IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT TACTICS: ITS RELATIONSHIP TO COLLEGIATE INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP

[1]Magnolia Libayne-Factora

ABSTRACT--This paper ascertained the impression management tactics of deans in one university. It looked into the profile of the different college deans and related it to collegiate interpersonal relationship. It further investigated the various impression management employed by the deans and how these are assessed by both the deans and the faculty. Eventually, a comparison of the assessment was made. There were 365 respondents in this study who come from 42 colleges university-wide. The quantitative method was utilized in this study. It also employed the descriptive correlational method which is qualitative in nature. The study used the quantitative method of research. Specifically, it employed the descriptive correlational research method which is quantitative in nature. The descriptive method was used considering that the study ascertains the profile of the college deans, the impression management tactic used and the reasons of the college deans for using their impression management tactics. On the other hand, the correlational part involves the investigation of the significant difference in the impression management tactics of the College Deans as assessed by the teachers and College Deans themselves; the significant difference in the impression management tactics of the College Deans according to their profile variables. The results revealed that CSU College Deans utilize eclecticism in their impression management in the workplace. The utilization of this impression management tactic is primarily dependent on every situation that the deans find effective. In utilizing an eclectic approach, the deans have healthy interpersonal outcomes to be liked, to be perceived competent and to be perceived as good performers by their subordinates. Thus, it can be said that the college deans used their impression management tactic successfully. Finally, it can be said that the CSU College deans utilize good impression management tactic which is an essential competency for an effective and productive organization.

Keywords-- impression management tactics, interpersonal relationship, productive organization

I. INTRODUCTION

It is normal for every individual to establish good impression from others in avoidance of negative views. This is true for people in any societal or organizational engagements. If there is a certain entity where this kind of behavior is prevalent, it is for the college deans who are considered middle managers in the university and in which the concern for a positive image is particularly salient. Significantly, deanship offers the perfect opportunity for the college deans to manage their impressions as they govern teachers and students under their care.

Impression management (IM), being a process in which people are able to have control of how others look at them, is important in any organization. According to Drory & Zaidman (2007), impression management aims at

¹ Ph. D, Cagayan State University, Tuguegarao City,magzon@yahoo.com, 0977 4957909

steering the opinion of others by controlling information. It can also be used in an individual setting and at a macro organizational level (Avery & McKay, 2006). For example, organizational leaders can use IM tactics to manage their image to their subordinates or at the organizational level, the leaders and employees can collectively cultivate a good image with other people out from the organization.

Inasmuch as the concern of the study is how impression management is used at the individual level, it is a fact that the college deans are engaged in such kind of management. The most common reason for using impression management is to have quick cost-benefit analysis (Schlenker, 2000). In this context, the college deans assess the benefits of showing one image rather than another one by putting premium importance on the cost of choosing that certain image. Example of this cost benefit analysis is that college deans desire to bring across the correct image to their subordinates such as an image of authority, good leadership, professionalism and competence to gain their approval and support.

Given this vital role of impression management in leadership behavior, it is generally regarded that this concept is a fundamental part of organizational life and vital to effective organizational communication. In short, in order to understand life in organizations, it is a basic requirement to first understand impression management. Heads of organizations are expected to be skilled in impressions management especially when the workplace is competitive and dynamic. Otherwise, managers who are not fully aware of this concept have the risks of poor performance, not only for the self but eventually for the organization (Gardner, 2002).

The main stimulus for the conceptualization of this study is anchored on the personal observation of the researcher that different college deans of Cagayan State University, use different impression management tactics. Some talk proudly about their experience, competence and qualifications to win the support of their subordinates. Others promote their power over their subordinates to win their approval. Still some use flattery or favors to win their subordinate's approval while others advertise their personal weaknesses to elicit the feeling that their subordinate's assistance is needed.

The fact is that an effective use of a particular impression management is important to influence subordinates to behave in ways that accomplishes their personal objectives as well as the college goals.   Specifically, the aim of this investigation is to determine the impression management tactic and its relationship to the collegiate interpersonal relationship. It also ascertained the motives of the deans in the use of the impression management tactics and the differences of their impression management with the end goal of determining implications to their interpersonal relationship with their faculty in the college.

According to Schlenker (2000), IM is any conscious or unconscious attempt in controlling persona being projected in social interactions. It is similar with the process of influencing the perception of others towards them (Rosenfeld, Giacalone & Riordan 2002). Moreover, Schneider (2001) pointed out that impressions may be managed external entities such as colleagues or subordinates. In this study, however, it is the manner the college deans manage to present themselves or control their images to their subordinates which is the locus of the investigation.

One of the important concerns that have to be understood with respect to impression management is its components. The components explain the process involved in making impression management. The reason for presenting this in this section is because of the objectives of the study is the determination of the motives or reasons for the utilization of the different impression management strategies.

Impression management involves two distinct processes operating on different principles and influenced by different positions. One is concerned with process while the other one is on creation.

There is a situation common to people wherein they regularly check on the perception of others towards them as a way of knowing what impressions or images they formed to them.

Meanwhile, the second component of impression management is concerned with creation. This involves knowing how others see another. And the latter makes a way to alter his/her behavior in trying to affect the impressions of the former, thereby getting an idea on how to create and establish a personality that fits their impressions.

For reasons why managers should make use of IM, Leary & Kowalski (2000) point to three major motivations. First, they would be involved in opportunities where they could manage their behaviors in manners that maximize the good and minimize the negative (Merkl-Davies & Brennan, 2007). Second, they will have the full control of conforming their image with the expectations set forth in their social roles and third, they can manage the future success and identity of the organization since they can manipulate on strategies according to their own behavior.

Different Impression Management Strategies

The following presents taxonomy of self-presentation strategies by Jones & Pittman (2002).

Ingratiation

This is a set of acquisitive IM technique that leads one to be more attractive and likeable to others. Someone who ingratiates seeks to look at others' perspective on what he finds pleasing so he can make a way to provide and measure up (Schlenker, 2000). Once this technique is utilized correctly, it can create good relationship; thus, harmonizing people inside the organization (Rosenfeld et al., 2005). Furthermore, Ralston (2005) states that ingratiation becomes beneficial to organization when it binds people in social groups. Once tendency to facilitate ingratiation depends on differences in power from which varying relationships can happen (Schlenker, 2000). Organization, today, have this element and it is commonly used to influence people from the low level of the hierarchy to its topmost level (Rosenfeld et al.2005).

Jones identified the following as tactics one can use to ingratiate him/herself with the target: (Jones & Pittman, 2002).

First is self-enhancement. This is when someone accepts and recognizes his/her weakness, and puts extra effort to overcome it (Rosenfeld et al., 2005).

The second type of ingratiation is other-enhancement. This is when the actor is more concerned with how he/she pleases other people in order that he/she gains their praise and approval (Tedeschi & Riess, 2001). According to Kipnis and Vanderveer (2001) this puts the bias for performing and average types of workers since when assessment comes, they tend to equal.

The third is opinion conformity. This happens when someone concedes to others; opinions in order to eliminate unwanted feeling, but instead, to let others' attention be drawn towards him (Tedeschi & Riess, 2001). This means that an individual makes his thoughts or feelings consistent with others in order to be liked even more (Bohra & Pandey, 2004). In terms of variations in power, there is a tendency that the lower fellow would most likely conform to the people within the upper level of the hierarchy (Rosenfeld et al., 2005).

