

# Variables Associated with the Institutional Development Services of Selected Higher Education Institutions

John Noel S. Nisperos

**Abstract**— Administrators, faculty/staff, and students of selected Higher Education Institutions identified their socio-demographic characteristics based on the majority of the respondents. Institutional development services were significantly affected or influenced by the respondents' socio-demographic characteristics. There were institutional development services implemented in instruction, research, extension, and production with focus on the whole organization, system orientation, use of change agent, problem solving, experiential learning, group processes, feedback, contingency orientation, and team building. Faculty/Staff rated satisfactory on their institutional development services in instruction and research while fair for extension and production. Meanwhile, students rated satisfactory on the institutional development services in instruction, research, extension and production. Administrators, faculty/staff and students identified and ranked the variables that contributed most to institutional development. There were no significant differences on the current institutional development services in instruction, research, extension, and production. Faculty/Staff rated fair on the weaknesses and problems encountered instruction, research, extension and production. Meanwhile, students rated fair on the weaknesses/problems encountered in instruction, research, and extension, while in production not serious for state HEI's and fair for private HEI's. There were significant differences on the weaknesses and problems encountered by faculty/staff between the state and private HEI's along with instruction, research and extension while significant differences did not occur in production. Meanwhile, there were no significant differences on the weaknesses/problems encountered by students between the state and private HEI's along with instruction, research, extension, and production.

**Index Terms**— Contingency orientation, experiential learning, extension, feedback, focus the whole organization, group processes, Higher Education Institutions (HEI's), institutional development services, instruction, problem solving, production, research, system orientation, team building, use of change agent

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In any educational institutions, leaders always clamor for change and development. These two interdependent facets exacerbate positive outlook in the part of the learners and the teachers as a whole. For this reason, education leaders and planners are always in the process of exploring pertinent alternatives to modify the barriers that may come, whether in social, economic and technical aspects of the system.

The quest for development is almost everywhere and occurs almost at every point of history. While the concern for development is universal, its application is local [9] (Garcia, 1985). Many institutions nowadays have their respective mission, vision, goals and objectives evolved in their perspectives to light their paths for quality output.

This century that we have now is a decade of voluminous challenges and responses. It is a world of change, evolving patterns and innovations. Hence, the Philippine educational system is not excused from the scenario of change and development. This system evolved from the past plans and conflicts resolve patterns many times, but usually revitalized by the thorough clarifications, experimentations, explorations, and implementations taken in the later decades [17] (Quiniones, 1996).

In a worldwide setting, social scientists and scholars asserted the global critical development issues for the 1990's and the 21<sup>st</sup> century is not growth. It is the transformation of our values, our behaviour, institutions and technology that is consistent without ecological and social realities [4] (David, 1990). In the same manner, the magnitude of change over the past decades gives an indication of , pervasiveness and character. The forces of change for

both "Baby Boomer" and millennial are technological advancement, avalanche of information, social changes, political movements, economic variable, value changes, fast-rate of change, and demographic regeneration.

One of the changes that we can perceive today is our educational reform. Education in the country plays a vital role for the development and interdependence of one's mind to the fullest. This is corollary to our ultimate aims in education outlined in our Philippine Constitution (1987), Article XV, Section 8, Subsections 1 and 4 states that the schools in the country should develop among the pupils love of country, teach the duties of citizenship, and develop moral character, personal discipline, scientific, technological, and vocational efficiency.

With increased social mobility and human progress, the challenges to our educators have no doubt become truly daunting. These challenges have become even more formidable in the light of our national goals of people empowerment, social reform and global competitiveness [18] (Ramos, 1996).

On the other hand, [10] Gloria (1996) emphasized that decentralization and modernization are the cornerstones on which we hope to establish a new policy environment for educational excellence. But we must do the right things in the right way.

For this, institutional development services of higher education institutions play a significant role in manifesting the goals of education for nation building. Their contributions will depend upon the way and extent of implementing their respective institutional development plan in the service of their clientele.

Institutional development plan is a continuous process. Thus,

each member within the institution must take their part by constantly identifying and generating resources and alternatives to fulfil and attain the real meaning of the word development.

## 2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This research study attempted to determine and assess the variables associated with the institutional development services of selected higher education institutions.

