ( $H_{02}$ ) was honored; and 4) a Leadership Skills Development Program (LSDP) is proposed to further enhance the leadership skills of the administrators.

The following recommendations are advanced by the researcher based on the findings and conclusions generated in the study: 1) the administrators should maintain their competence as leaders as well as continue upgrading themselves for the advancement of their performances. Equally contributory to their leadership skills are the academic qualifications wherein most of the administrators finished relevant degrees in their field. Hence, pursuing graduate studies is recommended to enhance professional development; 2) the institutionalization of a Development Program for the Administrators is proposed to further enrich the administrators' leadership skills. This recommendation is based on the ratings obtained on the leadership skills of administrators' self-rating where administrative, technical, decision-making, conceptual, and interpersonal skills ranked first, second, third, fourth, and fifth respectively while based on the ratings of faculty, the administrative, interpersonal, technical, conceptual, and decision-making emerged as first, second, third, fourth, and fifth in ranks respectively. Though leadership skills were rated "Very Satisfactory," the need for a training program is advocated to further enhance the administrators' leadership skills; 3) a follow- study may be conducted along with additional variables such as other personal attributes and job competencies (e.g. analytical skills, problem solving skills, innovative skills) to assess whether there is an improvement in the leadership skills of administrators; 4) a longitudinal study among administrators is endorsed to determine the impact of the sustained high leadership skills; 5) since the study is delimited to four SUCs, it is hereby recommended that future study should consider all administrators of Teacher Education Programs from all other SUCs in the region to further validate the findings of this research; 7) future researchers may conduct investigations along this line with the involvement of various entities of the academic departments of participating schools or Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

## References

- a. Altbach, P. G. (2015). *Young faculty in the twenty-first century-* SUNY Press. Retrieved from <https://www.sunypress.edu/pdf/63028.pdf> on February 21, 2019.
- b. Amina, A. & Alhakem, A. (2015). The Relation between Component & Obstacles of Administrative Creativity in Sudan Organizations. *Economic Science Magazine*, Issue (16).
- c. Amir, S. D. S., Kannan, S., Sharma, S. & Veeriah, J. (2016). Leadership behavior of deans and its impact on effectiveness for quality in a high ranking university. Retrieved on October 29, 2018 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication>
- d. Anbazhagan, S. & Kotur, B. R. (2014). The influence of age and gender on the leadership styles. Retrieved on October 29, 2018 from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org>

- e. Anuran, A., Buenviaje, M. G., Encio, H. A., & Refozar, R. G. (2016). Academic Performance and Application Level Acquired Learning and Student Outcomes from MBA Courses towards the Attainment of Personal Growth. *Asia Pacific Journal of Academic Research in Social Sciences*, 1(30-44)
- f. Besley, T., Montalvo, J.G., & Querol, M. R. (2011). Do Educated Leaders Matter? Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org> on October 29, 2018.
- g. Bimpeh, S. (2012). Factors influencing leadership and teacher performance in the senior high schools in the ho municipality of the volta region of Ghana, institute of distance learning, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.
- h. Boerrigter, C. (2015). How leader's age is related to leader effectiveness: Through leader's affective state and leadership behavior. Retrieved from <https://essay.utwente.nl> on October 29, 2018.
- i. Brown, C. (2011). Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, *International Journal of Applied Educational Studies*. Academia Journal Article.
- j. Ched Memorandum No. 46, S. (2012). Republic of the Philippines, office of the President. Retrieved from Commission on Higher Education: Retrieved from <http://pacu.org.ph/wp2/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/CMO-No.46-s2012.pdf> on August 18, 2018.
- k. Civil Service Commission (CSC) Memorandum Circular No. 22, s. 2016
- l. Clemente, Z. (2007). Assessment of the management skills of the principals in selected private sectarian and non-sectarian elementary schools in region III: basis of a proposed total quality management model. Unpublished Dissertation. CEU: Manila.
- m. Colakkadioglu, O., & Celik, B., and (2016). The Effect of Decision-Making Skill Training Programs on Self-Esteem and Decision-Making Styles. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 65.
- n. DeMeuse, K.P., Dai, G., & Hallenbeck, G. S. (2010). Learning Agility: a construct whose time has come. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practices and Research*, 62(2) 119-130. doi:10.1037/a0019988.
- o. Dilanco, M. D. G., & Borabo, M. L. (2014). Correlates of Leadership and Management: Inputs to
- p. Management Improvement for Selected Dental Schools in the Philippines. Unpublished Dissertation. CEU: Manila.
- q. Ganta, V. C. & Manukonda, J. K. (2014). Leadership during Change and Uncertainty in Organizations. *International Journal of Organizational Behavior and Management Perspective* 3(3), 1183.
- r. Gorska, A. (2016). Gender differences in leadership. Research Gate. Retrieved on December 28, 2018 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313266610>.
- s. Grint, K. (2007). What is leadership? From hydra and hybrid. Working paper. Said Business School and Templeton College, Oxford University.
- t. Guthrie, J.W. & Schuermann, P.J. (2010). Successful school leadership: planning, politics, performance, and power. Pearson Education, Inc.
- u. Inocian, R., & Hermosa, E. M. (2014). Social Studies Teachers' Quest for a Vertically-articulated Career Path. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(11) pp. 310-325.
- v. Katz, D. (2014). What are Conceptual Skills in Management?-Definition and Examples. Retrieved from <https://study.com> on April 6, 2019.
- w. Katz, R.L. (2002). Skills of an Effective Administrator, *Harvard Business Rev.*, 53 (7) 65-68.
- x. Lapid, G. B. (2015). Faculty Qualifications across the Vertically-Articulated Colleges of Cebu Normal University: The Policy Framework. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(16), 192-201.