And the last is favor-doing. This is when people who do good acts as looked to be emphatic and helpful. Behind this strategy is the rule of reciprocity -one has to pay back for the goodness or favors done (Gouldner, 2000).

Other than ingratiation, there are more IM tactics both for external and internal use in organizations. Besides, there are other means to manage positive impressions (Rosenfeld et al. 2005).

Self-promotion

In this manner, one receives impression by establishing a sense of competence, and he expresses this through communication (Tedeschi & Riess, 2001). Sometimes, this idea is misunderstood to cause intimidation; but, the fact that self-promotion is built on competence, then there is no way that it causes fear (Jones & Pittman, 2002). The risk however is, when someone gets to be promoted via competence, others have the tendency to feel jealous.

Godfrey, Jones & Lord (2006) give a point between these two strategies stating that self-promotion is proactive while ingratiation is reactive. The latter means one can react by expressing positive responses which may be in the form of smile or nod, while the former needs extra sense of verbal expressions to convey competence.

Self-promotion is commonly used when a competent person happens to be challenged of his points, having the feeling of being looked at very low (Rosenfeld et al. 2005). Another reason for its occurrence is when someone needs to impress someone with a higher rank about his competence (Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 2006).

Intimidation

An intimidator expresses an impression that he is to be feared for he can be dangerous (Jones & Pittman, 2002). This IM strategy can manipulate others to believe in the threat and therefore comply to the demands imposed by the intimidator (Tedeschi & Riess, 2001).

The likelihood of this phenomenon to happen may be between subordinates and supervisors as with students and teachers (Jones & Pittman, 2002). Where there is a counter flow of power, there is intimidation. In organizations, intimidation is usually a form of downward influence (Rosenfeld et al. 2005).

Generally, intimidation goes contrary with ingratiation. It usually puts gaps while ingratiation binds people (Jones & Pittman, 2002).

Exemplification

This may happen to someone who has high regard for integrity and morality. More than anything, an exemplifier wants to be recognized for being honest and disciplined. And the only way to succeed in this IM is to live by example on the ground of what is moral (Rosenfeld et al., 2005). Any head of an organization who goes to work early and leave late is an example of this. He/She is willing to sacrifice for the sake of others. But he/she has also that certain kind of command that makes others feel guilty for not acting in a morally upright manner. Only by the time others follow his/her ways can their guilt be lessened (Jones & Pittman, 2002).

Furthermore, the one who subscribes to this wants people to know how hardworking he/she is (Rosenfeld et al., 2005).

Supplication

This is for those who are honest enough to admit their weakness; thus having the dependence from others. Their lack of ability on certain areas expresses to others the need for help (Rosenfeld et al., 2005). Abuse of it, however, is a complete admission of incompetence (Jones, 2000).

There should be a way to compensate one another in order to still have the sense of responsibility for work and exchanges (Rosenfeld et al., 2005).

The above-stated strategies may not necessarily be taken individually for combinations can happen (Jones & Pittman, 2002).

Factors affecting the successful use of the five Impression Management tactics

There are possible reasons that can make each tactic work differently with different kinds of people.

As for ingratiation, the more one needs to engage in it, the more likely it will become apparent and people might instead dislike the ingratiator than being liked (Rosenfeld et al., 2005). To act with modesty is then the goal (Schlenker, 2000).

For self-promotion, Jones and Pittman (2002) mentions about "self-promoter paradox". This problem states that claims about an individual's competence are frequently more likely when the competence of the actor is doubtful than when it is high and secure. This may lead to possible argument that someone may just be using the tactic to make up for something. But for women who are assertive and confident, this may account to a positive impression (Rudman, 2008).

As regards intimidation, one's ease to it may let him think and believe he is liked while the truth may be is that he is being detested. (Rosenfeld et al., 2005).

As with exemplification, the danger may lie on that part where the actor acts contrary to his previous claims or beliefs. It is like not walking your talk.

However, there are still other aspects to consider in order to make use of IM in a better way (Schlenker & Weigold 2002) . It was found out that confident people have better ways of conveying thoughts or visions verbally or non-verbally (DePaulo, 2002). Finally Snyder (1974) mentioned an interesting point on self-monitoring. Accordingly, people who are aware of their own actions and are able to control their behaviors are good for new learning, and thus, are able to identify what is apt for new situations (Snyder, 1994). In addition, they are also able to clearly express and communicate their thoughts and feelings in any manner.

This research on impression management of the college deans is guided with three (3) basic assumptions. First, social interactions is what make organizations breathe and live; hence, IM is a necessity. This is particularly true to middle managers like the college deans who care so much on how they package themselves to their subordinates to exact cooperation, authority, and approval. There are many strategies that the college deans can utilize to control their image before their subordinates with the ultimate aim of winning their approval. According to Bolino and Turnley (1999), there are basically five impression management strategies as discussed above.

II.   STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study is an investigation of the impression management tactics of the College Deans in CSU. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1.   What is the profile of the College Deans in terms of the following:

1.1   Sex

1.2   Age

    1.3   Civil Status

    1.4   Highest Educational attainment

    1.5   Academic Rank

    1.6   Number of Years as College Dean

    1.7   Number of Faculty supervised

    1.8   Number of designations previously held

    1.9   Number of trainings on management

2. What impression management tactics are used by the College Deans along the following dimensions as assessed by the teachers and college deans themselves?

    2.1   Self promotion

    2.2   Ingratiation

    2.3   Exemplification

    2.4   Intimidation

    2.5   Supplication

3. What is the level of political skill of the College Deans along the following factors as assessed by the teachers and college deans themselves?

    3.1   Networking ability

    3.2   Interpersonal influence

    3.3   Social astuteness

    3.4   Apparent sincerity

4. What is the level of interpersonal skill of the College Deans as perceived by their teachers and themselves?

5. Is there a significant relationship between interpersonal skill, impression management tactics and interpersonal relationship of the College Deans?

6. What are the implications of the dean's impression management tactics to their collegiate interpersonal relationship?

III.   HYPOTHESIS

1. There is no significant difference in the impression management tactics of the College Deans as assessed by the teachers and College Deans themselves.

2. There is no significant relationship in the impression management tactics of the College Deans and the collegiate interpersonal relationship.

IV.   METHODOLOGY

This part of the research presents the methodology that was utilized in the conduct of the study. It includes the research design, locale of the study, respondents and sampling procedures, research instruments, data gathering procedures and data analysis.

V.   RESEARCH DESIGN

The study used the quantitative method of research. Specifically, it employs the descriptive correlational research method which is quantitative in nature. The descriptive method was used considering that the study ascertains the profile of the college deans, the impression management tactic used and the reasons of the college deans for using their impression management tactics. On the other hand, the correlational part involves the investigation of the significant difference in the impression management tactics of the College Deans as assessed by the teachers and College Deans themselves; the significant difference in the impression management tactics of the College Deans according to their profile variables; and the significant relationship between the impression management tactics and political skill of the College Deans.

