

**Bridging perspectives on Criminology Deans' management and leadership functions
in Pangasinan Colleges: A mixed-methods study**

Queen Glenn Quitlong Abungan

Philippine College of Criminology

Manila, Philippines

Email: qgqabungan17@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Leadership and management in criminology education are central to ensuring quality programs, ethical practice, and institutional performance. This study examined the leadership and management functions of criminology deans in selected higher education institutions in Pangasinan, as perceived by faculty members and top school management officials. Using an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, the study first employed a researcher-made survey to assess the level of implementation and effectiveness of deans' management functions—planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling—as well as faculty and management satisfaction with leadership dimensions such as Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. Quantitative data were summarized using descriptive statistics and analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U test to determine differences in perceptions between faculty and top management. The qualitative phase used semi-structured interviews and thematic analysis to explore the challenges experienced by deans in performing their roles. Findings revealed that criminology deans' management functions are highly implemented and highly effective, with uniform median scores of 4 across all functions. Satisfaction with all five leadership dimensions reached a median of 10 (Almost Always Satisfied), indicating very high appreciation of deans' leadership practices. While no significant differences appeared in the perceived implementation of management functions, significant differences emerged in selected leadership dimensions—particularly Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart—between faculty members and top management. Thematic analysis highlighted recurring challenges such as time traps, leadership overload, emotional labor, and the demands of regulatory compliance and digital transformation. Based on these findings, the study proposed a development framework that includes structured communication mechanisms, capacity-building interventions, workload management strategies,

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0404624>

Recommended citation:

Abungan, Q. G. Q. (2025). Bridging perspectives on criminology deans' management and leadership functions in Pangasinan colleges: A mixed-methods study. *Pantao (The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 4 (4), 6806-6816. <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0404624>

and a strengthened recognition and reward scheme to bridge perceptual gaps and further enhance criminology deans' leadership effectiveness in Pangasinan.

Keywords: Criminology Deans; management functions; leadership dimensions; mixed-methods; Pangasinan

Date Submitted: November 6, 2025

Date Accepted: November 23, 2025

Date Published: December 6, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Criminology education occupies a strategic position in promoting justice, public safety, and the strengthening of institutions. Within this context, criminology deans serve as both managers and leaders who influence curriculum quality, faculty development, student outcomes, and the overall performance of criminology programs (De Carlo & Dlugolenski, 2023). They do so through key management functions—planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling—as well as through leadership practices that shape organizational culture, relationships, and morale.

In recent years, criminology programs have been challenged by rapid changes in the criminal justice landscape, increasing demands for evidence-informed practice, and higher expectations from regulatory agencies, employers, and communities. These pressures intensify the need for deans who can perform their management functions effectively while also modeling ethical, participatory, and transformational leadership. At the same time, the perspectives of faculty members and top management play a crucial role in assessing the performance of deans, as these stakeholders directly experience the consequences of leadership and management decisions in daily academic life.

Statement of the problem

The study aimed to assess the leadership and management functions of criminology deans in selected colleges in Pangasinan as bases for a proposed development program. Specifically, it sought:

1. To determine the level of implementation of criminology deans' management functions—planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling—as perceived by faculty members and top management.
2. To determine whether there are significant differences in the level of implementation of these management functions when grouped according to respondents (faculty vs. top management).
3. To determine the level of effectiveness of criminology deans in performing their management functions, as perceived by faculty members and top management.
4. To determine whether there are significant differences in the level of effectiveness of these management functions when grouped according to respondents.
5. To determine the level of satisfaction of faculty members and top management with criminology deans' leadership dimensions—Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart.

6. To determine whether there are significant differences in satisfaction with these leadership dimensions when grouped according to respondents.
7. To identify the common challenges related to leadership and management functions encountered by criminology deans, as perceived by key informants.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. The quantitative phase was conducted first to obtain a broad assessment of the implementation and effectiveness of criminology deans' management functions and the satisfaction of stakeholders with their leadership dimensions. Quantitative results were then used to guide the qualitative phase, which explored in greater depth the challenges and contextual factors underlying the numerical patterns. In this design, the independent variables were the deans' management functions and leadership dimensions, while the dependent variables were the perceptions of faculty members and top management regarding implementation, effectiveness, and satisfaction. The mixed-methods approach allowed the researcher to combine the breadth of survey data with the depth of interview-based narratives.

The quantitative component utilized a researcher-made survey questionnaire structured around Fayol's five management functions and the identified leadership dimensions. Items were rated on a four-point scale for implementation and effectiveness, and a ten-point scale for satisfaction with leadership dimensions. The qualitative component used semi-structured interviews and documentation to elicit detailed accounts of leadership and management challenges, as well as strategies for improvement.