Specifically, the research sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the socio-demographic characteristics of administrators, faculty/staff and students?
2. Do the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents affect or influence to the institutional development services of their institution?
3. What are the current institutional development services of selected higher education institutions in terms of instruction, research, extension and production?
4. To what extent are these institutional development services implemented in relation to their institutional development plan?
5. What are the factors that contribute most to institutional development?
6. Do these current institutional development services significantly vary among the selected state and private higher education institutions?
7. What is the extent of seriousness of problems encountered in relation to the implementation of their institutional development plan?
8. Are there significant differences among the state and private higher education institutions as to the extent of seriousness of the problems encountered?

## 3 METHODOLOGY

Descriptive survey method of research was used in the study. The respondents involved in this study were selected using a combination of the stratified random sampling and proportional quota allocation technique [12] (Guildford, J.P. and Fruchter, B., 1975).

This sampling technique considered the inclusion of samples from the selected HEI's in Region XII, Philippines. The total number of respondents lies from the total population of the administrators, faculty/staff and students.

This study was conducted in the two provinces of Cotabato and Lanao del Norte, Region XII, Philippines. Higher Education Institutions namely: Cotabato Foundation College of Science & Technology, Central Mindanao Colleges, Mindanao State University-Iligan Institute of Technology, North Cotabato College of Arts and Trades, Notre Dame of Kidapawan College, Notre Dame of Midsayap College, Southern Baptist College, Southern Christian College, St. Michael's College, St. Peter's College, and University of Southern Mindanao were coded alphabetically for the purpose of facilitating the analysis and interpretation of data.

There were three structured questionnaires used namely: Respondent personal information and institutional development services for Administrators, Faculty/Staff information and per-

sonal information assessment of the administration, administrators and institutional development services, and Student personal information and assessment to the administration and faculty/staff.

Frequency counts, percentages, means and standard deviations including ranking of the variables that contributed most to institutional development and ratings on the extent of implementation of development services, so with the extent of seriousness of weaknesses/problems encountered were used in the descriptive portion of the analysis.

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to find out if the institutional development services were affected or influenced by the respondents' socio-demographic characteristics. Post Hoc Tests were particularly used in this portion. The t-test for independent samples was used to determine if these institutional development services significantly vary between the selected state and private Higher Education Institutions (HEI's) and to find out if there were significant differences between the state and private HEI's as to the extent of seriousness of the weaknesses/problems encountered. [14] Levene's (1960) Test for equality of variance was particularly used in this portion, along with instruction, research, extension and production.

## 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Socio-demographic characteristics of administrators, faculty/staff and students

There were 27 state and 23 private HEI administrators, 99 state and 94 private HEI faculty/staff while 203 state and 195 private HEI students included in the study.

Most of the administrators were male, 16 (59.30%) among state HEI's while female, 19 (82.60%) for private HEI's ranging from 51-55, 9 (33.33%) age bracket for state HEI's while 46-50, 9 (39.1%) for private HEI's. Both state and private HEI administrators were married, with MS, MA, MPS or MBA as their highest educational attainment. As to their academic rank, state HEI administrators range from Associate Professor I-V, 13 (48.10%) with Director or Dean, 9 (33.30%) as an Administrative Position while Assistant Professor I-IV, 14 (60.90%) for private HEI's with Department Chairman, 12 (52.20%) for their Administrative Position. Both state and private HEI administrators has a permanent employment status.

As to the number of years in service, state HEI administrators range from 21-25, 12 (44.40%) years while 16-20, 10 (43.50%) for private HEI administrators both finished graduate program taken and with a very satisfactory performance rating.

For Faculty/Staff, both state and private HEI's were female with 46-50, 43 (43.40%) and 31-35 (31.90%) age bracket respectively and were married. As to their highest educational attainment, MS, MA, MPS or MBA, 70 (70.70%) for state HEI's with Assistant Professor I-IV, 49 (49.50%) as their academic rank while BS, 55 (58.50%) for private HEI's with Instructor I-III, 65 (69.10%) academic rank. Both state and private HEI faculty/staff has a permanent employment status.

As to the number of years in service, state HEI faculty/staff range from 21-25, (41.40%) years while 11-15, (39.40%) for private HEI's both finished graduate program taken and with a very satisfactory performance rating.

For students, both state and private HEI's were dominated by female with 18-20 age bracket and were single and taking up Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED). As to their year level, third year, 56 (27.60%) for state HEI's while second year, 63 (32.30%) for private HEI's both with Cebuano tribe and Roman Catholic as their religion. For state HEI students, farming ranked most as to the occupation of their father, 71 (34.90%) while businessman, 59 (30.30%) for private HEI's and both housekeeping as their mothers' occupation with an average monthly gross income of 11,000 – 15, 000, 62 (30.50%) and 6,000 – 10,000, 81 (41.50%) respectively.

