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Abstract—The Institutional Sustainability Performance (ISP) of State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the Philippines reveals the level of compliance and fidelity of the latter to the mandates of the state. This performance evaluation procedure aims to perpetually monitor and sustain the quality of services provided by the state institutions in the country. Importantly, the SUC level rating is one of the key indicators of the merit system adopted by the state to give incentives to government institutions. With the crucial role of the ISP and SUC level in the performance of an institution and in sustaining quality assurance, this study theorized that the top managers’ capacity to influence is the critical factor in meeting the expectations of the state.

This study assessed the top managers’ capacity to influence. The hypothesis in this study proved that leadership style of top managers has significant relationship to the managers’ capacity to influence for institutional sustainability performance. Thus, the subjects of this study were restricted only to the State Universities and Colleges (SUC) that qualified in the top 20 Institutional Sustainability Performance; the digital governance performance, and the SUC leveling status nationwide. The top managers and their subordinates with doctorate of Bulacan State University and Bataan Peninsula State University whose programs have been consistently submitted to accreditation and were ranked Levels III and IV were subjected and participated to the study.

The standardized instrument adopted from an extensive research and used by the Survey of Influence and effectiveness measured and interpreted the capacity building of the top managers of the two state universities in the Philippines. The data collected were subjected to a correlation analysis. The analyses of the correlation coefficients acquired from the level of significance $t$ revealed that almost all the leadership style correlated positively with the manager’s capacity to influence. This means that in general, the higher the leadership styles, the higher the manager’s capacity to influence. Thus, this study suggested the capacity building program for institutional sustainability performance.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The Institutional Sustainability Performance (ISP) [5] of State Universities and Colleges (SUC) in the Philippines which stemmed in the National Compensation Circular (NCC) No.12 has become a prevailing issue among SUC top-level managers nowadays. Other than the fact that this evaluation procedure determines the salary grade of SUC Presidents and Vice Presidents (NCC No.12) and reveal the SUC’s self-sustaining institution status; impliedly, this mandate becomes a rigid command which state universities and colleges have to follow. Categorizing SUCs from Levels I to level 4 depending on its level of compliance to the Key Results Areas (KRA) A. Quality and Relevance of Instructions; B. Research Capability and Outputs within the Last Three (3) Years; C. Relations with and Services to the Community; and the Management Resources - The Department of Budget and Management (DBM) and the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) through a joint circular No.1, Series 2003; and the extent of implementation of every institution to the four-fold function-instruction, research, community service, production (RA7722) is the implied directive which Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) adhere to. The four KRAs represent the major indicators that measure the stages of development and institutional performance of the respective SUCs.

Directives put the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) under oath to exercise its power by promoting among institutions of higher learning the full implementation of four-fold functions. Though HEIs may opt not to submit itself to accreditation, endowed with academic freedom-RA7722; still, these privileges do not free HEIs from the perpetual monitoring and evaluation of the state for quality assurance.

The Philippine government now puts into effect the wide implementation of the merit system or the merit promotion system (E.O.80). This attempt aims to encourage every citizen to shift their paradigms and become more productive and efficient laborers - OPIF-DBM, SPMSCSC, RBPMS.

The sustainability performance of one’s institution is perpetually monitored by CHED. Series of monitoring systems are being implemented to periodically check the fidelity of one’s higher institutions to the state policies that are stipulated in Article XIV, Sec.1 of the 1987 constitution, the Batas Pambansa 232, and the Republic Act 7722 or the Higher Education Act of 1982. The quality assurance projects include the setting and enforcement of Policies, Standards, and Guidelines (PSGs) for academic programs, monitoring of compliance and phase out/closure of non-compliant programs, Institutional Quality Assurance Monitoring and Evaluation (IQuAME), CHED RQuAT, Regional Quality Assurance Team, and voluntary accreditation. The voluntary accreditation checks the alignment of the attributes of graduates to the vision and mission of the school and the quality of its instruction; while Philippine Qualifications Framework, E.O. 83, s. 2012, Institutionalization of the PQF, determines the “fitness of and for purpose” as well as the extent of the implementation and the degree of commitment to standards of the top-level managers in exercising reasonable supervision and regulation (RA7722) towards the achievement of institutional sustainability.
This study assessed the top level managers’ capacity to influence. The focal point of the study was proving that leadership styles relate to the managers’ capacity to influence. The results identified the capacity building that would help the top-level managers of select SUCs in Region III to further lead and influence for institutional sustainability performance.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The framework illustrates the relationship of the independent and dependent variables. The line that connects to the variables and the arrow show its correlation to the intervening variable.

