

GOVERNANCE AMONGST STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES IN REGION III, PHILIPPINES

Cecile M. Charcos, Ed.D

(Graduate School, President Ramon Magsaysay State University)

ABSTRACT: Governance means the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented or not implemented. This research study was a descriptive method and quantitative in its analysis. It revealed the governance among state universities in Region 3, Philippines. The subjects of the study included a total of 406 respondents. There were One hundred twenty-six (126) educational administrators from all levels of the organization and two hundred eighty (280) instructors/professors drawn among the State Universities (SUs) in Region III. In the light of the findings in this study, conclusions were made. Results revealed that the perception of the respondents towards the level of achievement in governance in the university in terms of its principles, participation and voice, accountability, transparency and fairness are described as moderately achieved. There is no significant difference in the perception of the respondents in governance as described to its principles. Based on the findings and conclusions, the researched highly recommended that the administration amongst State University in Region III, Philippines may enhance good governance practices.

KEYWORDS : *Governance, Participation and Voice, Accountability, Transparency, Fairness*

I. INTRODUCTION

Governance has become a hot topic as evidence mounts on the critical role it plays in determining societal well-being. The concept of governance is not new. It is as old as human civilization. Simply, “governance” means the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented or not implemented. The term governance indicates the formal and informal arrangements that allow higher education institutions to make decisions and take action. Formal governance is official and explicit. Informal governance refers to the unwritten rules that govern how people relate to each other within higher education. The respect accorded to professors and administrators, the freedom to pursue research, and the traditions of students’ behaviors. To name a few, is vital to articulate the rights and responsibilities of the various actors and to set rules that determine their interaction in a way that is consistent with achieving quality higher education.

The challenge for all societies is to create a system of governance that promotes supports and sustains human development, especially for the poorest and most marginal. But the search for a clearly articulated concept of governance has just begun. According to Matthew Lynch, 2014, most common problem when transparency is not maintained, is that a perception of mistrust is likely to develop making it more difficult to align priorities and efforts designed into strengthen the institution. When priorities are not aligned between faculty, administrators, and the governing board, organizational functioning may be negatively impacted. This often appears as tensions surrounding the rights and responsibilities of various groups for certain types of decision. The challenge, of course, is that more attention and energy can become focused on who has prime responsibility for what decisions versus figuring out how to collaborate in collegial manner to address the most pressing issues facing the institution. In some cases, relationships become strained, decision making can stall, and ultimately, organizational effectiveness is compromised.

The researcher believes it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of good governance for higher education, with a significant number of those she consulted believing it to be the key issue. Good governance is not a sufficient condition for achieving high quality, but it is certainly a necessary one. Good governance however, creates a strong future for an organization or institution by continuously steering toward a vision and making sure that day to day management is always lined up with the organization’s goal. At its core, governance is about leadership.

The researcher believes that every one of us have an important responsibility in having more transparent and accountable government. It is every one's right to monitor the transparency and efficiency of public administration. To ensure good governance in higher education institutions, the researcher decided to pursue this research study to be able to understand and to improve the characteristics of good governance among state universities in Region 3.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study was aimed to determine the status of governance in terms of the following principles: participation and voice, accountability, transparency and fairness and its relationship to the job satisfaction level of the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents among state universities in Region 3.

1. What is the profile of the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents in terms of the following:

- 1.1 Academic Rank; and
- 1.2 Years in Service?

2. What is the level of achievement towards good governance as perceived by the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents be described in terms of the following principles:

- 2.1 Participation and Voice;
- 2.2 Accountability;
- 2.3 Transparency; and
- 2.4. Fairness?

3. Is there a significant difference on the perceived level of achievement toward good governance by the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents as described to its principles?

III.METHODOLOGY

The study revealed the governance among state universities and the satisfaction level of the administrators and the faculty members in Region 3.

This research study is a descriptive method and quantitative in its analysis. Descriptive research includes surveys and fact-finding enquiries of different kinds. Descriptive research is a type of quantitative research that involves making careful description of educational phenomena (Gall & Borg 2007).

