
Determining Organizational Effectiveness through Organizational Diagnosis*Ruby Refuerzo Buccat* (0000-0003-0226-0490)

University of Baguio, Philippines

*rrbuccat@e.ubaguio.edu

Abstract - The researcher embarked on this study because no published research has been done yet on the same topic in one Philippine university and the results will address the need to improve the effectiveness of the institution. The purpose of this study was to conduct an organizational diagnosis of one university in the Philippines as a basis for determining its organizational effectiveness. The following elements were considered: purposes, structure, leadership, relationships, rewards, helpful mechanisms, and attitude towards change. The study made use of the descriptive-survey and descriptive-evaluative research designs. The teaching and non-teaching personnel of the university under study participated. Only employees with five (5) or more years of service in the university were considered part of the population of the study. Further, only those who were willing to participate were included in the population of the study. The study revealed that the university is functioning well at a moderate level but needs further improvement in some respects. The highest-rated element is relationships, and the lowest-rated element is rewards. The t-test indicate that the two groups agree regarding their perceptions of the elements of purpose and leadership while their perceptions differ along the elements of structure, relationships, rewards, helpful mechanisms, and attitude towards change. The high regard for relationships reflects the family-oriented culture in the university and therefore, must be maintained and nurtured. The elements of rewards, specifically promotions, incentives, pay scale, benefits, and salary, need very serious consideration.

Keywords - organizational effectiveness; diagnosis; business; quality assurance; six-box model

Introduction

The emergence of the twenty-first century has ushered in tremendous changes in every field of endeavor. This age of technology and globalization has influenced people from varied walks of life. In this era, people and organizations are beset with challenges resulting from a rapidly changing globalized economy and society. Today's business environment is becoming more competitive and dynamic. It is imperative that organizations improve their organizational effectiveness to survive and ensure success in a hyper-competitive environment. Since businesses are always looking for ways to develop competitive advantage, securing a business' competitive advantage is a must.

Continuous improvement can help build and secure a competitive advantage. Central to a continuous improvement mindset is the belief that a steady stream of improvements, diligently executed, will have transformational results. A continuous cycle of improvement can be created through the organizational development process. Organizational development is seen as a proactive method that helps companies build the capacity to change and achieve greater effectiveness. In the process, a company's bottom line can be improved as a result of increased efficiency and productivity.

Higher education institutions are organizations expected to project effectiveness in the totality of their operations by accomplishing organizational objectives and the general societal expectations in the near future, adapting and developing in the intermediate future, and surviving in the distant future (Cummings & Worley, 2019).

Aud, Wilkinson-Flicker, Kristapovich, Rathbun, Wang, & Zhang (2014) aver that higher education organizations must continuously strive to meet current demands and challenges in higher education in response to the varied elements of change that have emerged, brought by advances in technology and globalization.

An effective, high-quality higher education system is imperative for a nation's economic progress in today's global environment. A sound higher education system supports and enhances the process of economic and social development for a better future. In this regard, organizational development can play a vital role in achieving sustainable excellence among higher education institutions (Cummings & Worley, 2019).

Twenty-first century higher education institutions have to pay close attention to organizational development as this helps in preparing graduates to compete beyond the local market and equip them with skills to enable them to survive in today's highly turbulent and fast-paced world (Raza & Naqvi, 2011; Khan, Zia, TahirKheli, and Ali, 2011; Abadesco, 2015; Puangco, 2015; Singh & Ramdeo, 2020).

The integration of the Philippines into the ASEAN Economic Community creates and positions a more globally competitive Filipino human resource. The Philippine education sector is deeply involved in the ASEAN integration. Implementing the K-12 by the Department of Education envisions keeping the Philippines' educational standards up to par with the other countries. Also, quality assurance for schools, colleges, and universities is implemented in terms of quality of education. The effectiveness of educational institutions must be assured if the Philippines wants to compete globally. In order to sustain their effectiveness, educational institutions inevitably need to design and implement evaluative systems to identify the obstacles in their operations. A very important step in the organization development process is diagnosis.

An analysis of organizational diagnosis based on the Six-Box Organizational Model was conducted by Hamid, Siadat, Reza, Amesh, Ali, and Azizallah (2011). The organizational diagnosis revealed that purposes clarification, purposes and policies' coordination, organizational and individuals' purposes compatibility are areas that need to be improved and prioritized. Other areas that need to be improved are: clarification of structures, professional development, improving members' cooperation, promoting motivation and reward systems, and changing negative supervision and control to a positive one. The "boxes" in the six-box model that are considered weak areas are purposes, structures, helpful mechanisms, and relationships. Similar results were shown in the studies conducted by Bissell (2008), Elloy (2009), Nikookar (2009), Tavakoli (2009), Zali (2009), Saleem & Ghani (2013), and Zhang, Schidmt, and Li (2016).

There are studies that emphasize the importance of organizational development in transforming universities and in most of these studies, the researchers concluded that organizational development, although clearly emerging, is not yet fully implemented (Torraco, Hoover, and Knippelmeyer, 2005; Bazana, 2017; and Weston, Ferris, and Finkelstein, 2017).

In her research paper, Verghese (2010) analyzed the elements of the "six-box model" of organizational diagnosis. She concluded that educational developers can make a better diagnosis that will help higher education institutions identify their organization's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) by using a holistic OD diagnostic tool like the "six-box model."

