



ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Organizational Characteristics, Assertiveness, and Performance of College Administrators

Gilda A. Evangelista-Deguma

Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College Main Campus

Estancia, Iloilo, Philippines

Email: gilds_deguma@yahoo.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received:
10.06.2016
Revised
16.09.2016
Accepted
29.11.2016

ABSTRACT

This descriptive research aimed to determine and to describe the organizational characteristics, assertiveness, and performance of the College administrators of the NIPSC System in the Fifth District of Iloilo located in the municipalities of Estancia, Batad, Sara, Lemery, Concepcion, Ajuy, and Barotac Viejo for SY 2015-2016. This was anchored on John Locke's (Goal Setting Theory, Hoyle's Determinants of Work Performance, Likert's Systems Four of Management, Modern Management Theory and, Trait and Factor Theory and was limited to the 88 College administrators of the NIPSC system for SY 2015-2016 classified as to The respondents of this study were the College administrators of the NIPSC system for SY 2015-2016 classified as to Sex (Male; Female), Educational Attainment (Ph.D./Ed. D.; Master's Degree with doctoral units; and Master's Degree) Length of Service in the NIPSC System (Short - below 20 years; Long - 20 years and above), Academic Rank (Professor; Associate Professor; Assistant Professor; and Instructor), Administrative Designation (Vice President; Dean; Director; Program Chairperson; College Administrator, Principal) and NIPSC Campus (Estancia; Batad; Sara; Concepcion; Lemery; Ajuy; and Barotac Viejo). The study utilized the two published American model instruments: Likert and Likert's Organizational Characteristics Profile, and DuBrin's Assertiveness Test - UPLB's Rating Scale for Higher Education Administrators. The descriptive statistics used were mean and standard deviation. The inferential statistical tools were the Mann-Whitney U-Test, Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance, Spearman's Correlation, and Logistic Analysis. The results revealed that the College administrators use System 3 - (Consultative) Management Style in their respective campuses. All College administrators were found to be assertive regardless of the varied classifications. The result also revealed that among the variables in the organizational characteristics such as leadership, motivation, communication, decisions, goals, and control, decisions is the only predictor of the College administrators' performance. The path analysis showed that the decisions aspect is the most important which is based on goals or objectives of the programs to motivate subordinates. Leadership with no communication gap was also found to be important for the implementation and realization of the good performance of the College administrators. This study revealed that College administrators believed there is a broad policy at the top but is accompanied with more delegation; the subordinates are also generally consulted about decisions related to their work; the administrators felt the decision making process in their schools has done some contribution to motivation; and employed the System 3 (Consultative) of Management Styles.

Key Words: Organizational Characteristics, Assertiveness, Performance, College Administrators

CITATION OF THIS ARTICLE

Gilda A. Evangelista-Deguma . Organizational Characteristics, Assertiveness, and Performance of College Administrators. Inter. J. Edu. Res. Technol. 7[4] 2016; 09-14.

DOI: 10.15515/ijert.0976 4089.7.4.914

INTRODUCTION

Many people view organization as a group of people working together for a common goal or purpose. In this light, organization is considered as a mechanism that enables people to work effectively together (Pereda and Pereda, 2014). Man learned that more organized efforts could bring improvement in his way of life. Pereda and Pereda (2014) added that the man's social spheres became larger and the need for more complex organized effort became apparent since it is organization that motivated man to use his brain power to create new things. The refinement of the organizational system and the development of organized behaviour created more goods and services to satisfy the quest for modern living.

Organizational characteristics, on the other hand, are aspects of organizations that can be identified, usually in relation to performance. For example, Modern Management Theory suggests that organizations with an organizational climate focused on clear organizational objectives, a clarity of organizational structure with clear measurement systems enabling the monitoring of progress, and with a clear organizational commitment to goal achievement, would perform better than organizations without these characteristics.

The researcher chose this study for the fact that she wanted to have an eye-view of the characteristics of her school organization and the assertiveness of the school administrators. At the same time she wanted to know if these two factors could influence the administrators' performance.

To add, this study is expected to provide confirmation on the significance of a good performing administrator/manager in a successful organization. A school administrator can be an effective school leader through a blend of qualities and characteristics that yield an effective leader (Meador, 2015).

METHODOLOGY

Descriptive design was used in this study to describe characteristics of a population or phenomenon being studied. It does not answer questions about how/when/why the characteristics occurred. Rather it addresses the "what" question (What are the characteristics of the population or situation being studied?) (wikipedia.org - August 2, 2012, in Besonia, 2015).