Local of the Study

The study was conducted in the eight campuses of Cagayan State University in the whole province of Cagayan. Forty two (42) colleges were used in the study. Four came from Andrews Campus, eight from Aparri Campus, seven from Carig Campus, six from Gonzaga Campus, three from Lallo Campus, three from Lasam Campus, four from Piat Campus, and seven from Sanchez Mira Campus. Finally, the study was conducted from December 2013 to March 2014.

VI. RESPONDENTS AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES

The respondents are the different college deans and faculty members in the forty two (42) colleges in the whole university. Complete enumeration was done for the college deans and the faculty members. Only the regular faculty members were considered in the study for those Deans who have regular faculty under them but part-timers with more than three years of service were involved for those Deans who do not have regular faculty members. A total of 365 respondents was utilized for the study and the listing of the number of respondents per college is reflected in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Respondents of the Study

Campus	Colleges	College Deans	No. of teachers supervised
Andrews	College of Education	1	35
	College of Business, Entrepreneurship & Accountancy	1	10
	College of Hospitality Industry Management	1	09
	College Allied Health Sciences	1	10
Aparri	College of Business, Entrepreneurship & Accountancy	1	3
	College of Criminal Justice and Administration	1	3
	College of Information and Computing Sciences	1	11

	College of Teacher Education	1	5
	College of Fisheries	1	5
	College of Hospitality Industry Management	1	11
	College of Industrial Technology	1	6
	College of Nursing	1	3
Carig	College of Arts & Science	1	45
	College Engineering	1	36
	College of Technology	1	37
	College of Veterinary Medicine	1	07
	College of Public Administration	1	05
	College Information & Computing Sciences	1	23
	College of Human Kinetics	1	4
Gonzaga	College of Agriculture	1	6
	College of Business, Entrepreneurship & Accountancy	1	5
	College of Criminal Justice and Administration	1	3
	College of Teacher Education	1	6
	College of Hospitality Industry Management	1	3
	College of Information and Computing Sciences	1	5
Lallo	College of Agriculture	1	2
	College of Hospitality Industry Management	1	1
	College of Teacher Education	1	7
Lasam	College of Teacher Education	1	3
	College of Industrial Technology	1	3
	College of Information and Computing Sciences	1	3
Piat	College of Agriculture	1	7
	College of Criminal Justice and Administration	1	3
	College of Teacher Education	1	8
	College of Information and Computing Sciences	1	3
Sanchez Mira	College of Agriculture	1	6
	College of Arts and Sciences	1	3

	College of Criminal Justice and Administration	1	3
	College of Teacher Education	1	8
	College of Hospitality Industry Management	1	3
	College of Industrial Technology	1	3
	College of Information and Computing Sciences	1	3
	Total	**42**	**365**

VII.   RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

For this research, three (3) sets of questionnaires were used. The instruments for the measurement of impression management tactics and political skill were adopted from a standardized test.

1. The determination of impression management tactic used by the college deans was made through the use of Impression Management Scale. The instrument is composed of 25 items that was developed by Bolino and Turnley (1999). Dimensions of impression management tactics that are tested in this instrument are self promotion (items 1,6,7,13 and 19); ingratiation (items 2,8,12,14, and 20); exemplification (3,9,15,18 and 21); intimidation (items 4,10,16,22 and 24); and supplication (5,11,17,23 and 25). Moreover, with the following scale:

1   -   Never

2   -   Seldom

3   -   Often

4   -   Very often

2. Interpersonal Relationship was measured using the Interpersonal Relationships Questionnare which is composed of 21 items and was developed by Antonio Tamayao, Ph.D. (2013). This standard instrument uses the following scale:

1   -   Strongly Disagree

2   -   Disagree

3   -   Agree

4   -   Strongly Agree

VIII.   DATA GATHERING PROCEDURE

Permission was requested from the University President of Cagayan State University. After the approval, the questionnaires was floated to the college deans and their faculty members. Furthermore, interview with the college deans and their faculty members was done as a way of determining specific behavioral manifestation for the dean's impression management tactics and political skill as well as the reasons for the utilization for such. This made the researcher to do more probing questions in order to unravel more information about the topics to be investigated.

IX.   DATA ANALYSIS

The data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics. Specifically, frequency count and percentage was used to analyze the profile of the college deans and the reasons for the use of the impression management tactics. On the other hand, the impression management tactic was presented using means measured in terms of the four point Likert Scale.

To determine whether there is a significant difference in the impression management tactics skill of the College Deans as assessed by the teachers and College Deans themselves as well as the significant difference in the impression management tactic and political skill of the College Deans according to their profile variables, Chi square and T-test was used. On the other hand, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to look into the significant relationship between the impression management tactics and political skill of the College Deans.

X.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The presentation follows the order in the statement of the problem.

Table 2. Profile of the college deans

Category	Frequency	Percent
Campus		
Aparri	8	19.0
Andrews	4	9.5
Carig	7	16.7
Gonzaga	6	14.3
Lal-lo	3	7.1
Lasam	3	7.1
Piat	4	9.5
Sanchez Mira	7	16.7
College Affiliation		
AGRI	4	9.5
CAHS	1	2.4
CAS	3	7.1
CBEA	3	7.1
CCJA	2	4.8
CHK	1	2.4
CICS	1	2.4
CPA	1	2.4
CRIM	2	4.8
CVM	1	2.4

EDUC	6	14.3
ENGG	1	2.4
FISHERIES	1	2.4
HIM	4	9.5
INDTECH	3	7.1
IT	6	14.3
NURSING	1	2.4
TECHNO	1	2.4
Sex		
Male	22	52.4
Female	20	47.6
Age		
30 – 35	4	9.5
36 – 40	5	11.9
41 – 45	6	14.3
46 – 50	7	16.7
51 & older	20	47.6
Mean= SD = 53		
Civil Status		
Single	4	9.5
Married	38	90.5
Category	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Highest Educational Attainment		
BS/AB	1	2.4
MA/MS	19	45.2
Ph.D.	22	52.4
Academic Rank		
Instructor	3	7.1
Assistant Professor	15	35.7
Associate Professor	23	54.8
Professor	1	2.4
Number of Years as Dean		

1 – 2	11	26.2
3 – 4	14	33.3
5 – 6	10	23.8
7 & longer	7	16.7
Mean = SD = 3		
Faculty/Staff Size		
3 – 4	17	40.5
5 – 6	9	21.4
7 – 8	3	7.1
9 & more	13	31.0
Mean = SD =		
Number of Previous Designations		
1 – 2	33	78.6
3 – 4	5	11.9
5 – 6	4	9.5
Mean = SD =		
Number of Management Trainings Attended		
1 – 2	19	45.2
3 – 4	9	21.4
5 – 6	10	23.8
7 & more	4	9.5

Table 2 presents the profile of the college deans of Cagayan State University. The profile of the college deans is essential in this study because it is a way of determining the impression management tactics and political skills. With respect to campus assignment, 8 or 19% deans assigned are in Aparri, 7 or 16.7% are working in Carig and Sanchez Mira and 6 or 14.3% are found in Gonzaga. Moreover, 4 or 9.5% deans are assigned in Andrews and Piat Campuses while 3 or 7.1% deans are working in Lal-lo and Lasam campuses.