The "six-box model" of organizational diagnosis was applied by Mamillo (2016) in her study that focused on increasing organizational effectiveness through organizational diagnosis comparing two public institutions in Kosovo and Albania. She used the Organizational Diagnosis Questionnaire (Preziosi, 1980).

The current study's researcher was motivated to apply the "Six-Box Model" of organizational diagnosis. It was an organizational diagnosis that involved the participation of teaching and non-teaching personnel in organizational diagnosis. As an autonomous University, the university under study is undergoing a comprehensive program of institutional development in order to maintain its status as an autonomous institution of higher learning.

This study is anchored on the following: (a) theories of organization and culture; and (b) theories that underlie the philosophy and practice of organization development; concepts relating to institutional sustainability and assessment, quality assurance, the effectiveness of organizations, and organizational diagnosis.

Much of what occurs in schools must be interpreted in the context of the school's culture as organizational culture reflects the organization's feel, sense, atmosphere, character, or image. This gives the institution its own unique, distinctive features, and will influence the dynamics of the change phenomenon. (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Cummings & Worley, 2019; Kampf & Lizbetinova, 2015). The theory of organizational culture brings out three kinds of school culture: culture of efficacy, culture of trust, and culture of control (Bryk & Scheinder, 2002; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Goddard, Hoy, and LoGerfo, 2003; Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

In the process of organizational change, a number of theoretical models have evolved. One of the most widely applied models is Lewin's Three-Phase theory for Organizational Change (cited in Hoy & Miskel, 2005; and in Engbers,

deCaluwe, Stuyt, Fluit, & Bolhuis, 2013) which involves three phases: unfreezing, moving, and refreezing. Unfreezing is understanding and accepting that change is necessary. Moving is the process of change, the actual organizational development. Refreezing is the stage for accepting changes and becoming the new norm (Connelly, 2020). Another model is the Burke-Litwin Model of Organization Development (Burke, 2002) which is a comprehensive systems model that incorporates multiple levels (organization, work groups, and individuals) and shows how organizations interact with their external environments. Another model is Weisbord's Six-Box Organizational Diagnosis Model. According to Jones & Brazzel (2006), Weisbord's Six-Box Model is the most used in practice. An American analyst, Marvin Weisbord, developed the Six-Box Organizational Diagnosis model. The Six-Box model includes six components: purpose, structure, rewards, relationship, helpful mechanisms, and leadership.

Organizational development is a process of change according to the needs of the hour and is an important phenomenon for better survival in the global age. Closely tied up with organizational development is capacity building. Capacity building is an on-going process of updating skills, abilities, and knowledge to meet the challenges of the 21st century. Capacity building is the process of developing and strengthening the skills, abilities, processes, and resources of organizations in order to survive, adapt and thrive in this fast-changing world (USAID, 2010). In the advent of the pandemic COVID-19 crisis, an organization must respond to the challenges brought by this crisis. Changes are likely to occur which threaten an organization's sustainability. The organization must adapt to changes and strengthen its capacity building to meet the COVID-19 challenges. Now, more than ever, the organization must manage change to survive and thrive in the COVID-19 environment.

In the Philippine setting, institutional quality assurance mechanisms have been designed and developed through the Commission on Higher Education (CHED). CHED, in its CMO 46, s. 2012, enjoined HEIs to enhance their internal quality assurance systems. Specifically, CHED endorses the involvement of HEIs in Institutional Sustainability Assessment (ISA) which assesses the institutional sustainability of an HEI in five key result areas (KRAs): (1) governance and management; (2) quality of teaching and learning; (3) quality of professional exposure, research, and creative work/innovation; (4) support for students, and (5) relations with the community. The main goal of ISA is to help HEIs develop a culture of quality. In addition to program monitoring and evaluation, HEIs are monitored through Institutional Quality Assurance Monitoring and Evaluation (IQUAME). This is a mechanism for monitoring and evaluating outcomes of the programs, processes, and services of the KRAs.

Higher education institutions that attain standards about the minimum are encouraged and assisted to have their programs evaluated by private accreditors or duly recognized accrediting bodies, leading to the issuance of a Certificate of Accredited Status. Going through the accreditation process promotes quality assurance.

Accreditation is a process of validation in which colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher learning are evaluated. The accredited status would be granted to an institution of higher learning if the institution met the standards which are beyond the minimum requirements set by the government.

By vertical typology, this university in the Philippines is a private, autonomous institution of higher learning. As an autonomous educational organization, it has to pursue organization development continuously through the processes of planning, executing, monitoring, and checking or the Plan, Do, and Check pattern of quality assurance. One very crucial step in the quality assurance mechanism is diagnosis. This motivated the researcher to conduct this study on organization diagnosis, with the said university as a case in point.

In its totality, the results of this study will address the need to improve the effectiveness of the institution's administration, staff, faculty, and students in the context of globalization, increased demand for quality education, industry-university partnerships, and institutional/organizational change to make the institution function and perform more effectively and cater to all challenges that are encountered.

The management of the university will profit or benefit from the results of the study in terms of valuable insights relating to institutional strengths, areas needing improvement, and other relevant findings that will boost organization development's change efforts toward institutional improvement.

The personnel: administrators, faculty, support staff, non-teaching personnel, students, as well as parents and alumni, will benefit from the results of the study in terms of relevant information that will guide them in their consolidated

efforts to maintain sustainable development and effectiveness of the university as an autonomous and productive institution.