The study was conducted among higher education institutions offering criminology programs in Pangasinan. The target population consisted of criminology deans, faculty members, and top school management officials (e.g., presidents, vice presidents, academic heads) directly involved in criminology programs.

A total of 288 faculty members and 35 top management officials participated in the quantitative phase, yielding a high overall response rate. Criminology deans served as focal subjects of the assessment but were not the primary raters of their own performance. For the qualitative phase, a purposive sample of key informants—including deans, selected faculty members, and top managers—was identified to provide richer perspectives on challenges and development needs.

Data were gathered using a self-constructed survey questionnaire and an interview guide. The questionnaire contained sections on: (a) demographic information; (b) level of implementation of management functions; (c) level of effectiveness of management functions; and (d) level of satisfaction with leadership dimensions. Items were crafted based on the theoretical frameworks and related literature, and were subjected to content validation by experts in criminology, educational management, and research.

Instrument validation involved several stages: expert review using a structured validation checklist, pilot testing with 20 respondents from a similar institution, and reliability analysis. Cronbach's alpha for the survey instrument was 0.873, indicating high internal consistency and

reliability for the multi-item scales. Based on validation feedback, items were refined for clarity, relevance, and measurability before full deployment.

The interview guide for the qualitative phase focused on the perceived challenges of deans, areas of strength and improvement, and suggestions for enhancing leadership and management practices.

After securing permissions from institutional authorities and ethics clearance, the researcher distributed the questionnaires to faculty members and top management officials through a combination of on-site and online modes. Printed questionnaires were delivered to the offices of the deans or directly to faculty members, while some respondents preferred to complete the instrument via online forms for convenience and confidentiality.

Questionnaires were collected after approximately two weeks, with multiple follow-ups conducted through office visits, online reminders, and coordination with deans and staff. Some questionnaires were not returned due to respondents' workload, perceived sensitivity of items, or absence during the data collection period; these were documented as part of the study's limitations. For the qualitative phase, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews and/or focus group discussions with selected key informants. Sessions were scheduled at times convenient for participants and, where permitted, were audio-recorded and supported by note-taking.

For the quantitative data, descriptive statistics were used to summarize responses for each statement and domain. Median scores were computed to represent the central tendency of ordinal ratings on implementation, effectiveness, and leadership satisfaction. Interpretation of median scores followed predefined descriptive equivalents (e.g., Highly Implemented, Moderately Implemented, Highly Effective, Almost Always Satisfied).

To examine differences in perceptions between faculty members and top management, the Mann-Whitney U test—a non-parametric test appropriate for ordinal data and independent groups—was employed. A significance level of 0.05 was used to determine whether differences in medians were statistically significant.

For the qualitative data, thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's six-phase approach was used: familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the report. Codes representing recurring ideas, experiences, and concerns were clustered into broader themes such as time traps, leadership overload, and communication gaps. These themes were used to interpret and enrich the quantitative findings and to inform the proposed development strategies.

The study adhered to ethical principles of informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and respect for persons. All potential respondents were provided with an informed consent form that describes the purpose of the study, procedures, potential risks and benefits, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Only those who provided consent participated in the survey and interviews.

Participant identities and institutional affiliations were kept confidential. Names were omitted or replaced with codes in data files and reports. Data were stored securely and used solely for academic purposes. The researcher ensured that questions were phrased respectfully and that participants could decline to answer items they found uncomfortable. Care was taken to report findings in aggregate form to avoid identification of individual respondents or institutions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and interprets the findings of the study in relation to its objectives, drawing from data gathered from faculty members and top management respondents using a descriptive-comparative research design. The study employed validated survey instruments to measure the implementation and effectiveness of criminology deans' management functions as well as satisfaction with leadership dimensions. Nonparametric statistical analysis using the Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine differences in perceptions between the two respondent groups, while qualitative data were analyzed thematically to enrich the interpretation of quantitative results. The discussion integrates these findings with relevant literature to provide a comprehensive understanding of leadership and management practices within criminology programs.

Level of implementation of management functions

The first objective of the study examined the level of implementation of criminology deans' management functions, specifically planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. Findings revealed that all five management functions were rated as Highly Implemented, with uniform median scores of 4 from both faculty members and top management. This consistency across respondent groups indicates that the deans' management practices are not only visible but also widely acknowledged as being carried out at a high level within the institution.