#### 4.2 Effect of Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents' Rating of their Institutional Development Services

Based on the ranking scores, the socio-demographic characteristics of administrators significantly affect or influenced the institutional development services ( $F_c = 31.980, p < 0.05$ ). In like manner, the socio-demographic characteristics of faculty/staff significantly affected the institutional development services ( $F_c = 8.935, p < 0.05$ ). Likewise, the socio-demographic characteristics of students significantly influenced the institutional development services ( $F_c = 7.332, p < 0.05$ ). Thus, the hypothesis is accepted.

It is therefore concluded that the administrators, faculty/staff and students' socio-demographic characteristics significantly influenced their rating of institutional development services. The result is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. F-value of the ANOVA on the influence of the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents' rating of their development services.**

SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	Computed F-value	Tabular F-value
Administrators	31.980*	.000
Faculty/Staff	8.935*	.000
Students	7.332*	.000

$p < 0.05$

\* = significant at 5% set level of significance

#### 4.3 Current Institutional Development Services of Selected Higher Education Institutions in terms of Instruction, Research, Extension and Production

An institution of higher learning exists in order to bring about desirable changes in the lives of the students by providing them the kind of education they need [16] (Pontinoza, 1983). Education is necessary in a democratic society. One needs this to be able to exercise his rights and to perform his duties as a good citizen. However, education is not achieved by memorizing books from cover to cover, but by getting the essential facts to be applied in life [2] (Barcenas, 1983).

[13] Hersey and Blanchard's (1982) Situational Leadership Theory as cited by [3] Bauzon (1993) considered variables included in this study. Administrators from selected state and

private HEI's revealed that in Instruction, Focus the Whole Organization variables such as admission requirements, curriculum planning, curriculum revisions, appropriation for physical facilities and supplies, offering of scholarships/grants or financial incentives for faculty/staff, offering of scholarships, grants or aids to students were practiced. Under System Orientation, institution or group activities was observed among state HEI's while institution-community relations for private HEI's. Under Use of Change Agent, both state and private HEI's suggested for a quality change agent. Under Problem Solving, escalation of function with lower outputs and problems and action for budget and finance were practiced while escalation of function with lower outputs only for private HEI's. For Experiential Learning, state HEI's focused on the development of the immediate experience of subordinates while activities for instructional development for private HEI's. Under Group Processes, solve intergroup conflicts is given priority for state HEI administrators while co-curricular and extra-curricular activities and communication and information system were given priority for private HEI's. Under Feedback, immediate action on the constraints in instruction were selected by both state and private HEI's the same with Team Building where action for effective cooperative instruction must be recognized.

Colleges and universities should be deeply involved not only in the development of skills and in the transmission of knowledge but also in inculcation of a spirit of inquiry through research, a capacity for analysis of acts discovered, and a willingness to set on into the unknown. In other words, modern colleges and universities must be oriented to the service of science and scientific investigations [11] (Gregorio, H. and Gregorio, C., 1976).

For Research, both state and private HEI administrators have an eclectic type of research under Focus the Whole Organization. Under System Orientation, state HEI's recommended to hasten and develop the personnel involved in research while the same for private HEI's plus the need of an authority who leads and proposes researches and projects. Under Use of Change Agent, have bases in selecting a research director/coordinator or researcher was recommended by state HEI's while research consultants for private HEI's. For Problem Solving, state HEI administrators suggested to upgrade the researches done and utilize the researches done while for private HEI's, suggestion for a quality research output plus utilization of the researches done. Under Experiential Learning, state HEI's believed on the insights gained in conducting research and the advantages of conducted researches, while priorities in conducting research for private HEI's. As to the Group Processes, both state and private HEI's selected the integration of individual or group research. More group activities done in conducting research as further recommended by state HEI administrators. For Feedback, Contingency Orientation and Team Building, both state and private HEI's chose programs on the conclusions and recommendations done, choose the best methodology and build better teamwork for subordinates.

As one of the functions of HEI's, [8] Galuba (1982) suggested that research be encouraged through a system of incentives on alternative sources of materials for instruction using indigenous community resources. [6] Esguerra (1978) also recommended that efforts be exerted towards a better performance.

Extension program is a success by and through the commitment of the personnel and active participation of some agencies which served as linkages [7] (Flores, 1989). He added that extension programs could be successful through commitment of personnel and active participation of some agencies which served as linkages. He also added that extension programs could be successful through commitment of personnel and active participation of some agencies as linkages.

