

Management Support, Organizational Challenges, and Procurement Efficiency in Occidental Mindoro State College

Jofelyn Joy M. Zafra*

Graduate School, Occidental Mindoro State College, San Jose, Occidental Mindoro, Philippines

Abstract: This study was conducted using descriptive correlational design. Respondents were composed of hundred buyers/procurers from six campuses of Occidental Mindoro State College (OMSC). Results show that management support of OMSC was ranked high particularly towards leader's support, policy enforcement, training, resource distribution and monitoring. As for organizational challenges, multi-tasking, personnel and time were considered challenges. Technical skills and accountability were considered moderate, and all aspects of procurement efficiency were ranked high. Ethical compliance and fairness were ranked highest as for procurement efficiency. Correlation shows that management support was significantly related to procurement efficiency. While organizational challenges were not. Regression shows that policy enforcement and resource distribution were found to be significantly predicting procurement efficiency. As such, this study concludes that good management will lead to effective procurement and resilient purchasing departments while lack of challenges will not negatively affect procurement efficiency.

Keywords: Management support, organizational challenges, procurement efficiency.

1. Introduction

Procurement has become one of the most important functions that assist public higher education institutions in providing programs, projects, goods, and services in a cost-efficient and mandated way (Asian Development Bank, 2018; Mahmood, 2019). According to international studies, efficient procurement systems play a critical role in providing value for money, accountability, and transparency in the activities of the public sector. Management sup capacities institutional capacity is consistently cited as important determinants of the procurement performance of public organizations (Ahsan and Rahman, 2017; Choi and Chandler, 2020). The section title also can be copied and paste it, when you need new section and type the section heading as per your requirement.

In the Philippines, procurement activities in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) are regulated by Republic Act No. 9184, the Government Procurement Reform Act, as amended by Republic Act No. 12009, and its Implementing Rules and Regulations. These legislatures aim to standardize procurement procedures, ensure transparency, and prevent

anomalies in government expenditure. Nevertheless, reforms have also increased procedural complexity and placed higher demands on institutional capacity, technical competence, and managerial supervision (Commission on Audit, 2020; Manasan, 2019).

Occidental Mindoro State College (OMSC) operates within this dynamic procurement environment. With continuing governance reforms, alignment with national procurement standards, and growing digitalization efforts, the efficiency of procurement at OMSC carries direct implications for the timely delivery of academic programs, infrastructure development, and student support services (Commission on Higher Education, 2020; OMSC, 2023). Despite the existence of formal procurement systems, organizational challenges such as limited staffing, time constraints, technical skill gaps, multitasking demands, and accountability issues continue to present operational difficulties that may undermine efficiency and compliance (Mahmood, 2019; Patil and Patil, 2021; Tadelis, 2018).

While international and national literature illuminates' procurement dynamics broadly, empirical studies focused on the institutional level—particularly individual SUCs such as OMSC remain limited (Dela Cruz, 2021; Patil and Patil, 2021). This gap underscores the need for a localized evaluation to gain deeper insight into procurement dynamics at the institutional level. This study is therefore necessary to (1) assess procurement practices at OMSC, (2) identify key organizational barriers, and (3) evaluate the extent of management support in enhancing procurement efficiency (Commission on Higher Education, 2020).

Specifically, this study aimed to: (1) ascertain the level of management support at OMSC in terms of leadership commitment, policy enforcement, training and capacity building, resource allocation, and monitoring and evaluation; (2) assess the extent of organizational challenges in terms of limited personnel, insufficient time, limited technical skills, multitasking, and accountability; (3) determine the level of procurement efficiency in terms of transparency, fairness, stewardship, ethical compliance, and timeliness and quality; (4) establish whether significant relationships exist between

*Corresponding author: jofelynjoyz@gmail.com

management support and procurement efficiency; (5) assess whether significant relationships exist between organizational challenges and procurement efficiency; (6) determine which indicators of management support predict procurement efficiency; and (7) identify which indicators of organizational challenges affect procurement efficiency.

2. Materials and Method

A. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between management support, organizational challenges, and procurement efficiency at Occidental Mindoro State College. The descriptive component characterized the levels of each variable as perceived by the respondents, while the correlational component examined the associations among these variables. Multiple regression analysis was further applied to identify significant predictors of procurement efficiency.

B. Respondents

The respondents of this study were 91 employees of OMSC who were directly involved in procurement activities including members of the Bids and Awards Committee (BAC), procurement officers, and end-user unit representatives. These respondents were considered most knowledgeable about the institution's procurement processes and challenges. Total enumeration was employed given the manageable and clearly defined population.