In terms of college affiliation, 6 or 14.3% are in the college of education and College of Information Technology, 4 or 9.5% are deans of the college of Hospitality Industry Management and 3 or 7.1% are deans of the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business Entrepreneurship and Accountancy, and College of Industrial Technology.

As to sex, 22 or 52.4% of the college deans are males and 20 or 47.6% are female college deans. With respect to age, 20 or 47.6% have ages ranging from 51 and older, 7 or 16.7% belong to ages 46-50, and 6 or 14.3%

are aged 41-45. Moreover, 5 or 11.9% are 36-40 years old, and 4 or 9.5% have ages from 30-35. The mean age of the college deans is 53 which suggest that they are relatively old.

As regards civil status, 38 or 90.5% are married and 4 or 9.5% are single deans. With respect to highest educational attainment, 22 or 52.4% of the college deans are Ph.D. graduates, 19 or 45.2% are master's degree holders and 1 or 2.4% is a bachelor's degree graduate.

In terms of academic rank, 23 or 54.8% of the college deans are occupying associate professor position, 15 or 35.7% are assistant professors, 3 or 7.1% are instructors, and 1 or 2.4% is a professor. With respect to number of years of service as dean, 14 or 33.3% are in the service for 3-4 years, 11 or 26.2% are 1-2 years as deans, 10 or 23.8% have been in the service for 5-6 years, and 7 or 16.7% are 7 years and longer in the service. The mean years of service as dean is 3 years which indicates that they are relatively young in the service.

As regards number of faculty supervised, 17 or 40.5% of the college deans are supervising 3-4 faculty members, 13 or 31.0% have 9 or more faculty under their supervision, 9 or 21.4% are supervising 5-6 teachers and 3 or 7.1% have 7-8 teachers to be supervised.

With respect to number of designations previously held, 33 or 78.6% of the college deans have held 1-2 designations, 5 or 11.9% have occupied 3-4 designations and 4 or 9.5% have previously held 5-6 designations.

Lastly, in terms of number of management trainings attended, 19 or 45.2% of the college deans have 1-2 trainings attended relative to management, 10 or 23.8% have attended 5-6 trainings, 9 or 21.4% have 3-4 trainings and 4 or 9.5% have 7 and more trainings on management.

Table 3. Impression tactics employed by the college deans as assessed by themselves and their faculty.

Statements	College Deans		College Faculty		Average Weighted Mean	Description
	Weighted Mean	Description	Weighted Mean	Description		
Self-Promotion						
1. My Dean takes proudly about his/her experience or education.	2.19	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.34	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.27	Disagree (Sometimes)
6. My Dean lets others know that s/he has a reputation for being competent in a particular area.	2.38	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.45	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.42	Disagree (Sometimes)
7. My Dean makes his/her subordinates aware of his/her talents or qualifications.	2.33	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.44	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.39	Disagree (Sometimes)

13. My Dean lets his/her subordinates know that s/he is valuable to the organization.	2.38	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.60	Agree (Often)	2.49	Disagree (Sometimes)
19. My Dean makes his/her subordinates aware of his/her accomplishments.	2.14	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.41	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.28	Disagree (Sometimes)
Category Weighted Mean	2.28	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.49	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.39	Disagree (Sometimes)
Ingratiation						
2. My Dean complements his/her subordinates so they will see him/her as likable.	2.67	Agree (Often)	2.55	Agree (Often)	2.61	Agree (Often)
8. My Dean takes an interest in his/her subordinates' personal lives to show them that s/he is friendly.	2.17	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.41	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.29	Disagree (Sometimes)
12. My Dean uses flattery and favors to make his/her colleagues like him/her more.	1.60	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.98	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.79	Disagree (Sometimes)
14. My Dean praises his/her subordinates for their accomplishments so they will consider him/her a nice person.	2.26	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.38	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.32	Disagree (Sometimes)

20. My Dean does personal favors for his/her subordinates to show them that s/he is friendly.	1.86	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.16	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.01	Disagree (Sometimes)
Category Weighted Mean	2.11	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.30	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.21	Disagree (Sometimes)
Exemplification						
3. My Dean stays at work late so people will know s/he is hardworking.	2.36	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.42	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.39	Disagree (Sometimes)
9. My Dean tries to appear busy, even at times when things are slower.	1.62	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.04	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.83	Disagree (Sometimes)
15. My Dean arrives at work early to look dedicated.	2.05	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.51	Agree (Often)	2.28	Disagree (Sometimes)
18. My Dean tries to appear like a hardworking, dedicated employee.	1.62	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.19	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.91	Disagree (Sometimes)
21. My Dean comes to the office at night or on weekends to show that s/he is dedicated.	1.71	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.10	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.91	Disagree (Sometimes)
Category Weighted Mean	1.87	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.25	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.06	Disagree (Sometimes)
Intimidation						
4. My Dean is intimidating with his/her subordinates to help him/her get the job done.	1.62	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.03	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.83	Disagree (Sometimes)

10. My Dean lets his/her subordinates know s/he can make things difficult for them if they push him/her too far.	1.67	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.04	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.86	Disagree (Sometimes)
16. My Dean deals forcefully with his/her subordinates when they hamper his/her ability to get his/her job done.	1.76	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.07	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.92	Disagree (Sometimes)
22. My Dean uses intimidation to get his/her subordinates behaves appropriately.	1.40	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.98	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.69	Strongly Disagree (Never)
24.My Dean deals strongly or aggressively with co-workers who interfere in his/her business.	1.55	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.92	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.74	Strongly Disagree (Never)
Category Weighted Mean	1.60	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.01	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.81	Disagree (Sometimes)
Supplication						
5. My Dean acts like s/he knows less than s/he does so his/her subordinates will help him/her out.	1.74	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.97	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.86	Disagree (Sometimes)
11. My Dean tries to gain assistance or sympathy from his/her subordinates by appearing needy in some areas.	1.79	Disagree (Sometimes)	2.10	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.95	Disagree (Sometimes)

17. My Dean pretends not to understand something to gain his/her subordinate's help.	1.36	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.85	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.61	Strongly Disagree (Never)
23. My Dean acts like s/he needs assistance so his/her subordinates will help him/her out.	1.52	Strongly Disagree (Never)	2.03	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.78	Disagree (Sometimes)
25. My Dean pretends to know less than s/he does so s/he can avoid an unpleasant assignment.	1.38	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.81	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.60	Strongly Disagree (Never)
Category Weighted Mean	1.56	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.95	Strongly Disagree (Never)	1.75	Strongly Disagree (Never)

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 Strongly Disagree (Never)

1.76 – 2.50 Disagree (Sometimes)

2.51 – 3.25 Agree (Often)

3.26 – 4.00 Strongly Agree (Very Often)

Impression Management Tactics Employed by the College Deans as Assessed by Themselves and their Faculty

The impression management tactics of the teachers is shown in Table 3. It shows that the college deans as perceived by themselves and their faculty members 'sometimes' use self-promotion, ingratiation, exemplification and intimidation. They however, 'never' use supplication as an impression management tactic. The utilization of the four impression management tactics implies that the college deans of Cagayan State University do not use a particular impression management rather they use a combination of promotion, ingratiation, exemplification and intimidation. In short, they use eclectic approach in packaging themselves to their subordinates.