For Extension, both state and private HEI administrators revealed that their institutions has a contribution on extension activities under Focus the Whole Organization, step in conducting an extension activity for System Orientation, involvement in conducting extension work for Use of Change Agent.

Under Problem Solving, step in helping a service area was suggested by state HEI administrators while follow-up of projects and activities done for private HEI administrators. For Experiential Learning, state HEI's chose suggestion of method for an effective extension program while priorities in providing extension personnel for private HEI's. On the other hand, advantages in conducting an extension activity in group, action on the constraints reported by subordinates, utilization of single or several ways/alternatives and build better teamwork for subordinates were chosen by state and private HEI's under Group Processes, Feedback, Contingency Orientation and Team Building.

Higher Education Institutions need to generate resources by income-generating projects, encourage the support system from the different agencies and even transforming their institutions for accreditation. If this could be realized an institution will have a greater income and even budget for any proposed projects.

This entails team management, as [20] Tagaro (1995) revealed that administrators and faculty of State Universities and Colleges in Region XII practice team management which is a high concern for both people and production.

In Production, state HEI's have particular outputs and programs in production and further suggested for greater output and programs for Focus the Whole Organization while contribution of programs and projects to development for private HEI's. Furthermore, there was a group who evaluates output and programs for state HEI's under System Orientation while the same for private HEI's plus having a frequent evaluation. There was an authority involved in conducting programs and projects for state HEI's under Use of Change Agent while productions consultants for private HEI's. In addition, maintenance of budget and appropriation, step in upgrading production, significant developments experienced by subordinates, group activities done for income generation and programs, action on the constraints in production, authority who formulates objectives and methods and steps in maintaining excellent output were practiced by the selected state and private HEI's under Problem Solving, Experiential Learning, Group Processes, Feedback, Contingency Orientation and Team Building.

On the other hand, production also considers the product of an institution, the graduates. [19] Sanchez and Agpaoa (1987) stated that graduates would answer the occupational and professional demands of society through its practical, inexpensive, innovative, and broadened educational services within the reach of the urban and rural poor in order to help solve the

problems of mass poverty and unemployment.

It is imperative to empower all the resources needed, including the graduates by guiding them to a professional endeavour that suits their years-long learning and thereby inspire them attain their goals in life.

#### 4.4 Extent on the Implementation Institutional Development Services in Relation to their Institutional Development Plan

Faculty/Staff rated satisfactory on their institutional development services in instruction and research while fair for extension and production. Meanwhile, students rated satisfactory on the institutional development services in instruction, research, extension and production.

#### 4.5 Factors that contribute most to institutional development

Our government must invest more in the Filipinos so we can send out to the world better-educated and highly-skilled countrymen. Knowledge and jobs in the global economy and enable them to lead our country's drive to join the league of prosperous nations [15] (Macatangay, 1996). Government has to consider the following inputs to schools/institutions in order for educational institutions to come up with quality outputs or quality education. These are quality educational facilities, quality students/pupils, quality and updated texts and references, quality faculty and administrators, quality methods of teachings and materials, quality co-curricular activities, and quality governance [1] (Amilbahar, 1997).

[5] De La Goza's (1995) concept is corollary to the above mentioned precepts. He said that global excellence only means that our graduates will be globally competitive, if not number one in our region and the world.

Administrators, faculty and staff and students had the following profile based on what they ranked as to the variables that contributed most for institutional development:

#### Profile 1. Variables that contributed most for institutional development.

Variables	Administrators	Faculty/Staff	Students
<b>Socio-demographic</b>	Highest Educational Attainment and Administrative Position	Highest Educational Attainment	Degree sought/course
<b>Instruction</b>	Admission requirements and Formulation of Objectives	Involvement for instructional development services	Scholarships/Grants and benefits enjoyed
<b>Research</b>	Authority who leads and proposes researches and projects	Involvement in research development services and support, Activities	Involvement in research development services

		conducted by faculty/staff	
<b>Extension</b>	Type of extension services served	Authority who leads and proposes extension activities	Involvement in extension development services and programs
<b>Production</b>	Contribution of programs and projects for development	Involvement in production development services	Involvement in production development services

**4.6 Determine if these Institutional Development Services Significantly Vary Among the Selected State and Private Higher Education Institutions (HEI's) .**

In order to determine if the institutional development services significantly vary or differ between the selected state and private higher education institutions, administrators, faculty/staff and students' rankings in instruction, research, extension and production were used.