The respondents of this study were the College administrators of the NIPSC system for SY 2015-2016 classified as to Sex (Male; Female), Educational Attainment (Ph.D./Ed. D.; Master's Degree with doctoral units; and Master's Degree) Length of Service in the NIPSC System (Short - below 20 years; Long - 20 years and above), Academic Rank (Professor; Associate Professor; Assistant Professor; and Instructor), Administrative Designation (Vice President; Dean; Director; Program Chairperson; College Administrator, Principal) and NIPSC Campus (Estancia, Batad, Sara, Concepcion, Lemery, Ajuy, and Barotac Viejo).

Research Instruments

The study utilized the two published American model instruments - Likert and Likert's Organizational Characteristics Profile (1994, in Subong, 1998) and DuBrin's Assertiveness Test (1985, in Subong, 1998) - UPLB's Rating Scale for Higher Education Administrators (Ables, 1996 in Subong, 1998). These research instruments were accompanied with a brief information sheet to gather data on the administrators' personal and non-personal data.

The two American-made-instruments were trial administered among the selected secondary school principals in the Province of Iloilo (Subong, 1998) for the purpose of finding out their suitability in the Philippine settings. The construct validity for the Organizational Characteristics profile instrument came up with six factors corresponding to the six aspects of organizational characteristics. The items in the instruments obtained factor loads ranging from 0.70 to 0.96. The instruments proved to be reliable as indicated by the resulting Chronbach Alpha of 0.8436 indicating high reliability (Fraenkel, 1994 in Subong, 1998). On the other hand, the Assertiveness Test instrument obtained an alpha of 0.7174 which indicated high reliability.

To determine the administrators' organizational characteristics profile, this research utilized the Likert and Likert's questionnaire (1994, in Subong, 1998). The instrument has six components corresponding to the six organizational characteristics - leadership processes, goal setting processes, motivational forces, communication processes, goal setting processes, control processes, and decision-making processes, all of which were linked to Likert's Four Systems of Management.

To find out the level of the administrators' assertiveness, this study utilized the test developed by DuBrin (1985 in Subong, 1998). This contained 30 items and required the respondent to respond to each item with "Mostly True" or "Mostly False". To score the test, the answer that agrees to the scoring key was counted as correct.

To determine the College administrators' performance, UPLB's rating Scale for Higher Education Administrators (Ables, 1996 in Subong, 1998) was used. The instrument consisted of six parts: (1) planning and organizing, (2) communicating/leading, (3) decision-making, (4) evaluating, (5) improving

the unit and the institution, and (6) effectiveness of an administrator. The instrument required the respondents to rate themselves as "Outstanding", "Very Satisfactory", "Fair", "Needs Improvement", and "Very Unsatisfactory".

The researcher asked permission from the College President and to the Dean of the NIPSC of the School of Education to conduct the study. After permission was granted, she personally handed in the letters to the respective Campus Administrators together with the questionnaires to the identified respondents on September and October 2015. After which, the data gathered were tallied, computer-processed, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted.

The data gathered were subjected to computer-processed statistics (SPSS). The descriptive statistics used were mean and standard deviation. The inferential statistical tools were the Mann-Whitney U-Test, Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance, Spearman's Correlation, and Logistic Multiple Regression Analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This present study presents the following findings on Organizational Characteristics, Assertiveness, and Performance of the College administrators.

Organizational Characteristics

On **Leadership**, the College administrators believed there was a **substantial amount** of confidence and trust shown in the subordinates in their schools; convinced that the subordinates are **very free** to talk to their superiors about their job; believed that the subordinates' ideas were **often** sought and used constructively, and employed System 3 (Consultative Approach) Management Style. As regards **Motivation**, the College administrators perceived that the responsibility for achieving organizational goals was **fairly** felt in their schools; thought that a **moderate amount** of cooperative teamwork existed in schools; and tended to employ a System 3 (Consultative Approach) of Management Style. As to **Communication**, the College administrators felt there was a **down and up** direction of information flow; perceived the people in the schools to have accepted downward communication with a caution mind; thought that the superiors in their schools know the problem faced by their subordinates **quite well**; and were generally System 3 (Consultative) in Management Style in the area of Communication, although at times, they shifted to System 4 (Participative) of Management Style. With regards to **Decisions**, the College administrators believed there is a **broad policy at the top**, but was accompanied with more delegation; the subordinates were also generally consulted about decisions related to their work; the administrators felt the decision making process in their schools has done **some contribution** to motivation; and employed the System 3 (Consultative) of Management Styles. Regarding **Goals**, original goals, in the schools were established after discussion **sometimes by orders**; there was also some covert resistance to the goals at times; and the administrators employed System 3 (Consultative Approach) of Management Style. As to **Control**, the administrators believed there was a moderate delegation to lower levels in terms of review and control functions; sometimes, informal organizations in the schools manifest resistance to the formal organization; cost, productivity, and other control data were employed as means of reward and self guidance; and System 3 (Consultative Approach) appeared to be the administrators' Management Style. The standard deviations obtained for the different variables indicated the narrow dispersions of the means for each variable, further revealing the homogeneity of the administrators in terms of their perception about their organizational characteristics.