Specifically, the deans perceive themselves to be 'sometimes' using self-promotion, ingratiation, and exemplification while the faculty members perceive them to have 'never' used these impression management tactics.

The use of self-promotion of the college deans with a weighted mean of 2.39 (sometimes) indicates that they let their subordinates know that they are valuable to the organization. This implies that the deans make their subordinates realize that they are their superiors and that they play a key role in the growth and development of the college. They make it a point that their subordinates must recognize their importance, worth and potentials in realizing the planned targets of the college.

Significantly, the use of self-promotion by the college deans implies that they also "let the faculty members know that they have reputation for being competent in a particular area." (2.42) This act of the college deans is a way of selling themselves so that their subordinates will know what they can do as a college leader and to make them realize that they cannot be fooled when it comes to the operations of the college. In matters of curriculum, they also ensure that they know the standards set by CHED and they are also competent to handle enrichment and modification of the curriculum based on the demands of the time and other standards.

The show of reputation for being competent by the college deans supports the claim of Kouzes and Posner's (2002) model of exemplary leadership which begins with trusting others. In a study conducted by PricewaterhouseCoopers, trust was the number one differentiator between the top and bottom 20 percent of companies on the Financial Times 100 list. The more trusted people feel, the better they innovate.

Psychologists have also found that people who are trusting are more likely to feel happy and well-adjusted than those who view the world with suspicion. Trust is the most significant predictor of an individual's satisfaction with his organization. When you create a climate of trust, you take away the controls and allow people to be free to innovate and contribute. Trusting leaders nurture openness, involvement, personal satisfaction, and high levels of commitment to excellence.

Moreover, the 'sometimes' use of self-promotion as a management tactic indicates that they, too, "make their subordinates aware of their talents or qualification." (2.39) This is part of self-branding of the deans about themselves and making their subordinates know that they are persons of integrity. They put a sort of good labels about themselves so that people under their care would find them likeable and competent. This may be part of conditioning their minds about what they can deliver as deans of the college.

Meanwhile, the use of ingratiation by the college deans signifies that "they complement their subordinates so they will see them as likeable" (2.61). They ensure that they have common goals with their subordinates so that they would be accepted and supported in their leadership. During meetings, they make it a point that they are partners in the development of the college and they have to "put all their eggs in one basket", so to speak to realize their plans for their college. They stress to their subordinates that their weaknesses can be complemented by the teachers' strengths and vice versa.

The use of ingratiation by the college deans similarly conveys that they praise their subordinates for their accomplishments so they will consider them as a nice person (2.32). In here, praising of the deans can be a psychological shot to lift their spirit and further motivate them to work for the betterment of the college. Praising their subordinates for a job well done is one strategy for them to make them be likeable. In so doing, their subordinates would feel that they are cared, loved and accepted.

According to mind tools (http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newLDR_68.htm), superiors' act of giving praises is called appreciative intelligence. It is a mental ability of leaders who have a knack for reframing situations (the glass half full/half empty) and a keen eye for spotting what's valuable and positive in a situation or in people. And these individuals go one step further: they are able to envision how the positive aspects can be used to create a better future. Combining the two in an organization, i.e. a leader with appreciative intelligence using an appreciative inquiry approach, constitutes a powerful force indeed for effecting positive change and inspiring others to give the very best they have to offer. Such a culture would fuel employees' motivation. Surveys of what employees want consistently rank "appreciation for work well done" high up on the motivation index – well above "good wages". Ironically, managers often place good wages above appreciation in their responses of what

employees want. Other surveys show that one of the reasons employees leave companies is because of lack of praise and recognition.

Moreover, the use of ingratiation by the college deans implies that they take an interest in their subordinates' personal lives to show them that they are friendly. This management tactic shows that the college deans show sympathy, empathy and preferential concern to the needs, concerns and dreams of their subordinates. They see that the workplace is not only a place to work but an avenue by which their personal and professional lives are put into balance. In their decisions and plans, the deans factor in the personal needs of their teachers because this is one way by which they could get their support and cooperation. College deans do this because they have to harmonize the personal interest of their subordinates with the college interests. In so doing, they are able to put a sense of equilibrium in the college, where organizational goals are met without sacrificing the personal needs of the subordinates.

According to William A. Gentry (2007), empathy is a construct that is fundamental to leadership. Empathy is the ability to experience and relate to the thoughts, emotions or experience of others. Empathy is more than simple sympathy which is able to understand and support others with compassion or sensitivity. Many leadership theories suggest the ability to have and display empathy is an important part of leadership. Transformational leaders need empathy in order to show their followers that they care for their needs and achievement. Authentic leaders also need to have empathy in order to be aware of others. Empathy is also a key part of emotional intelligence that several researchers believe is critical to be an effective leader.

In the same vein, empathy and emotional intelligence are cited by Ken Blanchard Companies (2006) as the third most important skill set leaders can possess. This area was cited by 15% of respondents as critical for leadership success. The leaders' ability to put others before themselves, to empathize, to seek to understand and build rapport, and to show concern allows them to connect with their direct reports. This skill directly impacts the ability to build an environment based on trust, which allows people to flourish and to achieve their full potential.

On the other hand, the use of exemplificationof the college deans implies that they stay at work late so people will know they are hardworking. This implies that the college deans want to package themselves as workaholic and this is part of leadership by example. The use of time by the college deans is the primary message to be conveyed in this tactic. The deans believe that working must not be governed by working within the standard time or according to the workload to be delivered in the college rather subordinates must also walk an extra mile in giving service to the college without additional remuneration. Working by the time is conveyed not to be a good practice rather one must work based on the accomplishment of objectives, goals and targets irrespective whether they are to deliver services after their official workloads. Similarly, projecting that they are also hard working by spending much time in the office means that they are doing their best in realizing the plans and goals of the college and by showing this to their subordinates, they also need to follow or work beyond the time.

The utilization of exemplification by the college deans also connotes that they arrive at work early to look dedicated. This practice of the college deans implies that they have good work ethics and time management. They come to school on time and they extend more time just to finish the expected tasks for the day. Modeling of time management is also reflected in this case. The deans believe that the value of punctuality is not taught rather it is caught by their subordinates by making themselves as models of such virtue. Time is a very important resource in realizing one's work and the practice of the college deans to be punctual in meetings, in coming to office and in other school activities make their teachers think that they should also value time as they do.

Congruently, the use of exemplification as a management tactic makes the college deans try to appear like a hardworking and dedicated employee. Appearing to be hard working and dedicated employee is a show of leadership by example in this case. According to Danny Cox (1996), no organization can rise above the quality of its leadership. Because leadership is a position that must be earned day in and day out, there are important personal choices that both new and experienced leaders must make on a regular basis. Effective leaders are first and foremost effective people. Personal ethics cannot be separated from professional ethics. Therefore, the character of the leader is essential. Of these leadership qualities, the need to show commitment and hard work will eventually develop dedicated and hard working organizations regardless of whom they start with or the experience they bring to the job.