For administrators, faculty/staff, and students, the institutional development services did not significantly differ between public and private along with instruction, research, extension and production. Thus, the hypothesis is accepted. The result is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. T-computed and significance/probability on the significant differences of the institutional development services between the selected state and private Higher Education Institutions (HEI's).**

INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES	t-computed	Significance
<b>Administrators</b>		
Instruction	.024 ns	.981
Research	.146 ns	.884
Extension	.022 ns	.983
Production	-.655 ns	.513
<b>Faculty/Staff</b>		
Instruction	-.076 ns	.940
Research	.039 ns	.969
Extension	.038 ns	.970

Production	-.325 ns	.746
<b>Students</b>		
Instruction	.042 ns	.966
Research	.022 ns	.984
Extension	.015 ns	.988
Production	-.012 ns	.991

p>0.05

ns = not significant at 5% set level of significance

**4.7 Significant Differences Between the Selected State and Private Higher Education Institutions (HEI's) as to the Extent of Seriousness of Weaknesses and Problems Encountered**

Based on the results rated by faculty/staff under instruction, only no instructional support and activities conducted, and jealousy of old faculty and staff to new faculty and staff significantly differed between the state and private Higher Education Institutions, most of the weaknesses/problems encountered in instruction by faculty/staff did not significantly differ between the state and private HEI's.

Thus, the hypothesis was rejected. It is therefore concluded that there were significant differences on the weaknesses/problems encountered in instruction between the selected state and private HEI's.

Under research, only incapable/lack of skill in research significantly differed between the state and private HEI's, most of the weaknesses/problems encountered in research by faculty/staff did not significantly differ between the state and private HEI's. Thus, the hypothesis is rejected. It is therefore concluded that there were significant differences on the weaknesses/problems encountered in research between the selected state and private HEI's.

In extension, no structure/group that coordinates and manages community extension work of the institution and personnel's ineffectiveness or lack of capabilities and skills in the community extension work significantly differed between the selected state and private HEI's. Thus, the hypothesis is rejected. It is therefore concluded that there were significant differences on the weaknesses/problems encountered in extension between the selected state and private HEI's.

All weaknesses and problems encountered by faculty/staff and students in production did not significantly differ between the state and private Higher Education Institutions (HEI's). Thus, the hypothesis is accepted. It is therefore concluded that there were no significant differences on the weaknesses and problems encountered in production between the selected state and private HEI's.

**Table 3. T-computed and significance/probability profile on the significant differences between the selected state and private Higher Education Institutions (HEI's) as to the weaknesses/problems encountered by the students.**

WEAKNESSES/PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED	t-computed	Significance
<b>Faculty/Staff</b>		

<b>Instruction</b> No instructional support and activities conducted	2.33*	.0235
Jealousy of old faculty/staff to new faculty/staff	2.40*	.0287
<b>Research</b> Uncapable/Lack of skill in research activities	2.60*	.0210
<b>Extension</b> No structure/group that coordinates and manages community extension work of the institutions	2.13*	.0442
Personnel's ineffectiveness/lack of capabilities and skills in the community extension work	2.20*	.0448
<b>Production</b> Lack of support for various production from the administration	1.10ns	.2869
Lack of dedication from the faculty/staff for production related activities	1.69ns	.1117

\* =  $p < 0.05$  = significant at 5% set level of significance  
ns =  $p > 0.05$  = not significant at 5 % set level of significance

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the foregoing findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Institutional development services were significantly affected or influenced by the respondents' socio-demographic characteristics.
2. There were institutional development services implemented in instruction, research, extension and production.
3. Faculty/Staff rated satisfactory on their institutional development services in instruction, and research while fair for extension and production. Meanwhile, students rated satisfactory on their institutional development services in instruction, research, extension and production.
4. There were variables that contributed most to institutional development as well as on socio-demographic variables, instruction, research, extension and production.
5. Significant differences occurred on the institutional development services in instruction and research.
6. Weaknesses/problems encountered in instruction, research, extension and production were fair. Thus, the extent of seriousness of weaknesses/problems encountered varied from not serious to very serious.
7. There were no significant differences on the weaknesses/problems encountered from the institutional development services between the selected

state and private Higher Education Institutions, along with instruction, research, extension and production.