### Independent Variable

**Leadership styles**

1. Authoritarian
2. Paternalistic
3. Democratic
4. Laissez-faire
5. Transactional
6. Transformational

### Dependent Variable

**Managers’ Capacity to Influence**

1. Managing
   - Self
   - Others
2. Leading
   - Teams
   - Organization
3. Seeking and Giving Information
   - Reading
   - Listening
   - Writing
   - Speaking

### Capacity Building Program for Institutional Sustainability Performance

This study theorized that leadership style – independent variable - has significant relationship to the managers’ capacity to influence – dependent variable - which is categorized as to managing, leading, and seeking and giving information. This showed the relationship of the leadership style and the managers’ capacity to influence for institutional sustainability.

III. METHODOLOGY

The descriptive and inferential analysis design was applied which identified the predominant perceptions and views of the sixty-three (63) faculty members and twenty four (24) top managers with doctorate in Bataan Peninsula State University (BPSU) and Bulacan State University (BuSU) whose programs have qualified to level III to level IV status in the 2012 AACUP accreditation was included in the study. The respondents assessed the two (2) university presidents; the four vice presidents – for academic affairs and research and extension; the ten (10) deans / campus directors; and seven (7) area chairs. Both target subjects in this study have equal ranks in the institutional sustainability performance ranking based on the CMO60 s. 2007 which was released last 2007. In reference to the rank of SUCs in terms of institutional performance (CMO35s.2003) both- BPSU and BSU ranked 19.5. The responses were considered valid since experts and authorities evaluated the performance of the top management (CMO40, s2008). The standardized questionnaire in assessing the capacity building of managers was adopted in the extensive research on Survey of Influence and Effectiveness (SIE) [1]. Lastly, the data were subjected to correlation to determine if significant relationship exists. The analysis and interpretation of correlation answer the research hypothesis that leadership style has significant relationship to managers’ capacity to influence for institutional sustainability performance.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.179**</td>
<td>.151**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.260**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.179**</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>.219**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2tailed).**

The analyses of the correlation coefficients in Table I where the level of significant at 0.01 revealed that almost all the leadership styles correlated positively with the manager’s capacity to influence in managing self, others, and meetings. This means that in general, the higher the leadership style, the higher the manager’s capacity to influence in managing self,
others, and meetings. Further analysis of the data would show that the three variables, namely: authoritarian leadership, paternalistic leadership, and democratic leadership correlated negatively to managing self; managing others and meetings; managing meetings, respectively. The results indicate that these variables inversely correlated to manager’s capacity to influence.

The strategic planning should begin with the desired-end and works backwards to the current status [13]. From the recorded results in this study, this proved that the leadership style of top managers correlated positively to the manager’s capacity to influence in managing self, others, and meetings. Similar results were recorded that management and leadership can and does in the UK and elsewhere enhance performance for economic and social benefit [2]; management and leadership development contributes to performance in multiple rather than a single way; and management and leadership capability is located collectively in organization. Also, since leadership theory determines the kind of manager in an organization [16], then, the leadership style and manager’s capacity to influence are crucial in the productivity in the organizational level, down to the system level and to the individual level.

Table II presents the correlation of leadership style in leading teams and organization. The analysis of the correlation coefficients in Table II where the level of significant is at .01, revealed that the predictor variables correlated with the manager’s capacity to influence in leading teams and organizations. Of the six predictor variables, almost all correlated positively to leading teams and organizations. This means that in general, the higher the leadership style, the higher the manager’s capacity to influence in leading teams and organizations. The variable laissez-faire and transactional correlated negatively to leading teams and organizations. This means that laissez-faire and transactional inversely affect to leading teams and organizations respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.137**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>.105**</td>
<td>.185**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.272**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.282**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2tailed).