C. Research Instruments

Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire organized into two main sections. Part I captured respondent profiles, while Part II assessed management support, organizational challenges, and procurement efficiency through five-point Likert-scale items (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). Each variable section contained five sub-indicators, each composed of five items, resulting in 25 items per variable. The instrument was validated by five administrative unit heads and deans at OMSC, and reliability was confirmed through a pilot test with 20 non-respondent employees. Cronbach's Alpha values ranged from 0.809 to 0.887, with an overall reliability coefficient of 0.879, indicating very high internal consistency.

D. Data Collection Procedure

Data collection was conducted following institutional approval from the School President and the Graduate School Dean. Respondents were informed of the study's purpose and ethical considerations, and written informed consent was obtained. Two modes of data collection were employed an online survey via Google Forms for respondents across campuses, and face-to-face distribution of printed questionnaires for on-site participants. Confidentiality and voluntary participation were maintained throughout.

E. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages,

weighted means, and standard deviations were used to characterize the levels of each variable. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was utilized to determine the strength and direction of associations among variables. Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to identify significant predictors of procurement efficiency. A five-point scale was used for interpretation: 1.00–1.49 (Very Low), 1.50–2.49 (Low), 2.50–3.49 (Moderate), 3.50–4.49 (High), and 4.50–5.00 (Very High).

3. Results

A. Level of Management Support

The overall level of management support at OMSC was rated high (Grand Weighted Mean = 4.37, SD = 0.579). Leadership commitment received the highest mean (Mean = 4.47), while resource allocation received the lowest (Mean = 4.25), though both remained within the "high" range. Table 1 presents the summary of management support across all dimensions.

Table 1

Summary of management support at OMSC

Factors	Mean	Std.	Interpretation
Leadership Commitment	4.47	0.571	High
Policy Enforcement	4.39	0.589	High
Training and Capacity Building	4.35	0.625	High
Resource Allocation	4.25	0.607	High
Monitoring and Evaluation	4.38	0.601	High
Grand Weighted Mean	4.37	0.579	High

Scale: 1.00–1.49 – Very Low; 1.50–2.49 – Low; 2.50–3.49 – Moderate; 3.50–4.49 – High; 4.50–5.00 – Very High

B. Extent of Organizational Challenges

The overall extent of organizational challenges at OMSC was rated high (Grand Weighted Mean = 3.53, SD = 1.031), indicating that challenges are meaningfully experienced in procurement operations. Multitasking received the highest mean (Mean = 3.69), while limited technical skills and accountability both received moderate ratings (Mean = 3.42). Table 2 presents the summary.

Table 2

Summary of organizational challenges faced by OMSC

Factors	Mean	Std.	Interpretation
Limited Personnel	3.53	1.032	High
Insufficient Time	3.58	1.079	High
Limited Technical Skills	3.42	1.050	Moderate
Multi-tasking	3.69	0.076	High
Accountability	3.42	1.117	Moderate
Grand Weighted Mean	3.53	1.031	High

Scale: 1.00–1.49 – Very Low; 1.50–2.49 – Low; 2.50–3.49 – Moderate; 3.50–4.49 – High; 4.50–5.00 – Very High

C. Level of Procurement Efficiency

The overall procurement efficiency at OMSC was rated high (Grand Weighted Mean = 4.37, SD = 0.605). Ethical compliance received the highest mean (Mean = 4.48), followed by fairness (Mean = 4.39) and stewardship (Mean = 4.37). Timeliness and quality received the lowest mean (Mean = 4.26), still within the high range. Table 3 summarizes the results.

Table 3
Summary of procurement efficiency at OMSC

Factors	Mean	Std.	Interpretation
Transparency	4.34	0.598	High
Fairness	4.39	0.625	High
Stewardship	4.37	0.633	High
Ethical Compliance	4.48	0.053	High
Timeliness and Quality	4.26	0.685	High
Grand Weighted Mean	4.37	0.605	High

Scale: 1.00–1.49 – Very Low; 1.50–2.49 – Low; 2.50–3.49 – Moderate; 3.50–4.49 – High; 4.50–5.00 – Very High

D. Relationship Between Management Support and Procurement Efficiency

Pearson correlation analysis revealed that all dimensions of management support were positively and significantly correlated with procurement efficiency ($p < .001$). Resource allocation demonstrated the strongest correlation ($r = .687$), followed by training and capacity building ($r = .667$), monitoring and evaluation ($r = .572$), leadership commitment ($r = .555$), and policy enforcement ($r = .516$). Overall management support showed a strong positive correlation with procurement efficiency ($r = .687, p < .001$), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Table 4 presents the correlation results.