The Organizational Characteristics and the Management Styles employed by the College administrators in their schools were reflected by the school's organizational cultures. Both administrators and subordinates were very free to talk about their jobs; there's a moderate amount of cooperative teamwork, downward communications accepted with a cautious mind; decision making process has some contribution to the motivational aspects of the subordinates; after discussion, the organizational goals are established by orders; and cost, productivity, and other control data used through rewards or through some self guidance.

The administrators' organizational characteristics linked to their management styles were also determined and showed that the administrators' organizational characteristics in terms of their management styles as a whole employed the System 3 (Consultative Approach) of Management Style. When classified as to their academic ranks, only administrators with Instructor as their academic ranks employed the System 4 (Participative Approach) of Management Style. The rest of the categories of administrators used System 3 (Consultative Approach) of Management Style. The standard deviations further showed the homogeneity of the administrators in each category in relation to the Management Style.

Assertiveness

This study found out that the College administrators whether taken as an entire group or as to their gender, educational attainment, length of service, administrators in different campuses, the rest of their academic ranks, and administrative designations, rated themselves “assertive”. However, the administrators with Professor as their academic ranks, and those administrators with administrative designation as Vice Presidents exhibited an “aggressive” assertiveness level. Most of the administrators in the different categories were heterogeneous in terms of their assertiveness.

Moreover, the Kruskal-Wallis Test revealed no significant differences in the assertiveness of the College administrators when classified as to educational attainment, academic ranks, administrative designation, and campuses. The result simply showed that the College administrators were all assertive.

Administrators’ performance

The College administrators, when taken as an entire group, manifested a ‘very satisfactory’ performance. When considered as to their sex, both male and female administrators’ performance was ‘very satisfactory’. When classified as to their educational attainment, College administrators with Ed.D./Ph.D. degrees and those with Masters’ degree with Doctoral units were also “very satisfactory”, but those College administrators with only Masters’ degree have an “outstanding” administrative performance.

Likewise, when classified as to their length of service, those College administrators who were 20 years and below in the service had exhibited a “very satisfactory” performance (but those administrators who were above 20 years in the service exhibited an “outstanding” performance. When classified as to their academic ranks, only Professors exhibited an “outstanding” performance; the rest were only on a “very satisfactory” performance. Also, when the College administrators were classified as to their administrative designations, only the Vice Presidents exhibited an “outstanding” performance. When classified as to the campuses, only NIPSC Concepcion Campus exhibited an “outstanding” performance. The rest of the College campuses exhibited a “very satisfactory” administrative/administrators’ performance.

Differences in the performance, assertiveness and performance of NIPSC administrators

When classified as to sex, the College administrators’ performance has no significant difference. Likewise, when classified as to their length of service, the College administrators’ performance differed significantly. This simply showed that those College administrators who were above 20 years of service to the College had a significant difference in performance over those College administrators who served the College below 20 years.

The results also revealed no significant differences when the College administrators were classified as to educational attainment, academic ranks, and campuses. However, there was a significant difference in the performance when the College administrators were classified as to their administrative designation.

No significant difference in the assertiveness level of the College administrators when classified as to sex, and as to length of service were also found out. This means that both male and female administrators have the same level of assertiveness. The assertiveness level of the College administrators regardless of whether they were 20 years and below (short) or above 20 years of service in the institution, their assertiveness levels were also the same.

The results of the study further revealed no significant differences in the management styles of the College administrators when classified as to sex and as to length of service.