The main characteristic of this method is that the researcher has no control over the variables; he can only report what has happened or what is happening (Driscoll, 2011). Quantitative research is a formal, objective, systematic process in which numerical data is used to obtain information about the world (Burns & Grove, 2005).

Quantitative research is based on the measurement of quantity or amount. It is applicable to phenomena that can be expressed in terms of quantity (Saunders, et al., 2007).

IV. PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

1. Profile of the Respondent

This part discusses the profile of the faculty-respondents in terms of the following:

1.1 Position

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents as to Position

Position	Frequency	Percent
Faculty	280	68.97
Administrator	126	31.03
Total	406	100.00

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents as to position.

Out of 406 respondents, majority of the respondents are faculty with the frequency of 280 and equivalent to 68.97% and administrators are 126 or 31.03%.

1.2 Academic Rank

Table 2 : Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents as to Academic Rank

Academic Rank	Faculty		Administrator	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
University Professor	0	0.00	1	0.79
Professor	1	0.36	1	0.79
Associate Professor	42	15.00	41	32.54
Assistant Professor	59	21.07	44	34.92
Instructor	178	63.57	39	30.95
Total	280	21.07	126	34.92

Table 3 reflected the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents as to academic rank. For the administrator-respondents, out of 86 respondents, most of them are assistant professor with the frequency of 44 or 34.92%; associate professor with the frequency of 41 or 32.54%; instructor having a frequency of 39 or 30.95% and 1 or 0.79% are professor and university professor respectively. As revealed in this table, majority of the respondents held the position of Assistant Professor. For the faculty-respondents, out of 280 respondents, majority is instructor or 178 or 63.57%; assistant professor with a frequency of 59 or 21.07%; 42 or 15.00% are associate and only 1 or 0.36% is professor. As reflected in Table 3, it indicates that most of the respondents held the position of Instructors.

1.3 Years in Service

Table 3: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents as to Years in Service

Years in Service	Faculty		Administrator	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
31 and above	48	17.14	18	14.29
26 - 30	29	10.36	17	13.49
21 - 25	38	13.57	12	9.52
16 - 20	6	2.14	8	6.35
11 - 15	34	12.14	19	15.08
6 - 10	29	10.36	26	20.63
1 - 5	96	34.29	26	20.63
Total	280	100.00	126	100.00
Mean	15.50 years		16.06 years	

Table 4 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents as to years in service. As to administrator-respondents, the computed weighted mean as to profile variable, year in service is 16.06 or 16 years. Table 4 also signifies that most of the faculties with designation of State Universities in Region III were serving the institution for 1 to 10 years. It was revealed that the computed weighted mean as to profile variable, years in service is 15.50 or 16 years. In this table, it shows that most of the administrator-respondents are already serving for more than 31 years in the university. For this, majority of the faculty-respondents are considered as well experienced in their respective institutions. According to Belal A. Kaifi, Bahaudin G. Mujtaba (2010) on their study on Afghans and Americans, they had concluded that - education and experience – indeed have their impact on the performance of individuals. Hence, it was considered very important to investigate the influence of experience and educational qualification on the leadership styles of the workers and therefore the investigation was carried out.

1. Perception of the respondents towards Governance in the University

Table 4

Summary Mean Rating in the Perception of the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents toward Governance in the University

Governance in the University	Faculty			Administrator		
	WM	DE	Rank	WM	DE	Rank
Participation and Voice	3.39	Moderately Achieved	1	3.32	Moderately Achieved	1
Accountability	3.23	Moderately Achieved	2	3.04	Moderately Achieved	2
Transparency	2.97	Moderately Achieved	3	2.93	Moderately Achieved	3
Fairness	2.9	Moderately Achieved	4	2.78	Moderately Achieved	4
Overall Weighted Mean	3.12	Moderately Achieved		3.02	Moderately Achieved	

Table 9 shows the summary on mean rating in the perception of the respondents towards governance in the university. It was revealed that the overall weighted mean in terms of the perception of the faculty respondents towards the governance in the university is 3.12 which described as moderately achieved and as to the perception of the administrator-respondents is 3.02 and described as moderately achieved.