In terms of planning, respondents perceived that deans consistently establish clear vision, mission, and objectives for their programs, set realistic yet challenging goals, allocate resources efficiently, and prepare contingency plans to address risks and uncertainties. These practices suggest that planning is not treated merely as a formal administrative requirement but is embedded in the operational culture of the criminology departments. Similarly, organizing was perceived as highly implemented, as deans were seen to structure roles effectively, delegate responsibilities based on faculty members' competencies, and ensure coordination across academic and administrative units. These practices contribute to orderly workflows and clarity of expectations within the department.

The strong ratings for planning and organizing, alongside commanding, coordinating, and controlling, align with existing literature emphasizing that effective management functions are foundational to sound educational leadership. Studies have shown that well-implemented planning and organizing functions enhance alignment between institutional goals and available resources, thereby improving program quality and outcomes (Kapur, 2022; Sreeza, 2022). The present findings further support the assertion that when deans systematically exercise core management functions, academic departments are better positioned to meet accreditation standards, sustain instructional quality, and respond to external demands such as board examination performance requirements.

Differences in the level of implementation of management functions

To determine whether perceptions differed between faculty members and top management regarding the implementation of management functions, a Mann–Whitney U test was conducted. Results showed no statistically significant differences across all five functions, as all p-values were greater than 0.05. Specifically, planning yielded a p-value of 0.740, organizing 0.743, commanding 0.432, coordinating 0.166, and controlling 0.181. These findings indicate a strong alignment between the two respondent groups in their assessment of how consistently and frequently criminology deans implement their management functions.

Although coordinating and controlling registered comparatively lower p-values than the other functions, these values still did not reach the level of statistical significance. This suggests only minor variability in perceptions rather than substantive disagreement. The high p-values for planning and organizing, in particular, reflect a shared recognition that these functions are uniformly and effectively implemented. Overall, the absence of significant differences underscores a common understanding among stakeholders regarding the operational leadership practices of criminology deans.

Level of effectiveness of management functions

The third objective assessed the effectiveness of criminology deans in performing their management functions. Similar to the findings on implementation, all five functions—planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling—were rated as Highly Effective, with a consistent median score of 4. These results indicate that respondents perceived not only frequent execution of management functions but also the achievement of their intended outcomes.

Faculty members and top management noted that deans' planning efforts result in clear goal-setting and strategic direction, while organizing contributes to efficient workflows and role clarity. Commanding was associated with decisive leadership and guidance, coordinating with responsive communication and synchronization of activities, and controlling with consistent monitoring and evaluation of academic operations. In practice, these outcomes suggest that deans' decisions and directives are generally viewed as facilitating, rather than hindering, the attainment of program objectives.

The convergence of high implementation and high effectiveness ratings implies that the management functions exercised by criminology deans are not merely nominal or procedural. Instead, they are carried out in ways that stakeholders find meaningful and beneficial to departmental performance. This finding is consistent with organizational frameworks that link strong administrative and managerial functions to improved institutional performance, faculty commitment, and organizational stability (Nabi et al., 2017).

Differences in the level of effectiveness of management functions

When differences in perceived effectiveness were examined using the Mann–Whitney U test, results showed no statistically significant differences between faculty members and top management for planning ($p = 0.362$), organizing ($p = 0.093$), commanding ($p = 0.067$), and controlling ($p = 0.108$). These findings indicate general agreement between the two groups regarding the effectiveness of these functions.

However, a statistically significant difference emerged for the coordinating function, which yielded a p-value of 0.019. While coordination was still rated as effective overall, this result suggests a perceptual gap between faculty members and top management. Faculty may be

experiencing greater challenges related to day-to-day synchronization, communication flow, or resource alignment than top management perceives. This divergence highlights coordination as a critical area for further improvement, particularly in strengthening communication channels, enhancing interdepartmental collaboration, and ensuring that faculty members feel adequately informed and supported in coordinated initiatives.

Satisfaction with leadership dimensions

The fifth objective focused on respondents' satisfaction with the leadership dimensions of criminology deans. Findings revealed exceptionally high levels of satisfaction across all five dimensions—Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. All dimensions obtained a median rating of 10, interpreted as Almost Always Satisfied, indicating that leadership practices are consistently perceived in a positive light.

Respondents reported that deans regularly demonstrate integrity, professionalism, and congruence between words and actions, reflecting strong Modeling the Way. Inspiring a Shared Vision was evident in the deans' ability to articulate clear and compelling directions for the criminology program. Challenging the Process was manifested through encouragement of innovation and openness to constructive change, while Enabling Others to Act was associated with collaboration, trust, and empowerment of faculty members. Encouraging the Heart was reflected in recognition and appreciation of faculty and staff contributions.