On the part of the researcher, the conduct of this study expanded her horizons further as regards organizational diagnosis and organizational development. Conducting this study enriched her professional experiences as a business manager and as an academic manager.

Other researchers will benefit from the results of this study in terms of added sources of related literature in the field of business administration.

The researcher conducted an organizational diagnosis of the university as the basis for determining its organizational effectiveness. Specifically, the study determined the level of effectiveness of the organizational functioning of the university along the elements of purpose, structure, relationships, rewards, helpful mechanisms, leadership, and attitude towards change. Further, it compared the perceptions according to the group of respondents.

Materials and Methods

This study made use of the descriptive-survey research design as well as the descriptive-evaluative research design.

A total of one hundred twenty-one (121) teaching and non-teaching personnel participated in this study. Only employees with five (5) or more years of service in the university were considered part of the population of the study. In composing the population of the study, convenience sampling was used. Time constraints in the gathering of data, the difficulty in locating willing participants, and the COVID-19 pandemic situation left the researcher not much choice but to resort to convenience sampling.

The researcher used the Weisboard Six-Box Model as a frame of reference in the data-gathering process and the Organizational Diagnosis Questionnaire (Preziosi, 1980) was used as a data-gathering tool. To supplement/validate the answers to the questionnaire, the researcher also used focused group discussion and documentary analysis of evaluations conducted by accrediting teams in the different programs accredited by the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation (PACUCOA).

Instead of using the seven (7) categories of responses utilized by Dr. Preziosi, the researcher used the four-point Likert Scale. The ODQ was administered in a trial test or pre-test among twenty respondents (ten from the teaching group and ten from the non-teaching group). These randomly picked pre-test respondents were not included in the final population of the study. The reliability coefficient was determined through Cronbach Alpha with the use of SPSS. A Cronbach Alpha score of 0.989 was obtained, which indicates high reliability.

The data gathered had been treated and interpreted using weighted means while the differences of means considering the group of respondents were measured using t-test. The following Likert Scale was used to interpret the weighted means:

Weight	Scale	Qualitative Interpretation	Description
4	3.26-4.00	Strongly Agree / Very Effective	The organization functions very well in all aspects
3	2.51-3.25	Moderately Agree / Moderately Effective	The organization functions well but not in all aspects; Improvement needed in some aspects
2	1.76-2.50	Disagree / Ineffective	The organization functions fairly with needed improvements in many aspects
1	1.00-1.75	Strongly Disagree / Very Ineffective	The organization poorly functions; improvement very much needed in very many aspects

throughout the conduct of the study. The questionnaire contained a letter clearly stating the objectives of the study, that participation is voluntary, and that all responses will be held confidential and will be used for research purposes only. The results of the study will be disseminated through research journal publications and public lectures.

Results and Discussions

Level of effectiveness of the organizational functioning of the university

Table 1 shows the level of effectiveness of the organizational functioning of the university along: purpose, structure, relationships, rewards, helpful mechanisms, leadership, and attitude towards change.

Table 1. Level of Effectiveness of the Organizational Functioning of the University (n=121)

Indicators	Mean	SD	DI
<i>Purpose</i>			
1. The goals of this organization are clearly stated.	3.39	.60	SA/VE
8. I am personally in agreement with the stated goals of my work unit.	3.03	.76	MA/ME
15. I understand the purpose of this organization.	3.33	.62	SA/VE
22. The priorities of this organization are understood by its employees.	3.12	.66	MA/ME
29. I had enough input in deciding my work-unit goals.	2.94	.72	MA/ME
Area Mean	3.16	.55	MA/ME
<i>Structure</i>			
2. The division of labor of this organization is flexible.	2.74	.85	MA/ME
9. The division of labor in this organization is intended to help it reach its goals.	2.75	.91	MA/ME
16. The manner in which work tasks are divided is a logical one.	2.68	.87	MA/ME
23. The structure of my work unit is well designed.	2.79	.92	MA/ME
30. The division of labor in this organization actually helps it to reach its goals.	2.70	.92	MA/ME
Area Mean	2.73	.81	MA/ME
<i>Leadership</i>			
3. My immediate supervisor is supportive of my efforts.	2.83	1.02	MA/ME
10. The leadership norms of this organization help its progress.	3.11	.82	MA/ME
17. This organization's leadership efforts result in the organization's fulfillment of its purpose.	3.12	.81	MA/ME

Indicators	Mean	SD	DI
24. It is clear to me whenever my boss is attempting to guide my work efforts.	2.93	.91	MA/ME
31. I understand my boss's efforts to influence me and the other members of the work unit.	2.80	.96	MA/ME
Area Mean	2.96	.78	MA/ME
<i>Relationships</i>			
4. My relationship with my supervisor is a harmonious one.	3.35	.78	SA/VE
11. I can always talk with someone at work if I have a work-related problem.	3.17	.85	MA/ME
18. My relationship with members of my work group is friendly as well as professional.	3.33	.80	SA/VE
25. I have established the relationships that I need to do my job properly.	3.19	.99	MA/ME
32. There is no evidence of unresolved conflict in this organization.	2.90	.89	MA/ME
Area Mean	3.19	.92	MA/ME
<i>Rewards</i>			
5. My job offers me the opportunity to grow as a person.	2.84	.97	MA/ME
12. The pay scale and benefits of this organization treat each employee equitably.	2.39	1.13	D/I
19. The opportunity for promotion exists in this organization.	2.23	1.07	D/I
26. The salary that I receive is commensurate with the job that I perform.	2.41	1.10	D/I
33. All tasks to be accomplished are associated with incentives.	2.27	.97	D/I
Area Mean	2.43	.92	D/I
<i>Helpful Mechanisms</i>			
6. My immediate supervisor has ideas that are helpful to me and my workgroup.	3.02	.75	MA/ME
13. I have the information that I need to do a good job.	3.15	.79	MA/ME
20. This organization has adequate mechanisms for binding itself together.	3.07	.87	MA/ME
27. Other work units are helpful to my work unit whenever assistance is requested.	3.10	.99	MA/ME