Finally, the use of intimidation reveals that the college deans deal forcefully with their subordinates when they hamper their ability to get their job done. This means that the college deans at one point in time also compel their subordinates to deliver what they are expected for the college. It is a fact that not all employees have the same goals, work ethics and commitment. Such reality of the employees explains differences in the behavior of the subordinates. In cases where there are subordinates who do not fulfill the expected outputs, the deans may frighten or threaten their subordinates especially if they have already used numerous humanistic approaches to make the subordinates work. If after all humanistic approaches are exhausted then, they use their "whip" to make them work according to expectations. Interviews with the college deans reveal that to compel their non-performing teachers to work, they use the workload to "punish" and reward the teachers. Good teachers are recommended for promotion, they are given good schedules as well as overloads and they are not given college designations while the non-performing ones are given otherwise.

Moreover, the use of intimidation of the college deans reveals that they let their subordinates know they can make things difficult for them if they push them too far and they intimidate their subordinates to help them get the job done. Among the deans, some of them revealed that the use of intimidation can be effective at some point because it is also a manifestation of strong management. Sometimes there is a need to show this because some subordinates are abusive and they are trying to challenge their ability to manage the college. Thus, using intimidation once in a while may put control in the college as it signals deterrence to other future non-compliant subordinates not to commit the same errors and unwanted behavior.

Table 4. Interpersonal skills employed by the college deans as assessed by themselves and their faculty.

Statements	College Deans		College Faculty		Average Weighted Mean	Description
	Weighted Mean	Description	Weighted Mean	Description		
1. I don't have problems getting my needs met in my college.	2.79	Agree (High)	2.86	Agree (High)	2.83	Agree (High)
2. I get my needs met as soon as I ask in my college.	2.95	Agree (High)	2.73	Agree (High)	2.84	Agree (High)

3. I know when I need help or support from my colleagues in my college.	3.50	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.22	Agree (High)	3.36	Strongly Agree (Very High)
4. I realize that I need help in a particular situation after the situation has passed in my college.	2.67	Agree (High)	2.91	Agree (High)	2.79	Agree (High)
5. I do know how to put my needs into words in my college.	3.19	Agree (High)	2.92	Agree (High)	3.06	Agree (High)
6. I am able to identify the kind of help or social support I need from my colleagues in my college.	3.40	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.16	Agree (High)	3.28	Strongly Agree (Very High)
7. I don't have trouble recognizing when I can ask another colleague for something in my college.	3.29	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.11	Agree (High)	3.2	Agree (High)
8. When I need something, I ask for it as soon as I need it in my college.	3.14	Agree (High)	3.00	Agree (High)	3.07	Agree (High)
9. I can identify people who are willing and able to help me with my needs in my college.	3.55	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.35	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.45	Strongly Agree (Very High)

10. When I need help or social support, I will ask a close friend or colleague in my college.	3.12	Agree (High)	3.25	Agree (High)	3.19	Agree (High)
11. I don't ask a stranger or casual acquaintance for advice about a personal situation in my college.	3.14	Agree (High)	3.10	Agree (High)	3.12	Agree (High)
12. I avoid asking people for help in meeting my needs in my college.	2.52	Agree (High)	2.56	Agree (High)	2.54	Agree (High)
13. I usually start to ask another faculty for something in my college.	2.26	Agree (High)	2.70	Agree (High)	2.48	Disagree (Moderate)
14. I am willing to accept assistance from another faculty once the person has agreed to help me in my college.	3.05	Agree (High)	3.16	Agree (High)	3.11	Agree (High)
15. When someone notices that I need assistance, I don't deny that I need any help in my college.	3.26	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.27	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.27	Strongly Agree (Very High)
16. Teachers positively respond when I ask for help or social support in my college.	3.43	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.21	Agree (High)	3.32	Strongly Agree (Very High)

17. I express my needs freely, for example, by saying without hesitation on what I need in my college.	3.55	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.10	Agree (High)	3.33 Strongly Agree (Very High)
18. When I ask for assistance, teachers understand what I need in my college.	3.45	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.15	Agree (High)	3.3 Strongly Agree (Very High)
19. In my college, I give a lot of emotional support, and I get much support from them too.	3.21	Agree (High)	3.01	Agree (High)	3.11 Agree (High)
20. Teachers don't tell me that I ask for things too often in my college.	3.10	Agree (High)	2.92	Agree (High)	3.01 Agree (High)
21. Teachers like the way I ask for things in my college.	3.29	Strongly Agree (Very High)	3.08	Agree (High)	3.19 Agree (High)
Overall Weighted Mean	3.14	Agree (High)	3.04	Agree (High)	3.09 Agree (High)

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75   Strongly Disagree (Low)

1.76 – 2.50   Disagree (Moderate)

2.51 – 3.25   Agree(High)

3.26 – 4.00   Strongly Agree (Very High)

Interpersonal Skills Employed by the College Deans as Assessed by Themselves and their Faculty

Interpersonal skill is used by a person to properly interact with others. In the business domain, the term generally refers to an employee's ability to get along with others while getting the job done. Interpersonal skills include everything from communication and listening skills to attitude and deportment. Good interpersonal skills are a prerequisite for many positions in an organization (http://www.investopedia.com/terms/i/interpersonal-skills.asp)

Table 4 shows the interpersonal skills employed by the college deans as assessed by themselves and their faculty. The data shows that the overall level of interpersonal skills of the college deans is "high" with a mean of 3.09.

The high level of interpersonal skills of the college deans indicates that they can identify people who are willing and able to help them with their needs in the college (3.45); they know when they need help or support from their colleagues (3.36); and they can express their needs freely for example, by saying without hesitation on what they need in the college (3.33).

The high ability of the college deans to identify people who are willing and able to help them with their needs in the college (3.45) reveals that they know their subordinates fully well in terms of their competence, talents and skills. They could easily identify people whom they could tap during accreditation, trainings, research, extension and other college activities and projects. In matters of delegating tasks in the college, they could readily pinpoint who are the right persons who can do the job for them. This is the principle of delegation which is a must for the college deans to master.

By definition, delegation is the transfer of authority to make decisions and complete specific tasks. Learning how to delegate is one of the most important skills for managers and leaders to possess. Strong delegation techniques can help managers save time, motivate people, and train people, as well as these techniques can enable managers to take on new opportunities. However, the lack of delegation practices often leaves people frustrated, unmotivated, and under-trained, while the manager remains overworked. Delegation is a skill that enables managers to achieve more without burning themselves out (http://www.saylor.org/site/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/BUS208-4.3.6-Effective-Delegation-FINAL.pdf.)

On the other hand, the high competence of the college deans to know when they need help or support from their colleagues (3.36) suggests that they know their timing in eliciting help or support from their subordinates. Interview with the college deans reveals that obtaining help or support from their subordinates requires right timing in doing it. By right timing means it has to be obtained only when they need it most. Most often than not, they do the tasks themselves first.