The mean difference in the College administrators’ management styles showed **no significant difference** in the following as to campuses: Estancia and Sara, Estancia and Concepcion, Estancia and Batad, Estancia and Lemery, Estancia and Barotac Viejo, Sara and Concepcion, Sara and Batad, Sara and Lemery, Sara and Barotac Viejo, Concepcion and Batad, Concepcion and Lemery, Concepcion and Barotac Viejo, Batad and Lemery, Batad and Barotac Viejo, and Lemery and Barotac Viejo. However, a significant difference in the management styles existed between Ajuy and the rest of the campuses: Sara, Estancia, Concepcion, Batad, Lemery, and Barotac Viejo. It was also found that the only significant predictor of the College administrators’ performance was the organizational characteristics of the different campuses as perceived by the administrators. This means that the impact contribution of the organizational characteristics to the administrators’ performance was about 36.50% to the total variance of organizational characteristics to College administrators’ performance.

The predictor of the College administrators’ performance as an organizational characteristics variable was the decision aspects of the leader. The path analysis showed that the decisions aspect was the most important but decisions were based on goals or objectives of the programs to motivate subordinates. Leadership was also very important with no communication gap for its implementation to realize good performance of the College administrators.

CONCLUSIONS

It was found out in this study that the College administrators believed there is a broad policy at the top, but is accompanied with more delegation; the subordinates are also generally consulted about decisions related to their work; the administrators felt the decision making process in their schools has done some contribution to motivation; and employed the System 3 (Consultative) of Management Styles.

This study confirms that in the *System 3 – Consultative*, the responsibility is, indeed, spread widely through the organizational hierarchy. The superior has substantial but not complete confidence in subordinates. Some amount of discussion about job related things takes place between the superior and subordinates. There is a fair amount of teamwork, and communication takes place vertically and horizontally. The motivation is based on rewards and involvement in the job as emphasized in the Likert and Likert's Organizational Characteristics Profile (1994, in Subong, 1998).

All College administrators were found to be assertive. It is hereby concluded that NIPSCians are willing to undergo all challenges in the workplace and may consider them as good experiences for personal and professional improvement. The result of this study also showed that among the variables in the organizational such as leadership, motivation, communication, decisions, goals, and control, decisions is the only predictor of the College administrators' performance.

The path analysis confirms that the decisions aspect is the most important but decisions are based on goals or objectives of the programs to motivate subordinates. Leadership is also very important with no communication gap for its implementation to realize good performance of the College administrators.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations are hereby forwarded:

The College President could benefit from this study as an end-user of the perceived organizational characteristics as perceived by the College administrators since the culture of the different campuses are reflected in the assertiveness, and performance of the College administrators. This would give him idea as to what programs to implement and strategies to utilize to make the College become a catalyst of change towards quality performance in its service.

The College administrators are expected to get an eye-view of their organizational characteristics that could enable them to embrace new strategies and plan out activities to improve their performance. It is also expected that they could readily ascertain the importance of their roles in their respective campuses and make them continue to work with quality and excellence. Since the results of the study shows that decisions aspect is the most important, the College administrators must consider that decisions are based on goals or objectives of the programs to motivate subordinates. Leadership is also very important with no communication gap for its implementation to realize their good performance as College administrators.

The parents and benefactors are expected to gain more confidence and trust to the Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College, knowing that efficient and effective school management are given much priority for the welfare and complete development of the students.

The students should feel confident that their school administrators are working with quality and are performing well in their respective roles which could pave the way for better services and facilities for learning.

Since this study presents the results based on the questionnaires as research instrument, the researcher should gain more knowledge on the characteristics of an organization where she belongs and help create plans and programs in the institution's quest for academic excellence. She could perhaps, internalize the path analysis provided and use it to better perform her responsibilities, as one of the College administrators.

The future researchers may use the result of this study to enhance their respective researches using the same variables or utilize other variables for their own purpose. This could further encourage them to work into some factors that might improve the result of the investigation.

REFERENCES

1. Pereda, P.R. and Pereda P.P. (2014). Principles of Management and Organization. Mindshapers Co., Inc. Intramuros, Manila.
2. Andong, J.V. (2015). "Teaching Performance and Instructional Competence of the Secondary School Teachers". Unpublished Graduate Research Paper. Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College, Estancia, Iloilo.
3. Bayhon, R.S. (2013). "Vertical Articulation in the NIPSC System" Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College, Estancia, Iloilo.
4. Besonia, B.A. (2014). "Marxist, Feminist, and Reader-Response Perspective of William C. Faulkner's 'A Rose for Emily'". Unpublished Graduate Research Paper. Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College, Estancia, Iloilo.