Similar to the result of the study of Tuyo (2022), findings revealed that there was an effective governance of SUCs in terms of policy execution, direction setting, and management control which indicate the SUCs need to maintain their best practices and intensify more their four-fold functions such as instruction, research, extension, and production in order to achieve their vision, mission, goals and objectives more efficiently and effectively. .

2. Significant difference on the extent of level of achievement toward good governance as described to its principles.

Table 23 shows the difference in the perception of the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents toward governance in the university.

The computed value for participation and voice (Sig. =0.56); accountability (Sig = 0.10); transparency (Sig = 0.71) and fairness (Sig = 0.35) were greater than the 0.05 alpha level of significance. The data provided sufficient evidences to conclude that there is no significant difference in the perception of the respondents towards governance in the university in terms of participation and voice; accountability; transparency and fairness. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

In the given data, it is evident that the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents believe that participation and voice moderately exist among stakeholders in the decision making processes in the State Universities in Region 3. It was also a belief of the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents that the employees amongst State Universities are moderately accountable with their duties and responsibilities. According to the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents, transparency was moderately achieved in the state universities. Administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents believed that amongst State Universities in Region 3 were fair enough in their decision making processes.

Table 5
Difference in the Perception of the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents on the Governance in the University

Source of Variations		df	F	Sig.	Decision/ Interpretation
Participation and Voice	Between Groups	1	0.35	0.56	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	404			
	Total	405			
Accountability	Between Groups	1	2.77	0.1	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	404			
	Total	405			
Transparency	Between Groups	1	0.14	0.71	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	404			
	Total	405			
Fairness	Between Groups	1	0.87	0.35	Accept Ho Not Significant
	Within Groups	404			
	Total	405			

V.CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In the light of the findings in this study, the following conclusions are made: Majority of the administrator-respondents is assistant professor and had served for one to five (1 – 5) years in the university. Majority of faculty-respondents are instructor, served 1-5 years. The perception of the administrator-respondents and faculty respondents towards the level of achievement in governance in the university in terms of its principles, participation and voice, accountability, transparency and fairness are described as moderately achieved. There was no significant difference in the perception of the administrator-respondents and faculty-respondents towards governance in the university in terms of participation and voice, accountability, transparency and fairness. Based on the findings and conclusions, the researcher offers the following recommendations: To be able to enhance the achievement in participation and voice, employees may have

proper representation in decision making process in the university. There should have an opportunity to make recommendations, in some cases, be part of the actual decision-making process, and the administration may consider having an open communication with the stakeholders of the university in order to give representation to concerns and needs.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Matthew Lynch. (2014)). *Diverse Conversations: The Importance of Transparency in Governance*.
- [2]. Dela Cruz, M., et al. 2009. *Toward a Participatory University Governance: Model for State Universities and Colleges in the Philippines*. Manila, Philippines: University of Santo Tomas (UST).
- [3]. Sagonoy, A. S. 2014. "Transparency and Effectiveness of Information System Among Selected Municipalities in Northern Samar". Unpublished Dissertation, University of Eastern Philippines, University Town, Northern Samar.
- [4]. Burns, T. and F. Koster (eds.) (2016), *Governing Education in a Complex World*, Educational Research and Innovatio, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264255364-en>. Open DOI
- [5]. Kaifi B.A & Mujtaba B.A. (2010) *The Influence of Education and Work-Experience in the Leadership Styles*.
- [6]. Penaranda Z.C.& Erivera J.C. (2016), *State of Governance of the University of Eastern Philippines*, www.ijsr.net
- [7]. Tuyo L.E (2022), *Governance of State UNiveristies and Colleges in Region XII, Philippines*, ISSN: 2581-7027/Volume 4/ Issue/2/Pages 29-36/2022/
- [8]. Bell, S. 2002. *Economic Governance and Institutional Dynamics*, Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.