Qualitative accounts further emphasized the importance of recognition practices, such as public acknowledgements, personalized expressions of appreciation, and institutional award programs like PAGLAWAD. These practices were perceived to foster a positive organizational climate, enhance morale, and strengthen faculty motivation and loyalty. The findings align with previous research underscoring the role of recognition, supportive relationships, and emotional reinforcement in effective leadership (Celestin et al., 2024; Chen, 2023; Lansing et al., 2023; Zhang, 2024).

Differences in satisfaction with leadership dimensions

The sixth objective examined whether satisfaction with leadership dimensions differed between faculty members and top management. Mann–Whitney U test results indicated no statistically significant differences for Modeling the Way ($p = 0.372$) and Inspiring a Shared Vision ($p = 0.054$), suggesting shared and consistent perceptions of the deans' integrity and visioning capabilities.

In contrast, statistically significant differences were observed for Challenging the Process ($p = 0.049$), Enabling Others to Act ($p = 0.026$), and Encouraging the Heart ($p = 0.016$). These dimensions are more relational and participatory in nature, and the observed differences suggest that faculty members may feel less empowered, less involved in innovation, or less recognized than top management assumes. While leadership is generally viewed as effective, these gaps

indicate a possible disconnect between leadership intentions and faculty members' everyday experiences.

From a leadership perspective, these findings highlight the importance of examining how participatory practices, empowerment strategies, and recognition mechanisms are implemented and experienced across stakeholder groups. Greater alignment in these areas is essential, as they directly influence faculty engagement, openness to change, and sense of belonging within the institution (McCallum, 2012; Paraiso, 2021).

Qualitative themes on challenges in leadership and management

The seventh objective explored the challenges encountered by criminology deans, as revealed through qualitative data. One prominent theme was time traps and leadership overload, with deans reporting the difficulty of balancing extensive administrative responsibilities alongside teaching, research, extension services, and external engagements. Both faculty members and managers noted that heavy administrative workloads can sometimes limit deans' availability for mentoring, consultation, and long-term strategic initiatives.

Another recurring theme involved emotional and relational demands. Deans are expected to manage conflicts, address faculty concerns, and support students facing personal or academic difficulties. Navigating disciplinary issues while maintaining fairness, transparency, and empathy was described as particularly challenging and emotionally taxing. These demands highlight the relational complexity of academic leadership roles.

Regulatory and compliance pressures also emerged as a significant challenge. Frequent changes in accreditation standards, board examination requirements, and regulatory directives require constant updating of policies, documentation, and program alignment. These pressures intensify the planning and monitoring responsibilities of deans and demand sustained attention to compliance-related tasks.

Finally, digital and pedagogical transitions were identified as ongoing challenges. The shift toward technology-enhanced learning, digital documentation, and online platforms necessitates continuous upskilling for both leaders and faculty members. Deans are expected to champion innovation while ensuring that all stakeholders remain supported and digitally prepared.

Collectively, these qualitative insights help explain why certain management functions and leadership dimensions, particularly coordination, empowerment, and recognition, exhibited perceptual gaps despite generally high ratings. They underscore the need for structured institutional support systems, including leadership development programs, administrative assistance, and wellness initiatives, to sustain effective leadership performance over time.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that criminology deans in selected colleges in Pangasinan are widely perceived by both faculty members and top management as highly effective and consistent in the implementation of core management functions, namely planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. Across these functional areas, the deans demonstrated not only frequent execution but also meaningful attainment of intended outcomes, as reflected in uniformly high ratings for both implementation and effectiveness. These findings suggest that management practices within criminology programs are well institutionalized and aligned with organizational

goals, contributing positively to program quality, operational stability, and overall institutional performance.

In addition to strong managerial performance, the leadership of criminology deans was viewed very favorably, with exceptionally high levels of satisfaction reported across all five leadership dimensions—Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. Respondents consistently recognized the deans' integrity, professionalism, and ability to articulate a clear and compelling direction for their programs. Particularly noteworthy was the strong appreciation for recognition and encouragement practices, which were perceived to foster a positive organizational climate characterized by motivation, loyalty, and professional commitment among faculty and staff.

The findings further revealed a high degree of perceptual alignment between faculty members and top management regarding the implementation and effectiveness of most management functions, underscoring a shared appreciation of the deans' leadership contributions. However, modest yet statistically significant differences emerged in the perceived effectiveness of coordination and in satisfaction with certain leadership dimensions, specifically Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. These divergences suggest that while leadership is generally effective, faculty members may experience gaps in empowerment, participation, recognition, or day-to-day coordination that are less visible from a top management perspective. Such differences highlight the importance of examining how leadership intentions translate into everyday practices and experiences at the operational level.