Table 4
Relationship between management support and procurement efficiency

Management Support Dimension	r	p-value	Description
Leadership Commitment	.555**	.000	Significant
Policy Enforcement	.516**	.000	Significant
Training and Capacity Building	.667**	.000	Significant
Resource Allocation	.687**	.000	Significant
Monitoring and Evaluation	.572**	.000	Significant
Overall Management Support	.687**	.000	Significant

E. Relationship Between Organizational Challenges and Procurement Efficiency

No statistically significant correlation was found between any dimension of organizational challenges and procurement efficiency (all p -values $> .05$). Limited personnel ($r = .098, p = .418$), insufficient time ($r = .082, p = .500$), limited technical skills ($r = .151, p = .211$), multitasking ($r = .159, p = .187$), and accountability ($r = .081, p = .505$) all showed negligible correlations. The null hypothesis was accepted. Table 5 presents these results.

Table 5
Relationship between organizational challenges and procurement efficiency

Organizational Challenge	r	p-value	Description
Limited Personnel	.098	.418	Not Significant
Insufficient Time	.082	.500	Not Significant
Limited Technical Skills	.151	.211	Not Significant
Multi-tasking	.159	.187	Not Significant
Accountability	.081	.505	Not Significant
Overall Organizational Challenges	.121	.317	Not Significant

F. Regression Analysis: Management Support and Procurement Efficiency

Multiple regression analysis showed that the combined management support dimensions significantly predicted procurement efficiency ($R = .740, R^2 = .547, \text{adjusted } R^2 = .511, F = 15.448, p < .001$). Among individual predictors, policy

enforcement ($\beta = .484, p = .003$) and resource allocation ($\beta = .345, p = .044$) were statistically significant. Leadership commitment ($\beta = .045, p = .783$) and training and capacity building ($\beta = .351, p = .125$) were not significant at the individual level. The null hypothesis was rejected. Table 6 presents the regression results.

Table 6
Regression Analysis: management support and procurement efficiency

Predictor	β	p-value	Description
Leadership Commitment	.045	.783	Not Significant
Policy Enforcement	.484	.003	Significant
Training and Capacity Building	.351	.125	Not Significant
Resource Allocation	.345	.044	Significant
Monitoring and Evaluation	.278	.138	Not Significant

$R = .740; R^2 = .547; \text{Adjusted } R^2 = .511; F = 15.448; p = .000$

G. Regression Analysis: Organizational Challenges and Procurement Efficiency

The overall regression model for organizational challenges was statistically significant ($R = .501, R^2 = .251, \text{adjusted } R^2 = .207, F = 5.625, p = .001$), indicating that the combined organizational challenges accounted for approximately 20.7% of the variance in procurement efficiency. However, none of the individual predictors were significant: limited personnel ($\beta = .127, p = .658$), insufficient time ($\beta = .092, p = .704$), limited technical skills ($\beta = .457, p = .197$), multitasking ($\beta = .306, p = .199$), and accountability ($\beta = .400, p = .207$). The null hypothesis is rejected for the combined model. Table 7 presents the regression results.

Table 7
Regression Analysis: organizational challenges and procurement efficiency

Predictor	β	p-value	Description
Limited Personnel	.127	.658	Not Significant
Insufficient Time	.092	.704	Not Significant
Limited Technical Skills	.457	.197	Not Significant
Multi-tasking	.306	.199	Not Significant
Accountability	.400	.207	Not Significant

$R = .501; R^2 = .251; \text{Adjusted } R^2 = .207; F = 5.625; p = .001$

4. Discussion

A. Management Support

The consistently high ratings across all management support dimensions indicate that OMSC has an established and functional procurement management environment. This finding is aligned with recent literature emphasizing that effective management support—anchored in leadership commitment, policy orientation, resource provision, and continuous monitoring—creates an enabling environment that fosters transparency, compliance, and operational efficiency in public procurement (Kissi et al., 2025; OECD, 2024; World Bank, 2024). The high rating in terms of leadership commitment reflects a culture in which leaders actively model ethical procurement behavior, a practice empirically linked to improved organizational performance and stakeholder trust (Al-Hussami et al., 2018; Daskalova-Karakasheva et al., 2024). Policy enforcement ratings corroborate that procurement procedures are consistently applied, which is essential for preventing irregularities and ensuring supplier confidence

(Alsamarraie and Ghazali, 2023; Thai, 2017). The strong investment in training and capacity building further demonstrates recognition that technical competence is integral to efficient procurement, consistent with findings that structured capacity development reduces procedural errors and improves compliance (Oppong and Adam, 2025; Ndaedapo et al., 2023).