5. Maligang,A.P.(2013).“Language Anxiety and English Performance of the Freshmen College Students. Unpublished Graduate Research Paper. Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College, Estancia, Iloilo.
6. Subong,P.E.(1998). "Organizational Characteristics, Assertiveness, and Management Styles of the Higher Education Institutions in the Province of Iloilo". Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. West Visayas State University, Iloilo City.
7. NIPSC Research and Extension Journal, July-September 2014, Vol. 1, No. 1.
8. Ahmetoglu, G.; Leutner, F.; and Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (December 2011). "EQ-nomics: Understanding the relationship between individual differences in trait emotional intelligence and entrepreneurship." (PDF). *Personality and Individual Differences* 51 (8): 1028–1033. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.08.016.
9. Bono, J. E., and Judge, T. A. (2003). Core self-evaluations: A review of the trait and its role in job satisfaction and job performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 17(Suppl1), S5-S18. doi:10.1002/per.48.
10. Cote, S. and Miners, C.T.H. (2006). "Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence and job performance", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(1), pp1-28.
11. Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance: In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp. 35-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
12. Craighead, E. W. and Nemeroff C. B.(2002). p. 142 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assertiveness> - retrieved August 4, 2015.
13. Erez, A., and Judge, T. A. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations to goal setting, motivation, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1270-1279.
14. Farh, C. C.; Tesluk S.(March 5, 2012). "Emotional Intelligence, Teamwork Effectiveness, and Job Performance: The Moderating Role of Job Context". *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/a0027377.
15. Johnson, R. <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/top-10-characteristics-healthy-organization-20452.html> - retrieved August 4, 2015.
16. Joseph, D. L. and Newman, D. A. (2010). "Emotional Intelligence: An Integrative Meta-Analysis and Cascading Model". *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95 (1): 54–78. doi:10.1037/a0017286
17. Meador, D. http://teaching.about.com/od/admin/a/What-Makes-A-School-Administrator-An-Effective-School-Leader.htm?utm_term=school%20administrators&utm_content=p1-main-2-title&utm_medium=sem&utm_source=msn&utm_campaign=adid-aa92a027-69ab-4c34-9840-458c440af9c4-0-ab_msb_ocode-29604&ad=semD&an=msn_s&am=broad&q=school%20administrators&dqi=&o=29604&l=sem&qsrc=999&askid=aa92a027-69ab-4c34-9840-458c440af9c4-0-ab_msb - retrieved August 10, 2015.
18. Reynolds, M. (2010). <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/wander-woman/201011/the-fine-art-female-assertiveness> - retrieved August 4, 2015.
19. Sackett, P. R., and Devore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D. Ones, H. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 145–164). London, UK: Sage.
20. Scott, E. <http://stress.about.com/od/relationships/p/profileassertiv.htm> - retrieved August 4, 2015.
21. Stybel, L. Ed.D., and Peabody, M.(2003). Platform for Success. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/platform-success/201303/people-want-follow-calm-assertive-leaders> - retrieved August 4, 2015.
22. Tang, Y. and Chang, C. (2010, February 26). Impact of role ambiguity and role conflict on employee creativity. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(6), 869-881.
23. Wilson, J. H. *Regent University Emerging Leadership Journeys*, Vol. 3 Iss. 1, 2010, pp. 33-41. © 2010 School of Global Leadership & Entrepreneurship, Regent University ISSN 1930-806X, editorelj@regent.edu
Wilson/EMERGING LEADERSHIP JOURNEYS 40
24. http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/elj/vol3iss1/Wilson_ELJV311_pp33-41.pdf - Retrieved September 28, 2015.
25. Wolpe, J.(1958). <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assertiveness> - retrieved August 4, 2015.
26. Microsoft® Encarta® 2009.- retrieved August, 2015.
27. dictionary.reference.com/browse/academic+rank - retrieved August 4, 2015
28. <http://www.skillsyouneed.com/ps/assertiveness.html> - retrieved August 4, 2015.
29. http://www.answers.com/Q/What_are_the_characteristics_of_an_organization - retrieved August 4, 2015.
30. http://psychology.wikia.com/wiki/Organizational_characteristics - retrieved August 4, 2015.
31. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Job_performance - retrieved August 10, 2015).