Qualitative findings provide important contextual insight into these perceptual gaps by revealing the complex challenges faced by criminology deans. These include substantial time and workload pressures arising from the need to balance administrative responsibilities with teaching, research, extension work, and external engagements, as well as emotional and relational demands associated with conflict management, faculty support, and student concerns. Additionally, persistent regulatory pressures related to accreditation, licensure performance, and compliance, alongside ongoing digital and pedagogical transitions, further shape how leadership and management functions are enacted and perceived. These realities underscore that high performance often occurs within constrained and demanding conditions, reinforcing the need for structured institutional support.

Taken together, the findings affirm that sustaining cohesive, responsive, and high-quality criminology programs depends not only on effective leadership and management but also on continuous alignment between faculty and top management perspectives. Strengthening participatory leadership practices, enhancing coordination mechanisms, and sustaining inclusive recognition systems are essential for deepening engagement and trust. Moreover, targeted leadership and management capacity-building initiatives, coupled with workload-balancing measures and administrative support, can help mitigate leadership overload and enable deans to focus on strategic, relational, and academic priorities. Promoting regular dialogue among stakeholders can further bridge perceptual gaps and foster a collaborative institutional culture. Finally, the study points to the value of future research that broadens the scope of inquiry to include student perspectives, regional comparisons, and longitudinal assessments of leadership

development initiatives, particularly in relation to outcomes such as licensure performance and graduate employability.

REFERENCES

- Aguirre, J. P. A., Librando, M. T., & Mendoza, K. M. (2022). Introduction to criminology: Its nature, concept, and scope. Central Book Supply.
- Alfiler, M. C. P., & Nicolas, E. E. (1997). Leadership studies in the Philippines: A review of literature. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 41(1–4), 1–28.
- Ariola, M. M. (2018). The contemporary world. Unlimited Books and Library Services.
- Ariola, M. M. (2020). Society and culture in the Philippine setting. Colegio de Dagupan.
- Birzer, M. L., & Tannehill, R. (2012). Principles of leadership and management in law enforcement. CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b11802>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(3), 391–406.
- DeCarlo, J., & Dlugolenski, E. (2023). Criminal justice management and leadership: An anthology. Cognella Academic Publishing.
- Entoma, R. C. (2023). Work management style of college deans of state universities and colleges in Region VIII, Philippines. *JPAIR Institutional Research*, 8(1), 1–15.
- Kapur, R. (2022). Implementing management functions: Fundamental in leading to upgrading the overall structure of the organization. University of Delhi. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361829706>
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2010). The leadership challenge (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Kramer, M. W., Hecht, M. L., & Donohue, W. A. (2017). Organizational communication. Routledge.
- McCallum, J. (2012). A study of the leadership dimensions of national distinguished principals (Doctoral dissertation). Nova Southeastern University.
- Montez, J., Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. (2002). The roles and challenges of deans. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 241–266. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2002.0026>

Nabi, A., Siyal, A. A., & Solangi, G. M. (2017). Dimensions of leadership and management in educational institutions: A theoretical and conceptual framework. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 31(6), 673–685.

Ozkan, T., & Aytas, T. (2018). Evaluation of the managerial effectiveness of school administrators from teachers' perspectives. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 14(6), 2341–2352. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/89558>

Pacadaljen, L. (2020). Management functions of college deans among state universities and colleges in Eastern Visayas. *Psychology and Education Journal*, 57(9), 2385–2396.

Paraiso, L. R. (2021). Toward a conceptual framework of Filipino leadership among education leaders in selected Philippine higher education institutions (Doctoral dissertation). De La Salle University.

Racelis, A. D. (2005). Exploratory study of organizational culture in Philippine firms. *Philippine Management Review*, 12(1), 1–22.

Saldaen, F. V., et al. (2021). Public management challenges in a local government unit in the Philippines: Implications to the educational sector. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 9(4), 234–241. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-9-4-10>

Sreeza, V. (2022). Planning, organizing, and controlling in educational management. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 5(2), 45–52.

Sumad-on, D. T., et al. (2022). Management and challenges of criminology deans in the new normal. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 7(8), 1120–1127.

Tan, K.-L. (2023). Responsible leadership: A brief review of literature. *Journal of Responsible Tourism Management*, 3(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.47263/JRTM.03-01-04>

Vito, G. F., & Higgins, G. E. (2010). Examining the validity of the leadership challenge inventory: The case for law enforcement. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 12(3), 305–319. <https://doi.org/10.1350/ijps.2010.12.3.191>