The fundamental role of managers is to constantly look for ways on how to improve the technique of finding creative alternative solutions and innovations [17]. The results of measures of internal management and the use of multiple performance indicators will allow for the development of strategic guide for management [12]. Relatively, the relationships between transformational leadership and goal accomplishment did not indicate a significant correlation but have implications in applying transformational leadership [10]. Similarly, transformational leadership has positive, strong and significant association with the commitment. The motivational level in respect of laissez-faire is low because of not interference of management. Laissez-faire also have positive relation but due to insignificant relation, it indicates that laissez-faire is not important style that boost the motivation level of workers to other leadership styles [3].

Table III presents the correlation of leadership style in seeking and giving information. As viewed in the preceding table where the level of significant is at 0.01, analysis of the correlation coefficients in Table III revealed that all the six predictor variables correlated positively to manager’s capacity to influence in seeking and giving information. This means that the higher the leadership style, the higher the manager’s capacity to influence in seeking and giving information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>.226**</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.584**</td>
<td>.605**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>.141**</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.577**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>.640**</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>.112**</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.551**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.345**</td>
<td>.566**</td>
<td>.516**</td>
<td>.532**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.623**</td>
<td>.560**</td>
<td>.594**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2tailed).

A closer look at the obtained coefficients, one could glean that only authoritarian to listening; paternalistic to writing; democratic to speaking; and transformational to reading correlated negatively. These obtained negatively correlated coefficients revealed that these variables inversely correlated.

Considering the measurement of the ranking of leadership behavior [7]; past leadership behavior both of the leader and the followers in terms of traits [18]; interactions between leaders and followers [8] and charisma [9], the leadership style applied in a state university may be predictive of the institutional sustainability performance of an institution. Similarly, HEIs are essentially dynamic operations- their quality cannot be assured with a static process [11]; there is a need to establish working linkages [6]; digital governance in learning, promoting citizen participation, and advocating peace were recorded apposite substantial [4]; an effective and collaborative planning to enable greater scales of change and integration of activist oriented research (participatory action research and collective inquiry) [15]. The different facets of leadership style define the very challenging nature of the role of top managers. The contradicting theories that there is a science for every need [17]; and there is no best way to organize and lead an organization [14]; validate that the challenge is on the capacity of the managers to coordinate separate components together for institutional sustainability performance.

V. Conclusion

The data that were subjected to correlation analysis recorded that leadership style has significant correlation on leadership style in terms of seeking and giving information.
through reading, listening, writing, and speaking. As viewed in the enumerated tables where the level of significant is at 0.01 level using two-tailed test, it showed that almost all the leadership styles showed a significant correlation to managing self; others; meetings; leading teams; organization; and seeking and giving information through reading; listening; writing; and speaking; except authoritarian and self; paternalistic and others; democratic and team; laissez-faire and team; transactional and organization; authoritarian and listening; paternalistic and writing; democratic and speaking; and transformational and reading. From the weak points in the attributes, the findings revealed that there is the need to promote the adoption of transformational leadership style. The focus is on increasing the sources of power using the ability of managers to influence to increase commitment [1]. In the same manner, the target is to influence the values of the individual system.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

From the empirical results collected, the adoption of the transformational leadership style is highly recommended. The focus of this leadership style is on increasing the sources of power and influence of the individual system. Since, it was proven that the leadership style of top managers has significant correlation to the attributes that are crucial in meeting the institutional sustainability performance indicators; then, top managers are expected to model prudence in promoting the source of WILL power of every individual unit. When this most important source of power is enhanced, people are more likely to become more committed to their work. Thus, top managers may enhance their capacity building and may aim to become mentors. Conversely, since institutional sustainability is a process by which all its members and components work together as individuals in a group under one system to increase their capacity and performance in relation to its purpose, resources, and environment, management supervision and control should be exclusive and institutional. Likewise, the General System Theory of Bertalanfy function as unified systems are self-regulating and self-correcting; therefore, this theory best fits to the indicators of institutional sustainability performance.

State Universities in region III are recommended to create a pool of experts to be called BRAINS. Since, the ISP is done periodically, then, there should be a system in each institution that would monitor and sustain the required outputs indicated in CMO60. BRAINS is an acronym for Best Researches Approaches Inventions and Novel Stratagems. BRAINS in turn would be the system that would control the sustenance and maintenance of the performance of all the systems in each institution in the fourfold function- instruction, research, extension, and management of resources for institutional sustainability performance.
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