Indicators	Mean	SD	DI
34. This organization's planning and control efforts are helpful to its growth and development.	3.01	.82	MA/ME
Area Mean	3.07	.69	MA/ME
<i>Attitude Towards Change</i>			
7. This organization is not resistant to change.	3.12	.81	MA/ME
14. This organization introduces enough new policies and procedures.	3.18	.73	MA/ME
21. This organization favors change.	3.20	.88	MA/ME
28. Occasionally I like to change things about my job.	3.09	.81	MA/ME
35. This organization has the ability to change.	3.28	.79	SA/VE
Area Mean	3.18	.59	MA/ME
Overall Mean	2.96	.61	MA/ME

Legend: SA - Strongly Agree; MA - Moderately Agree; D - Disagree; SD - Strongly Disagree; VE – Very Effective; ME – Moderately Effective; I – Ineffective; VI – Very Ineffective

The overall mean of 2.96 (SD=.61) indicates that the employees of the university moderately agree that the organization functions well but not in all aspects. This means that the university's organizational functioning is moderately effective. The highest-rated indicator is "The goals of this organization are clearly stated." It has a mean of 3.39 (SD=.60) which is interpreted as moderately agree / moderately effective. Organizational goals are strategic objectives established by management to outline expected outcomes and guide the efforts of employees. When goals are clear and well-defined, they can easily be communicated to employees. Employees will be more enthusiastic and engaged when they understand what they are expected to achieve. The Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities Commission on Accreditation, Inc. (PACUCOA) observed that the vision, mission, objectives, and core values (VMOC) of the university were widely disseminated to the academic and external community by posting in strategic locations in the university campus; reflecting them in the manuals and handbooks of schools and offices and the university's infographics, brochures, and website; reflecting in the syllabus of all courses and presenting them to the students during class orientation; and discussing them during the orientation of new employees. This has resulted in the awareness of the teaching and non-teaching staff of the university's VMOC (PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Architecture Program, 2021; PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Nursing Program, 2021; PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Bachelor of Arts in Political Science Program, 2021; and PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Bachelor of Arts in Mass Communication Program, 2021). The lowest rated indicator is "The opportunity for promotion exists in this organization." It has a mean of 2.23 (SD=1.07) and is interpreted as disagree / ineffective. In Herzberg's theory, promotion/advancement in the job falls under the dimension of satisfaction, on the intrinsic aspect of motivation. Since the opportunity for promotion is the lowest rated indicator under the element reward, it is implied that the reward is not only monetary (extrinsic) but also satisfaction derived from advancement or promotion in the job. The low mean in this indicator contributed to the over-all low mean for the element of rewards, which makes it rank lowest among the elements of organizational functioning. Promotion is generally understood as the movement of an employee from one position to another with increased duties and responsibilities and a higher pay grade or salary. Given the organizational set-up of an academic institution, where there are few middle management and top management positions that one can be promoted or appointed to, the opportunity for promotion is rare. Moreover, the competition between and among employees can be very tough. This is a possible reason why many respondents disagree that an opportunity for promotion exists in the university. However, even when the teaching and non-teaching personnel may not be promoted or appointed to a higher position, a promotion in rank is possible. To recognize the academic and professional achievements of faculty members in all

levels, they are ranked in accordance with the evaluation criteria adopted by the Ranking and Promotions Board. Likewise, to recognize outstanding performance, loyalty, and professional advancement of non-teaching staff, they are evaluated and ranked in accordance with the matrix duly approved by the Ranking and Promotions Board. The implementation of the new ranking system in the university is still in its early stages so, the impact is yet to be seen.

The highest-rated element is relationships ($M=3.19$, $SD=.92$). This indicates that the organizational functioning of the university is moderately effective along the element of relationships. This implies that the teaching and non-teaching personnel manifest harmonious relationships between individuals, departments, and interdependence among themselves with respect to the performance of their jobs. As reflected in the Six-Box Model, the interdependence and teamwork are demonstrated between people, between work units doing different tasks, and between people and the technology they use. Employees of the university boast of the organization's family-oriented culture. Asked what factors influenced them to stay for more than five years, the majority of the FGD participants cited the family-oriented culture of the university as one of the main factors. PACUCOA pointed out that the family culture was practiced and observed prominently in the campus. According to research, when an organization uses the family metaphor in businesses, it creates a positive, motivating, and morale-boosting culture, where colleagues are not seen as colleagues anymore but as brothers or sisters. This leads employees to emotionally attach themselves to the organization (Luna, 2021). The culture of an organization determines the atmosphere inside the organization; it is something relevant yet intangible that results from the people's thinking and the activities they perform in the organization (Kampf, Lizbetinova, 2015). A culture of trust in an organization is important because it facilitates cooperation, enhances openness, promotes group cohesiveness, and improves student achievement (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Bryk & Schneider, 2002).