## 6 RECOMMENDATIONS

Premised on the findings and conclusions made, the following recommendations were formulated:

1. Authorities involved in leading and proposing services, researches, programs and projects should integrate team management—involving all resources to enhance or transform institution's functions with lower or degrading outputs.
2. Weaknesses/Problems encountered must serve as parameter for innovations and bases for more suitable, timely and needed services geared toward a dynamic organizational structure.
3. Institutional development services implemented in instruction, research, extension and production must be a collaborative experience of all the members in the academe. Strict implementation of the institution's work and financial plans must be observed.

## 7 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wish to extend his sincerest gratitude to the respondents.

## 8 REFERENCES

- [1]Amilbahar, Carmat K. (1997). *Pillars of Total Quality in Education*. Second Annual Convention of Philosophy of Education Society of Mindanao (PESM). North Cotabato College of Arts and Trades (NCCAT), Kidapawan, Cotabato, Philippines. February.
- [2]Barcenas, Leonora J. (1983). *Education and Our National Objectives*. The Philippine Journal of Education. Vol LXII No. 2, July. Philippines
- [3]Bauzon, Prisciliano T. (1993). *Organizational Development for Empowerment*. Second Zonal Training Center. Superintendent Quarterly Forum. ATI-RTC, Training Complex, USM, Kabacan, Cotabato, Philippines.
- [4]David, Kortzen C. (1990). *Getting to the Twenty-First Century*. Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda. Kumarian Press, Inc., Connecticut, USA.
- [5]De La Goza, Rolando S. (1995). *Culture of Excellence at Commission on Higher Education (CHED)*. USM Quarterly, Vol III No. II, July. University of Southern Mindanao, Kabacan, Cotabato, Philippines.
- [6]Esguerra, Josephine S. (1978). *A Survey of Master's Theses Produced in Region I*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Baguio, Baguio City, Philippines.
- [7]Flores, Francisco M. (1989). *The Evaluation of Agricultural Extension Programs of State Colleges and Universities in Region I*. Doctoral Dissertation. Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University. Bacnotan Campus, Bacnotan La Union, Philippines.
- [8]Galuba, Henry L. (1982). *The Faculty of Natural Sciences in the Different Private Colleges and Universities in Region I: Their Academic Profile and Academic Functions*. Doctoral Dissertation. Saint Louis University, Baguio City, Philippines. June.

- [9]Garcia, Manuel B. (1985). *Sociology of Development: Perspectives and Issues*. Metro Manila: National Book Store, Philippines.
- [10]Gloria, Ricardo T. (1996). *Message-Greetings 1997*". PPSTA The Herald, Vol XLXII No. 12, November-December. Philippines.
- [11]Gregorio, Herman C. and Gregorio, Cornelia M. (1976). *Introduction to Education in Philippine Setting*. R.P. Garcia Publishing Co. 903 Quezon Ave. Quezon City, Philippines
- [12] Guilford, Joy Paul and Benjamin Fruchter (1978). *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education*. McGraw-Hill Education (ISE Editions), U.S.A.
- [13]Hersey, Paul and Blanchard, Ken . (1982). *Management of Organizational Behavior Utilizing Human Resources*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition Paul Hersey, Ken Blanchard Prentice Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, USA.
- [14]Levene, Howard (1960). *Robust Tests for Equality of Variances*. Contributions to Probability and Statistics of Harold Hotelling. Stanford University Press. Retrieved from Levene's test-Wikipedia en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Levene's-test
- [15]Macatangay. Ma. Lourdes Q. (1996). *Year 2001: 100 Years of Philippine Public Education*. Philippine Graphic Weekly Magazine (DECS Special Edition), Vol 7, No. 27-A, December. Philippines
- [16]Pontinoza, Zenaida S. (1993). *The Thrust: High Quality Education in the Tertiary Level*. The Philippine Journal of Education. Vol. LXII No. 2. July. Philippines.
- [17]Quiniones, John C. (1996). *The Institutional Development Programs of Private Tertiary Schools in La Union*." Doctoral Dissertation, Saint Louis University, Baguio City, Philippines.
- [18]Ramos, Fidel B. (1986). *Six-Point Thrust Towards Education 2000*. More Than Literacy. PICC, Philippines.
- [19]Sanchez, Custodia A. and Agpaoa, Fe B. (1987). *Contemporary Social Problems and Issues*. (Revised Edition). National Book Store Inc. Kalayaan Press Marketing Enterprises, Inc. 58 Kalayaan, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.
- [20]Tagaro, Consuelo A. (1989). *Variables Associated with Personnel Management Style and Leadership Performance in State Universities and Colleges in Region XII*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Southern Mindanao, Kabacan, Cotabato, Philippines. March.