According to James Kouzes and Barry Posner (2008), trust is a central issue in human interactions. It begins with trusting others. In a study conducted by PricewaterhouseCoopers, trust was the number one differentiator between the top and bottom 20% of companies on the *Financial Times 100 List*. The more trusted people feel, the better they innovate. Psychologists have also found that people who are trusting are more likely to feel happy and well adjusted than those who view the world with suspicion. Trust is the most significant predictor of an individual's satisfaction with his organization. When a leader creates a climate of trust, he takes away the controls and allows people to be free to innovate and contribute. Trusting leaders nurture openness, involvement, personal satisfaction and high levels of commitment to excellence (http://www.leaderpresence.com/resources/The%20Leadership%20Challenge.pdf)

Table 5. Comparison between the assessment of the college deans and their faculty on the impression style, political style used by the dean, and interpersonal relationships prevailing in the college.

Table 5. Group Statistics

Variables	group	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Difference	t-value	Probability
Impression Management Tactics	Dean	47.12	15.297	2.588	2.958**	0.004
	Faculty	54.77	19.440			
	Faculty	18.30	3.890			
Interpersonal Skills	Dean	60.02	8.179	1.403	3.012**	0.004
	Faculty	55.80	11.243			

** = significant at 0.01 level

ns = not significant

Comparison Between the Assessment of the College Deans and their Faculty on the Impression Tactics and Interpersonal Skills of the College Deans

It was hypothesized in the study that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the college deans and their faculty on their use of impression management tactic, political skill and interpersonal skills. Table 5 shows that the hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 level of significance as there is a significant difference in the assessment of the college deans and their faculty on their use of impression management tactic and interpersonal skills. This is reflected on the t-value of 2.958 with a probability of 0.004 for impression management tactic and 3.012 with a probability of 0.004.

The significant difference in the assessment of the college deans and their faculty on their use of impression management tactic reveals that the faculty perceive their college deans differently from how the deans perceive themselves. This is seen in the mean of 54.77 for the faculty and 47.12 for the deans. In other words, the deans' impression management tactic does not match with the way they are perceived by their subordinates.

Specifically, the deans perceive themselves to be 'sometimes' using self-promotion and exemplification while the faculty members perceive them to have 'never' used these impression management tactics. This is previously reflected on the computed means of the different items of impression management tactics on Table 2. Relative to self-promotion, the deans disagree that they let their subordinates know that they are valuable to the organization but this statement is agreed by the faculty members as they often manifest such behavioral trait. This finding connotes that the faculty feels that the deans project that they are valuable members of the university. Perhaps this could be attributed to the fact that the deans play a major role in the different activities of the college and in so doing, they try to highlight their functions, contributions and significance in the growth and development of the college that they are managing.

As regards exemplification, the college deans disagree that they arrive at work early to look dedicated but the faculty members agree to this statement. Perhaps, the faculty misinterpret this act of the college deans just as a show-off to look committed to their work. However, for the college deans, this is how they demonstrate their own dedication and one way of showing to their subordinates the virtues of punctuality is to be punctual in coming to work.

On the other hand, both the deans and faculty members are consistent in their perception that the former have 'never' used intimidation and supplication management tactics. Both groups of respondents believe that there is no intimidation to get the job done, there is no intention of making things difficult for the subordinates, there is no intimidation just to get subordinates behave appropriately and there is no use of coercion when subordinates hamper their ability to get their job done.

On the other hand, the significant difference in the assessment of the college deans and their faculty on the level of interpersonal skills suggests that the college deans strongly agree to have demonstrated the following statements: "I know when I need help or support from my colleagues in my college"; "I express my needs freely"; and "Teachers positively respond when I ask for help or social support." The college deans strongly agree with these items but the faculty members just simply agree with it.

Table 6. Relationship between interpersonal skill and impression management tactics and political skill of college deans.

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Probability	Statistical Inference
Interpersonal Relationship and -			
Impression Style	0.099	0.054	Not significant

Relationship Between Interpersonal Skill and Impression Management Tactics of College Deans

The relationship between interpersonal skill and impression management tactics and political skill of the college deans is presented in Table 6. The data show that there is a significant relationship between interpersonal skill and political skill of the college deans. This is reflected in the correlation coefficient of 0.129 and probability of 0.012. On the other hand, the same table shows that there is no significant relationship between the college deans' interpersonal skills and their use of impression management tactic. Thus, the null hypothesis of the study is rejected.

The absence of relationship between the college deans' interpersonal skills and their use of impression management tactic implies that there is no association between these two variables. The absence of association between these two variables can be accounted to the fact that the utilization of an impression management tactics such as self-promotion, exemplification, ingratiation, intimidation and supplication affects how one interacts with people. In short, the dimensions of interpersonal skill such as networking ability, interpersonal influence, social astuteness and apparent sincerity change depending on the kind of impression management tactic that is utilized by the college deans.

Political behavior in organizations has been operationalized as interpersonal political skills (IPS) and defined as the difference between successful and unsuccessful influence attempts (Kolodinsky, 2003). Similar to organizational power and influence processes, interpersonal skill impacts how one works with others within an organization (Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Pfeffer, 1992; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). Interpersonal skill is a vital leadership skills in the workplace as organizational settings are becoming more complex with higher expectations required of employees.

Empirical research has found that leaders who possess a moderate amount of political skill experience less job tension ($r = -.22$) and greater job satisfaction ($r = .16$) and higher job commitment ($r = .18$) (Kolodinsky, 2003). Another study found positive political behaviors to be significantly correlated with employee satisfaction with the supervisor ($r = .29$) and satisfaction with work group ($r = .34$) (Fedor et al., 2003).

Table 7. Relationship between impression management tactic and interpersonal relationship and the deans profilevariables.

Variables	Impression Management Tactic	Interpersonal Skills
Sex	-.012 (0.820)	.045 (0.382)
Age	-.014 (0.801)	.124* (0.029)
Civil Status	.118* (0.021)	-.005 (0.924)
Highest Educational Attainment	-.085 (0.100)	-.068 (0.190)
Academic Rank	-.112* (0.030)	.010 (0.848)
Number of years as Dean	-.024 (0.649)	-.008 (0.873)
Number of faculty supervised	-.078 (0.129)	-.111* (0.031)
Previous Designations	-.068 (0.186)	.028 (0.586)
Number of Trainings on Management Attended	-.059 (0.256)	-.025 (0.629)

- = Coefficients are significant at 0.01 level. All other coefficients are not significant.

Relationship Between Impression Management Tactic, and Interpersonal Skill of the Deans with their Profile Variables

Table 7 shows the relationship between impression management tactic, political skill and interpersonal skill of the college deans with their profile variables. As noted from the table, there is a significant relationship between the college deans' civil status and academic rank with their use of impression management tactic. This relationship is inversely related. This conveys that single and lower ranking college deans are more able to use self-promotion and ingratiation than their counterparts.

The tendency of the single college deans to use self-promotion than the married ones can be attributed to the fact that being single they do not have biological family members who appreciate their achievements, their competence, talents and their value to the organization. Also, being single, they want to be seen competent because they exert much time and effort in their work as the college dean. Considering that they do not have immediate family, much of their time and effort is devoted to their duties and responsibilities. Usually, the office becomes their home and inasmuch as they commit themselves with their work, they want to appear as competent before their subordinates.

Meanwhile, the tendency of single college deans to utilize ingratiation than the married ones suggests that they want to be liked and to be attractive to others. Being single, they want to be likeable and this facilitates positive interpersonal relationship and harmony in the college. In doing this, they project an image that they are caring,

friendly and considerate in order to be attractive. They, too engage in non-verbal positive actions such as smiling or nodding to be liked and to be attractive.