The lowest rated element is rewards ($M=2.43$, $SD=.92$). This indicates ineffective functioning along the element of rewards. This means that employees have issues regarding the rewards provided by the university. This implies that the teaching and non-teaching personnel expect both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards in relation to their work. They are formally rewarded with their salary and fringe benefits. However, the changing needs of the times also impinge upon their level of satisfaction with the rewards they receive. A question in the Six-Box Model asks: "What does the organization need to do to fit the environment?" This question refers to the changing needs of the times. Apparently, the university personnel also expect changes or adjustments in their compensation packages to fit the needs of the times. In Herzberg's theory, two dimensions related to the job are identified as satisfiers (motivators) and dissatisfiers (hygiene factors). Job security and salary fall under the dimension of dissatisfaction. In this case, salary is a dissatisfaction factor instead of satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 2005, cited in Bateman and Snell, 2013). Hygiene factors, where salary/compensation falls, tend to produce job dissatisfaction. Further, Herzberg states in his theory that the hygiene factors relate to how the job affects basic needs. Because of the changing needs of the times, the individual's satisfaction of basic needs is also affected. The university employees perceive rewards in this light as compensation packages that fit the needs of the times. Rewards, whether monetary or non-monetary, have a strong influence over employee motivation, satisfaction, and perceptions of work. It is worth note taking that the PACUCOA accreditors reported that employees of the university are appreciative of the fringe benefits given by the university that are beyond those mandated by law. Some of these benefits include: longevity pay; eleventh-month pay (after rendering eight years of service) and twelfth-month pay (after rendering fifteen years of service); three hours release time (after rendering eighteen years of service) and six hours release time (after rendering 23 years of service); birthday leave; paid sabbatical leave for those who rendered 30 years of service; service-incentive leave of twelve days convertible to cash if unused; and educational benefits for dependents and for employees pursuing graduate programs (PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Architecture Program, 2021; PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Bachelor of Arts in Mass Communication Program, 2021; PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Bachelor of Arts in Political Science Program, 2021; PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Nursing Program, 2021). In the FGD, participants agree that compensation is one area that need attention. One participant said that in terms of salary, the employees of the university get lower compensation compared to other universities within the city. However, the benefits given make up for it. This corroborates the findings of De Guzman, Depositario, and Banzon (2020) that while the faculty of one Philippine university are not satisfied with most of the benefits provided by the institution, educational benefits for the faculty and their dependents were appreciated by the faculty.

To recognize the loyalty, excellence, and contribution to the general collection of knowledge of teaching employees, awards and recognition are given to deserving teaching employees of the university. Likewise, the non-teaching personnel are awarded for outstanding performance, dedication, loyalty, and services rendered.

Comparison of the level of effectiveness of the organizational functioning of the university according to the group of respondents

The data on the level of effectiveness of the organizational functioning of the university according to group are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Level of Effectiveness of the Organizational Functioning of the University According to Group of Respondents

Indicators	Teaching			Non-Teaching			Differences
	Mean	SD	DI	Mean	SD	DI	
<i>Purpose</i>							
1. The goals of this organization are clearly stated.	3.40	.68	SA/VE	3.38	.52	SA/VE	
8. I am personally in agreement with the stated goals of my work unit.	2.89	.82	MA/ME	3.16	.70	MA/ME	
15. I understand the purpose of this organization.	3.33	.69	SA/VE	3.33	.56	SA/VE	
22. The priorities of this organization are understood by its employees.	3.11	.77	MA/ME	3.13	.55	MA/ME	
29. I had enough input in deciding my work-unit goals.	2.75	.74	MA/ME	3.11	.67	MA/ME	
Area Mean	3.10	.62	MA/ME	3.22	.48	MA/ME	.058
<i>Structure</i>							
2. The division of labor of this organization is flexible.	2.39	.84	D/I	3.05	.74	MA/ME	
9. The division of labor in this organization is intended to help it reach its goals.	2.42	.98	D/I	3.05	.72	MA/ME	
16. The manner in which work tasks are divided is a logical one.	2.40	.82	D/I	2.92	.84	MA/ME	
23. The structure of my work unit is well designed.	2.37	.82	D/I	3.17	.85	MA/ME	
30. The division of labor in this organization actually helps it to reach its goals.	2.39	.88	D/I	2.98	.86	MA/ME	
Area Mean	2.39	.83	D/I	3.03	.66	MA/ME	.002