B. Organizational Challenges

The high overall extent of organizational challenges indicates that OMSC procurement personnel experience significant operational pressures, particularly from multitasking demands, staffing shortfalls, and time constraints. These findings align with broader public sector research demonstrating that limited institutional capacity, insufficient staffing, and workload imbalances impede procurement efficiency and compliance (Khan et al., 2022; Ademeso and Maiyaki, 2025; OECD, 2024). The predominance of multitasking as the highest-rated challenge reflects a common structural reality in state institutions, where procurement functions are embedded within broader administrative roles rather than treated as distinct specializations. The moderate ratings for limited technical skills and accountability suggest that while competency gaps exist, they are not as acute as resource and workload-related pressures, potentially indicating that existing training programs have yielded some positive impact on technical readiness.

C. Procurement Efficiency

The high procurement efficiency ratings across all dimensions—transparency, fairness, stewardship, ethical compliance, and timeliness and quality suggest that OMSC has successfully embedded governance principles into its operational procurement practices. Ethical compliance receiving the highest rating is particularly notable, as it reflects an institutionalized culture of integrity consistent with compliance requirements under RA 9184 and RA 12009. This finding resonates with the work of Uyanik (2023), who identified that ethical behavior in public procurement is closely correlated with improved transparency and reduced irregularities. The relatively lower rating for timeliness and quality, while still within the high range, indicates that workload and coordination pressures may periodically affect service delivery speed, an observation consistent with studies linking time constraints to procurement performance variation (Bongomin et al., 2018; Thai, 2017).

D. Management Support and Procurement Efficiency

The significant positive correlation between overall management support and procurement efficiency ($r = .687, p < .001$) confirms that stronger management practices are associated with more efficient procurement outcomes at OMSC. This finding is consistent with the broader empirical literature establishing management support as a key determinant of public procurement performance (Kissi et al., 2025; Eyaa and Oluka, 2020; Akhtar et al., 2021). The regression results further specify that policy enforcement and resource allocation are the primary drivers of procurement

efficiency within the management support construct. Policy enforcement ensures procedural integrity and minimizes governance risks, while resource allocation provides the financial, human, and technological inputs necessary for sustained procurement performance (Alsamarraie and Ghazali, 2023; Saleh et al., 2026). The non-significance of leadership commitment and training as individual predictors—despite their theoretical importance suggests that their impact may be mediated by policy and resource factors, or that their effects manifest indirectly through organizational culture and staff competence (Daskalova-Karakasheva et al., 2024; Oppong and Adam, 2025).

E. Organizational Challenges and Procurement Efficiency

The absence of statistically significant correlations between individual organizational challenges and procurement efficiency does not suggest these challenges are inconsequential. Rather, it suggests that the robust management support framework at OMSC may be effectively mitigating the negative impacts of operational constraints—functioning as a buffering mechanism. This interpretation aligns with research indicating that strong governance structures and management commitment can counterbalance structural limitations in procurement settings (Chileshe et al., 2016; Gálvez-Rodríguez et al., 2024). The significance of the combined organizational challenges model ($F = 5.625, p = .001, \text{adjusted } R^2 = .207$) further supports the view that collective operational pressures exert a meaningful, if modest, influence on procurement efficiency—particularly when no single challenge dominates the effect. This underscores the multidimensional nature of organizational constraints in public procurement and the need for holistic rather than piecemeal intervention strategies.

5. Conclusions

This study concludes that OMSC demonstrates a high level of management support across all assessed dimensions, including leadership commitment, policy enforcement, training and capacity building, resource allocation, and monitoring and evaluation. Organizational challenges particularly multitasking, limited personnel, and time constraints are experienced at a high extent, though they do not individually predict procurement efficiency. Procurement efficiency across transparency, fairness, stewardship, ethical compliance, and timeliness and quality is rated high, reflecting a well-functioning and compliant procurement system.

Management support is a significant and strong positive predictor of procurement efficiency ($r = .687, p < .001$), with policy enforcement and resource allocation identified as the most influential individual predictors. In contrast, organizational challenges as a combined construct explain only a modest portion of variance in procurement efficiency ($\text{adjusted } R^2 = .207$), and no single challenge is a significant individual predictor indicating that management support effectively counterbalances operational constraints.