Interestingly, the tendency of the lower ranking college deans to use self-promotion means that they want to achieve an attribution of competence. Having a lower academic rank, they want to be seen competent instead of being likeable. According to Rosenfeld et al. (2005) self-promotion is most often used when the chance of their claims being challenged or discredited is low. The occurrence of self-promotion increases when individuals have the opportunity to openly impress someone with a higher status about their competence (Giacalone& Rosenfeld, 2006)

On the contrary, the tendency of the lower ranking college deans to use ingratiation suggests that they have the tendency to flatter and compliment, they have the tendency to do favors as they want support and cooperation from the subordinates. They have the tendency to be popular with their decisions because they want to prolong their stay in the position. Being holders of lower academic rank than some of their teachers, they want to impress their subordinates by presenting themselves to adopt popular decisions.

On the other hand, there is a significant relationship between the college dean's age and number of faculty supervised with their level of interpersonal skill. Such finding implies that older college deans have more tendency to have better interpersonal skill than the younger ones. Additionally, the college deans who supervise few faculty members have higher interpersonal skill than those who have more faculty members.

The tendency of the older college deans to have better interpersonal skill than the younger ones may be accounted to the fact that older college deans tend to be matured in interacting with people. With the numerous relationships they have been through, more or less they are seasoned in interacting with people.

Moreover, the tendency of the college deans who have few faculty members to have higher interpersonal skill than those who have more faculty members can be attributed to the frequency and quality of engagement that they have with their subordinates. A small number of faculty supervised may mean quality of interpersonal engagement. The deans may known their teachers at the personal and professional level, they are more relaxed handling them, and there is more quality in terms of frequency of bonding and communication.

XI. SUMMARY

After subjecting the data gathered into statistical analyses, the study came out with the following findings:

1.   The profile of the college Deans reveals that majority of them come from Aparri Campus (8 or 19%) and most of them are Deans in the colleges of education and Information and Computing Sciences (6 or 14.3%). Moreover, the findings reveal that there are more male (22 or 52.4%) than female Deans, most of them are 51 years old and above (20 or 47.6%), and majority of them are married (38 or 90.5%). Finally, most of the College Deans are Ph.D. graduates (22 or 52.4%), they are holders of associate professor position (23 or 54.8%), they have served as a Dean for 3-4 years (14 or 33.3%), they have 1-2 previous designations (33 or 78.6%), and they have attended 1-2 trainings on management (19 or 45.2%).

2.   The college deans as perceived by themselves and their faculty members 'sometimes' use self-promotion, ingratiation, exemplification and intimidation. However, they 'never' use supplication as an impression management tactic. Thus, they do not use any particular self impression management tactic but they use eclectic approach in packaging themselves to their subordinates.

12622

3. The overall level of interpersonal skills of the college deans as perceived by themselves and their faculty is "high" with a mean of 3.09. The perceptions of these two groups of respondents regarding the rating of the deans along interpersonal skill are consistent with each other. Hence, the CSU College deans get along with their subordinates in getting the job done in their colleges.

4. There is a significant difference in the assessment of the college deans and their faculty on their use of impression management tactic and interpersonal skills. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Specifically, the deans perceived themselves to be 'sometimes' using self-promotion, ingratiation, and exemplification while the faculty members perceived them to have 'never' used these impression management tactics.

On the other hand, both the deans and faculty members are consistent in their perception that the former have 'never' used intimidation and supplication management tactics.

5. There is a significant relationship between the college deans' civil status and academic rank with their use of impression management tactic. This relationship is inversely related. Single and lower ranking college deans are more able to use self-promotion and ingratiation than their counterparts.

6. On the other hand, there is a significant relationship between the college dean's age and number of faculty supervised with their level of interpersonal skill. Older college deans have more tendency to have better interpersonal skill than the younger ones. Additionally, the college deans who supervise fewer faculty members have higher interpersonal skill than those who have more.

XII.   CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing findings, it can be concluded that CSU College Deans utilize eclecticism in their impression management in the workplace. The utilization of this impression management tactic is primarily dependent on every situation that the deans find effective. In utilizing an eclectic approach, the deans have healthy interpersonal outcomes to be liked, to be perceived competent and to be perceived as good performers by their subordinates. Thus, it can be said that the college deans use their impression management tactic successfully.

Finally, it can be said that the CSU College deans utilize good impression management tactic which is an essential competency for an effective and productive organization.

XIII.   RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are hereby presented:

1. The deans must sustain their level of interpersonal skill as it is important and relevant to the realization of their colleges' goals and objectives;

2. The deans must utilize the same impression management tactic and interpersonal skill in managing their subordinates, and linking with other internal and external linkages as they are beneficial to personal and organizational interests;

3. The deans are recommended to be maintained in their designations because they are able to manage their people well which is an essential ingredient in sound and effective college management;

4. A similar study must be conducted focusing on the effects of impression management tactic, political skill and interpersonal skill on group level processes.

REFERENCES

1. Avery, D. & McKay, P. (2006). Target Practice: And Organizational Impression Management Approach. Blackwell Publishing, Inc. pp.157-187.

2. Bolino M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring Impression Management in Organizations: A Scale Development based on the Jones and Pittman taxonomy, Organizational Research Methods, 2: 187-206

3. Fedor et al (2003). Reflections on the Looking Glass: A Review of Research on Feedback-Seeking Behavior in Organizations. Elsevier Inc., pp. 773-799.

4. Godfrey, D K., E. E., & Lord, C. G. (1986). Self-promoting is not ingratiating. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 106-115.

5. Gouldner, A. (1960). The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. American Sociological Review, 47, 73-80.

6. Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (2002). Toward a General Theory of Strategic Self-Presentation. In: J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological Perspectives on the Self: Vol. 1, 231-262. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

7. Kipnis, D. & Vanderveer, R. (2001). Ingratiation and the Use of Power. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17: 280-286.

8. Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (2000). Impression Management: A Literature Review and Two Component Model. Psychological Bulletin, 107: 34-47.

9. Rosenfeld P., Giacalone R., and Riordan C. (2002). Impression Management: Building and Enhancing Reputations at Work (London: Thomson Learning)., p. 45.

10. Schlenker, B. R. (2000). The Strategic Control of Information: Impression Management and SelfPresentation in Daily Life. In A. Tesser, R. Felson, & J. Suls (Eds.), Perspectives on Self and Identity,Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 199-232.

11. Schneider, D. J. (2001). Tactical Self-Presentations: Toward a Broader Conception. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Impression Management Theory and Social Psychological Research, New York: Academic Press, pp. 23-40.

12. Snyder, M. (1994). Self-Monitoring of Expressive Behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, pp. 526-537.

13. Tedeschi, J. T., (2001). Identities, the Phenomenal Self, and Laboratory Research, In: J. T. Tedeschi. Impression Management Theory and Social Psychological Research. New York: Academic Press

14. Zaidman, N., & Drory, A. (2007). Upward Impression Management in the Workplace. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25, pp. 671-690.

15. (http://www.saylor.org/site/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/BUS208-4.3.6-Effective-Delegation-FINAL.pdf