Indicators	Teaching			Non-Teaching			p-value
	Mean	SD	DI	Mean	SD	DI	
<i>Leadership</i>							
3. My immediate supervisor is supportive of my efforts.	2.61	1.05	MA/ME	3.02	.97	MA/ME	
10. The leadership norms of this organization help its progress.	2.98	.77	MA/ME	3.22	.86	MA/ME	
17. This organization's leadership efforts result in the organization's fulfillment of its purpose.	3.14	.81	MA/ME	3.11	.82	MA/ME	
24. It is clear to me whenever my boss is attempting to guide my work efforts.	2.77	.89	MA/ME	3.06	.92	MA/ME	
31. I understand my boss's efforts to influence me and the other members of the work unit.	2.63	.92	MA/ME	2.95	.98	MA/ME	
Area Mean	2.83	.81	MA/ME	3.07	.74	MA/ME	.309
<i>Relationships</i>							
4. My relationship with my supervisor is a harmonious one.	3.21	.88	MA/ME	3.47	.67	SA/VE	
11. I can always talk with someone at work if I have a work-related problem.	2.96	.93	MA/ME	3.34	.74	SA/VE	
18. My relationship with members of my work group is friendly as well as professional.	3.19	.90	MA/ME	3.45	.69	SA/VE	
25. I have established the relationships that I need to do my job properly.	2.88	1.17	MA/ME	3.47	.71	SA/VE	
32. There is no evidence of unresolved conflict in this organization.	2.58	.98	MA/ME	3.19	.69	MA/ME	
Area Mean	2.96	.90	MA/ME	3.38	.51	SA/VE	.000
<i>Rewards</i>							
5. My job offers me the opportunity to grow as a person.	2.56	1.07	MA/ME	3.09	.81	MA/ME	

Indicators	Teaching			Non-Teaching			p-value
	Mean	SD	DI	Mean	SD	DI	
12. The pay scale and benefits of this organization treat each employee equitably.	2.23	1.23	D/I	2.53	1.02	MA/ME	
19. The opportunity for promotion exists in this organization.	2.32	1.28	D/I	2.16	.86	D/I	
26. The salary that I receive is commensurate with the job that I perform.	2.26	1.22	D/I	2.55	.97	MA/ME	
33. All tasks to be accomplished are associated with incentives.	2.11	.94	D/I	2.42	.97	D/I	
Area Mean	2.29	1.05	D/I	2.55	.76	MA/ME	.000
<i>Helpful Mechanisms</i>							
6. My immediate supervisor has ideas that are helpful to me and my workgroup.	2.84	.77	MA/ME	3.17	.70	MA/ME	
13. I have the information that I need to do a good job.	3.02	.92	MA/ME	3.27	.65	SA/VE	
20. This organization has adequate mechanisms for binding itself together.	2.79	.96	MA/ME	3.31	.71	SA/VE	
27. Other work units are helpful to my work unit whenever assistance is requested.	2.84	1.11	MA/ME	3.33	.80	SA/VE	
34. This organization's planning and control efforts are helpful to its growth and development.	2.77	.96	MA/ME	3.22	.60	MA/ME	
Area Mean	2.85	.84	MA/ME	3.26	.44	SA/VE	.000
<i>Attitude Towards Change</i>							
7. This organization is not resistant to change.	2.96	.87	MA/ME	3.27	.74	SA/VE	
14. This organization introduces enough new policies and procedures.	3.05	.81	MA/ME	3.30	.63	SA/VE	
21. This organization favors change.	3.02	1.08	MA/ME	3.36	.63	SA/VE	

Indicators	Teaching			Non-Teaching			p-value
	Mean	SD	DI	Mean	SD	DI	
28. Occasionally I like to change things about my job.	3.11	.86	MA/ME	3.08	.76	MA/ME	
35. This organization has the ability to change.	3.16	.88	MA/ME	3.39	.68	SA/VE	
Area Mean	3.06	.71	MA/ME	3.28	.44	SA/VE	.022
Overall Mean	2.78	.76	MA/ME	3.11	.39	MA/ME	.000

Legend: SA - Strongly Agree; MA - Moderately Agree; D - Disagree; SD - Strongly Disagree; VE – Very Effective; ME – Moderately Effective; I – Ineffective; VI – Very Ineffective

Results show that both groups moderately agree regarding the level of effectiveness of the university's organizational functioning as moderately effective. In terms of specific elements, the highest mean for the teaching group is that of purpose, with a mean of 3.10 (SD=.62), interpreted as moderately effective. The highest mean for the non-teaching group is that of relationships with a mean of 3.38 (SD=.51), interpreted as very effective. Rewards had the lowest mean for the two groups with the teaching group having a mean of 2.29 (SD=1.05) interpreted as ineffective, and 2.55 (SD=.76) for the non-teaching group interpreted as moderately effective.

As revealed in the t-test, there were no significant differences in the perceived level of effectiveness of the organizational functioning of the university according to group of respondents along the elements of purpose and leadership. This indicates agreement between the two groups regarding their perceptions of the elements of purpose and leadership. On the other hand, there were significant differences in the perceived level of effectiveness of the university's organizational functioning according to group of respondents along the elements of structure, relationship, rewards, helpful mechanisms, and attitude toward change.

All indicators under the element "structure" were found to be ineffective by the teaching group, while all indicators were found to be moderately effective by the non-teaching group. The nature of their job and the tasks performed by these two groups influence how they view how tasks and responsibilities are divided and delegated as well as the structure of their work unit. While the tasks of the non-teaching personnel are rather straightforward, the teaching personnel have academic and non-academic tasks to perform. Teachers' perception of the degree of difficulty and the volume of work they have to do is influenced by the number of preparations they have, the nature of subjects taught, the variety of requirements that must be complied with, activities that must be attended, and duties they must fulfill. According to Sravani (2018), employee dissatisfaction can be caused by an employee's sense of workload balance or imbalance due to perceived disparities between his workload and that of other organizational members. The study of Zhang, Schmidt, and Li (2016) revealed that the factors hindering internal growth are (a) lack of task engagement with energy and time; (b) lack of personal work units; and (c) a poor division of labor.