These findings carry important practical implications: strengthening policy enforcement mechanisms and ensuring adequate resource provision should be prioritized as key levers

for improving procurement outcomes in state higher education institutions. Simultaneously, addressing workload and multitasking challenges through better workforce planning and role clarification would further protect the quality and integrity of procurement operations.

References

- [1] O. Ademeso and A. Maiyaki, "Institutional reforms and procurement efficiency in developing economies," *J. Public Admin. Res.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 45–67, 2025.
- [2] K. Ahsan and S. Rahman, "Green public procurement implementation challenges in Australia," *J. Cleaner Prod.*, vol. 165, pp. 1544–1556, 2017.
- [3] S. Akhtar et al., "Management support and procurement performance: Evidence from public sector institutions," *Int. J. Oper. Prod. Manage.*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 211–234, 2021.
- [4] M. Al-Hussami et al., "The influence of leadership behaviors on organizational commitment," *Int. J. Nurs. Pract.*, vol. 24, no. 1, Art. no. e12620, 2018.
- [5] S. Alsamarraie and M. Ghazali, "Procurement governance and efficiency in public sector organizations," *Public Admin. Quart.*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 123–145, 2023.
- [6] Asian Development Bank, *Public Procurement in Southeast Asia: Challenges and Reforms*. Manila, Philippines: ADB Publications, 2018.
- [7] O. Bongomin et al., "Procurement performance and time management in public institutions," *Cogent Bus. Manage.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–18, 2018.
- [8] N. Chileshe et al., "Assessing drivers and barriers to public sector procurement performance," *Int. J. Project Manage.*, vol. 34, no. 7, pp. 1268–1282, 2016.
- [9] S. Choi and J. Chandler, "Capacity constraints in public procurement," *Public Admin. Rev.*, vol. 80, no. 4, pp. 581–591, 2020.
- [10] Commission on Audit, Annual Audit Report on State Universities and Colleges. Philippines: COA, 2020.
- [11] Commission on Higher Education, Policies, Standards and Guidelines for Higher Education Governance. Philippines: CHED, 2020.
- [12] A. Daskalova-Karakasheva et al., "Leadership commitment and sustainable procurement in higher education institutions," *Sustainability*, vol. 16, no. 5, Art. no. 2034, 2024.
- [13] M. Dela Cruz, "Procurement efficiency in Philippine state universities: A review," *Philippine J. Public Admin.*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 34–52, 2021.
- [14] S. Eya and N. P. Oluka, "Explaining non-compliance in public procurement in Uganda," *Int. J. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 2, no. 11, pp. 11–15, 2020.
- [15] M. Gálvez-Rodríguez et al., "Value-for-money outcomes in public procurement: Institutional factors," *J. Purchasing Supply Manage.*, vol. 30, no. 1, Art. no. 100866, 2024.
- [16] E. Kissi et al., "Management support and procurement performance: A systematic review," *Int. J. Public Sector Manage.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 12–34, 2025.
- [17] N. Khan et al., "Organizational challenges and procurement efficiency in developing countries," *J. Developing Areas*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 89–107, 2022.
- [18] S. Mahmood, "Public procurement and good governance," *Int. J. Law Manage.*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 434–451, 2019.
- [19] R. Manasan, "Procurement reforms in the Philippines: Gains and challenges," *PIDS Discussion Paper No. 2019-19*, Philippine Institute for Development Studies, 2019.
- [20] V. Ndaedapo et al., "Leadership and accountability in public procurement systems," *Afr. J. Public Admin.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 67–89, 2023.
- [21] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *OECD Principles for Integrity in Public Procurement*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2024.
- [22] Occidental Mindoro State College, *Institutional Strategic Development Plan 2023–2028*. Occidental Mindoro, Philippines: OMSC, 2023.
- [23] G. D. Oppong and A. M. Adam, "Procurement literacy and performance in public institutions," *J. Public Procurement*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 2025.
- [24] S. Patil and Y. Patil, "Public procurement challenges: A literature review," *Int. J. Supply Chain Manage.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 1–15, 2021.
- [25] M. Saleh et al., "Digitalization and continuous improvement in public procurement systems," *Government Inf. Quart.*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 101–117, 2026.
- [26] S. Tadelis, "Public procurement design: Lessons from the literature," *Oxford Rev. Econ. Policy*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 297–314, 2018.
- [27] K. V. Thai, *International Handbook of Public Procurement*. Boca Raton, FL, USA: Taylor & Francis, 2017.
- [28] S. Uyanik, "Ethical behavior and procurement compliance in public institutions," *Public Integrity*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 211–228, 2023.