- y. Lussier, R. & Achua, C. (2016). *Leadership: Theory, Application, and Skill Development*. Cengage Learning.
- z. Medina, R. (2010). Upgrading yourself- technical and non-technical competencies. *IEEE Potentials*, 29,10.
- aa. Medina, R. G. (2006). *Personnel and human resources management*. Manila: Rex Bookstore.
- bb. Miller, J. (2014). 5 ways you can position yourself as a leader (before you have any followers)-the muse. Retrieved from <https://www.themuse.com/advice/5-w> on November 6, 2018.
- cc. Miller, P. (2012). "Leadership Communication- the three levels". *Today's Manager*. Singapore Institute of Management, Issue February, pp19-21.
- dd. Motlaq, M. A., Motlaq, M. A., Dareke, M., & Rezaei, H. (2012). *The Effect of Conceptual Skills Training on the Degree of Job Satisfaction and Performance in Women Managers*. Research Gate Publications.
- ee. Northouse, P.G. (2017). *Leadership: theory and practice*, (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- ff. Parker, P. (2015). The Historical Role of Women in Higher Education. *Administrative Issues Journal: Connecting Education, Practice and Research*, 5(1): 3-14.
- gg. Pricellas, V., Niez, R., Niera, R., & Tubis, A.P. (2016). Effectiveness of School Administrators' Leadership Skills and Behaviors and their School Performance in Area III Leyte Division, Philippines. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 18(8) pp. 106-126.
- hh. Rojas, T., & Rojas, R. C. (2016). College Education Graduate Tracer Study (GTS): Boon or Bane? *European Scientific Journal* (63-78).
- ii. Thompson, S. (2011). Relationship between age and wisdom among older leaders. Retrieved from <https://yourbusiness.azcentral.com/age> on October 29, 2018.
- jj. Thompson, S. (2012). How does age affect leadership styles? Retrieved from <https://yourbusiness.azcentral.com/age> on October 29, 2018.
- kk. Wasim, A. & Imran, A. (2010). The Role of Leadership in Organizational Change: Relating the Successful Organizational Change to Visionary and innovative Leadership, 3 (2), 9.
- ll. Yossef, S. A. M. & Rakha, A.H.H. (2017). Efficiency of Personal and Administrative Skills for Managerial Leadership on Administrative Creativity at Najran University. *Journal of Education and Practice*.
- mm. Yahya, B. & Rashid (2002). *Intergrasi Kemahiran "employability" dalam program pendidikan vokasional pertanian dan industri di malaysia*. Universiti Tekoog, Malaysia.
- nn. Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations*, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition. Pearson Education, Inc.