The university's environment is conducive to building good relationships because of the family-oriented culture that the organization has. However, how relationships are built and maintained may be influenced by the nature of the jobs of the people in the organization.

The following indicators were considered by the non-teaching group as very effective: "My relationship with my supervisor is a harmonious one" (M=3.47, SD=.67); "I have established the relationships that I need to do my job properly" (M=3.47, SD=.71); "My relationship with members of my work group is friendly as well as professional" (M=3.45, SD=.69); and "I can always talk with someone at work if I have a work-related problem" (M=3.34, SD=.74). Most non-teaching employees stay in their offices for most of their working hours, allowing them to mingle and communicate more with their co-workers.

On the other hand, teachers spend a lot of time in their classrooms, depending on their teaching loads. While they also have time to stay in the faculty room with their co-teachers, most of their break time is spent rating students' outputs, preparing their lessons for their next class, or accomplishing their non-academic duties.

The indicator "The opportunity for promotion exists in this organization" was considered ineffective by the teaching group ($M=2.32$, $SD=1.28$) and the non-teaching group ($M=2.16$, $SD=.86$). Given the organizational set-up of an academic institution, where there are few middle management and top management positions that one can be promoted or appointed to, the opportunity for promotion is rare. The indicators "The salary that I receive is commensurate with the job that I perform" ($M=2.26$, $SD=1.22$) and "The pay scale and benefits of this organization treat each employee equitably" ($M=2.23$, $SD=1.23$) were rated ineffective by the teaching group because they feel that the compensation they are given does not equate the volume of work they are expected to perform and/or the extra hours that they spend working. For example, unlike non-teaching employees whose overtime work is compensable, there is no extra pay for teachers for overtime work. The indicator "All tasks to be accomplished are associated with incentives" was rated ineffective by the teaching group ($M=2.11$, $SD=.94$) and the non-teaching group ($M=2.42$, $SD=.97$).

While the teaching group rated all indicators under helpful mechanisms as moderately effective, the non-teaching group rated some indicators as very effective. Helpful mechanisms are the tools, processes, and systems that link institutional inputs. The nature of the work of the non-teaching personnel influences the way they view the helpful mechanisms available in the organization. There are offices whose task is to deliver services to internal customers who are expected to cooperate to ensure that objectives are accomplished. This is why they rated the indicator "Other work units are helpful to my work unit whenever assistance is requested" as very effective ($M=3.33$, $SD=.80$). Most non-teaching personnel in the university perform routine work and the tools they need to perform their tasks are readily provided by the organization. This is why they believe that "This organization has adequate mechanisms for binding itself together" ($M=3.31$, $SD=.71$). The tasks assigned to most of the non-teaching personnel are straightforward and less complex compared to the teachers. Due to their job's relative simplicity, they rated the indicator "I have the information that I need to do a good job" as very effective ($M=3.27$, $SD=.65$).

Most of the indicators under "attitude towards change" were rated very effective by the non-teaching group. However, the teaching group has a higher mean on the indicator "Occasionally I like to change things about my job" ($M=3.11$, $SD=.86$) compared to that of the non-teaching group ($M=3.08$, $SD=.76$). Teachers may find their job more challenging that they think about changing some things about their job.

In the over-all perspective, the organizational diagnosis revealed that the university is moderately effective in its organizational functioning. This indicates that the university is functioning well but improvement is needed in some aspects.

Conclusion

The moderately effective level of organizational functioning of the university indicates that it is functioning well but not in all aspects. As such, improvement is needed in some aspects to raise the level of effectiveness of the university.

The variable of group caused significant differences in the ranking of the elements in the organizational diagnosis due to the nature of the job.

Acknowledgement

This paper and the research behind it would not have been possible without the exceptional support of my mentor, Dr. Josefina S. Esguerra. Her enthusiasm, knowledge and exacting attention to detail have been an inspiration and kept my work on track. Special thanks to the University of Baguio - my second home, for all the wonderful opportunities and to all the resources provided to make this endeavor possible.

References

Abadesco, E. Jr. (20 December 2015). An updated definition of organizational development. Philippine Daily Inquirer. <https://business.inquirer.net/204420/an-updated-definition-of-organizational-development>

Aud, S., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., Kristapovich, P., Rathbun, A., Wang, X., & Zhang, J. (2014). *The Condition of Education 2014* (NCES Publication No. 2014-083). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>

Bateman, T.S. and Snell, S.A. (2013). *Management: Leading and Collaborating in a Competitive World*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin. Bazana, S. (2017). Organizational development could transform universities. Research Paper. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20171207075242375>

Bissell, B. (2008). Organizational assessment and diagnosis. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 16, 7-17. http://coe.unm.edu/uploads/docs/ifec/counselored/couns_ed_co_keim.pdf

Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.B. (2003). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/mar03/vol60/num06/Trust-in-Schools@-A-Core-Resource-for-School-Reform.aspx>

Burke, W.W. (2002). *Organization change: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

CHED Memo Order No. 46

Connelly, M. (2020). The Kurt Lewin Change Management Model. https://www.change-management-coach.com/kurt_lewin.html

Cummings, T. & Worley, C. (2019). *Organization Development and Change*. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

De Guzman, R. S., Depositario, D. P., & Banzon, A. (2020, October 5). An assessment of the level of job satisfaction among faculty members in a Philippine University. *JEMAD*. <https://jemad.cem.uplb.edu.ph/articles/an-assessment-of-the-level-of-job-satisfaction-among-faculty-members-in-a-philippine-university/>

Elloy, D. (2008). The relationship between self-leadership behaviors and organizational variables in a self-management work team environment. *Journal of Management Research News*, 31, 11, 801-810. Doi: 10.1108/01409170810913015

Engbers, R., deCaluwe, L., Stuyt, P., Fluit, C. & Bolhuis, S. (2013). Towards organizational development of sustainable, high-quality medical teaching. *Springerlink.com. Perspective Medical Education* (2013) 2:28-40 doi 10.1007/s40037-013-0043-6

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W.L., & LoGerfo, L. (2003). Collective efficacy and student achievement in public high school: A Path Analysis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Hamid, R., Siadat, S.A., Reza, H., Arash, S., Ali, N.H., and Azizallah, A. (2011). The analysis of organizational diagnosis based on six-box model in universities. *Higher Education Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1: June 2011. Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education.

Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2005). *Educational Administration: Theory, research and practice*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Hoy, W. K. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools. In Hoy, W.K. & Miskel, C. (Eds.). *Studies in Leading and Organizing Schools*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Jones, B., & Brazzel, M. (2014). *The NTL handbook of Organizational development and change: Principles, practices and perspectives*. New Jersey: Pfeiffer. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781118836170>

- Kampf, R., & Lizbetinova, L. (2015). The Identification and Development of Talents in the Environment of Logistics Companies. Nasemore. Publisher: University of Dubrovnik. Vol. 62, No. Special Issue/2015. Pp. 139- 142. ISSN 0469-6255. doi 10.17818/NM/2015/SI9
- Khan, S., Zia, S., TahirKheli, S., and Ali, A. (2011). Organization Development of Higher Learning Institutions. Proceedings of 2nd International Conference on Business Management. <https://www.umt.edu.pk/icobm2012/pdf/2C-37P.pdf>
- Luna, J. (2021). The Toxic Effects of Branding your Workplace a “Family.” Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2021/10/the-toxic-effects-of-branding-your-workplace-a-family#:~:text=According%20to%20research%2C%20when%20an,attach%20themselves%20to%20the%20organization>
- Mamillo, D. (2016). Increasing organizationaleffectiveness through organizational diagnosis: Comparison between public institutions in Kosovo and Albania. International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Research Technology, 5(7), 587. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.57046
- Nikookar, G.H. (2009). The components of organizational diagnosis in center of Iran carpet. The Journal of Business Management, 3, 165
- PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Bachelor of Arts in Mass Communication Program (September 15, 2021)
- PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Bachelor of Arts in Political Science Program (September 15, 2021)
- PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Bachelor of Science in Architecture Program (March 15, 2021)
- PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Bachelor of Science in Architecture Program (September 15, 2021)
- PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program (March 15, 2021)
- PACUCOA Accreditation Team Report for the Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program (September 15, 2021)
- Preziosi, R. (1980). Organizational diagnosis questionnaire. The 1980 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators, University Associates, New Jersey.
- Puangco, T. (28 June 2015). Rising need for organization development. Philippine Daily Inquirer. p. J4.
- Raza, S. and Naqvi, S. (2011). Quality of Pakistani University Graduates as Perceived by Employers: Implications for Faculty Development. Journal of Quality and Technology Management, 7(1): 57-72. <http://pu.edu/pk/images/journal/iqtm/PDF-FILES/04-faculty%20development%2031-5-11.pdf>
- Saleem, A. & Ghani, U. (2013). Application Of Weisbord’s Organizational Diagnosis Model: A Case of Pakistan Banking Industry. Business & Economic Review. 5. 1-12. DOI: 10.22547/BER/5.1.1
- Singh R., Ramdeo S. (2020) Introduction to Organizational Development and Change. In: Leading Organizational Development and Change. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Sravani, A. (2018). Managing the distribution of employee workload of the hospital staff. IJRDO J. Bus. Manag, 4(1), 40-50. <https://doi.org/10.53555/bm.v4i1.1799>
- Tavakoli, Sh. (2009). The diagnosis of human resource management toward improvement & development. The Journal of Human Resource Management in Oil Industry, 4.
- Torraco, R., Hoover, R., Knippelmeyer, S. (2005). Organization development and change in universities. University of Nebraska.

USAID (2010). Introduction to organizational capacity development. Washington, D.C.: Pact's Learning Series Publications. <https://www.k4health.org/sites/default/files/PACTIntrotoOODFirstEdition.pdf>

Verghese, A. (2010). OD Interventions for sustainable excellence in higher education. Proceedings of the Conference on Global Competition & Competitiveness of Indian Corporate. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.493.4972&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Weston, C., Ferris, J., & Finkelstein, A. (2017). Leading change: An organizational development role for educational developers. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Vol. 29, No.2 (2017). <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>

Zali, M.R. (2008). The organizational diagnosis in a public company. *The Journal of executive management*, 21, 2, 28-45.

Zhang, J., Schmidt, K., & Li, H. (2016). An Integrated Diagnostic Framework to Manage Organization Sustainable Growth: An Empirical Case. *Sustainability*, 8, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8040301>