

## **Assessing the University President's Eight-Point Agenda from the Standpoint of Stakeholders**

**Marilyn F. Isip**

Director, PUP Sta. Maria Campus  
Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP)

[mfisip@pup.edu.ph](mailto:mfisip@pup.edu.ph)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0526-2598>

**Sheryl R. Morales**

Faculty Researcher

PUP Research Management Office

**Francis Leo T. Mingo**

PUP Institute for Data and Statistical Analysis

**Doris B. Gatan**

Academic Head, PUP Quezon City Branch

**Edgardo S. Delmo**

Director, PUP Quezon City Branch

**Anna Madonna M. Arellano**

Student Services, PUP San Juan Branch

### **Abstract**

Establishing the foundations for an epistemic community and elevating education to a new level of quality and excellence is not a simple process as president of a state university with the largest student population. The study is to determine stakeholders' satisfaction with the 8-point agenda during the 8-year term as a president (201-2020) of the Polytechnic University of the Philippines. The study used descriptive quantitative research using survey questionnaires. The result from the 426 respondents provided a satisfaction score of 3.197. There are statistical significances on the branch/campus where the respondents belong, it is important to highlight the challenges of collaborative governance and on the internal control system; incorporating modernization and upgrading of the governance system. The study is important because it provided a critical understanding of which a university organizational structure and systems are based primarily on a multifaceted approach to human resource management that takes social, ethical, democratic, and economic considerations into account. There are statistically significant differences between branches/campuses where respondents work. It is critical to emphasize the challenges of collaborative governance and the internal control system, as well as the importance of modernizing and upgrading the governance system. The study is important because it established a critical understanding of how a university's organizational structure and systems are founded on a multifaceted approach to human resource management that incorporates social, ethical, democratic, and economic considerations.

**keywords:** State university and colleges (SUCs); human resource management; eight-point agenda; epistemic community; shared values and knowledge

## Introduction

Effective governance is critical for enhancing the quality of higher education, and there is a strong correlation between governance indicators and higher education reforms in both developed and developing countries (Zaman, 2015). A leader's good governance is a positive way to train an individual to render quality services to the nation (Kadir, 2019). Valuing stakeholders' engagement and collective participation and accountability, monitoring and evaluation, transparency, and consistent accountability and responsibility mechanism support the growth and sustained delivery of quality education. Hence, if good governance is working within the institution, leadership is working as well (Hénard & Mitterle, 2010). According to Fontana (2017), higher education can serve as a role model for positive values and good governance by providing mentorship programs, promoting shared living experiences, and socializing future leaders.

In its report, the Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (2019) mentioned that educated human resources are unquestionably a critical driver of innovation among ASEAN member states, and that higher education is therefore critical for sustaining the region's human capital growth.

Given the critical role of higher education in promoting human development and strengthening the economy's competitiveness, the state-run universities and colleges in the Philippines have long faced challenges regarding educational quality, management, and access. Recently, the Philippine tertiary education has also witnessed significant expansion, with the number of HEIs (higher education institutions) expanding from 1,380 in 2001 (according to the Asian Development Bank (2012) to 1,963 institutions in 2019. (CHED, 2019). However, only 12.3 percent of all HEIs in the Philippines are state-operated, while 87.7 percent are privately run. Thus, effective public administration at these state universities and colleges (SUCs) benefits the state's population through educating and advancing human growth.

The tenth president of the largest SUCs in the Philippines (the Polytechnic University of the Philippines) in terms of population—with more than 70,000 students and over 2,000 faculty and administrative personnel spread across its 20 branches and satellite campuses throughout central Luzon—created an eight-point agenda to achieve his vision of becoming an epistemic community.

By uncovering university stakeholders' satisfaction with the laid-out 8-point agenda and determining its significant difference when grouped according to demographic profile, various implications for higher education institution key officials and policymakers can be provided. Furthermore, previous literature on the context of good governance in framing epistemic community in SUCs have a significant limitation. As a result, it is academically essential to acknowledge how framing the University agenda can become a road map that resonated throughout the entire university system—from its main campus cascaded down to all its branches and satellite campuses. This serves as a road map for everyone involved in the university's pursuit of an epistemic community. It acts as fundamental criterion, encouraging people to collaborate and pursue what they believe is "excellence" for the university.

In general, the study determined the satisfaction of the University stakeholders with the 8-point agenda implemented from 2012 to 2020 in transforming the Polytechnic University of the Philippines into its vision of becoming an epistemic community. First and foremost, this study determined the demographic profile of PUP stakeholders. Second, their satisfaction with the eight-point agenda set in place and implemented from 2012 to 2020. Third, there is a significant difference in stakeholder satisfaction when they are grouped based on their demographic profile.

#### Good Governance in HEIs

The six essentials of good governance identified by Keping (2017) are legitimacy, transparency, accountability, rule of law, responsiveness, and effectiveness. Good governance is the active and mutually beneficial cooperation of the state and its citizens, and its success is dependent on the participation and authority of the governing force.

There was also evidence in other studies showing that governance indicators related to higher education policy formulation such as stakeholders' voice and accountability, political uncertainty and violence, government effectiveness, regulatory soundness, and rule of law all contribute to the internationalization of universities (Zaman, 2015).

Chinese higher education has adopted pro-competition policy instruments along the lines of privatization, marketization, and commodification in order to transform social service delivery in accordance with neo-liberal ideas of governance (Mok & Lo, 2014), which is in direct opposition to democratic governance.

In the United Kingdom, governance disclosures of vice chancellors of higher education institutions (HEIs) can enhance legitimacy and operational efficiency by (i) aligning HEI's goals and standards with those of the larger society; (ii) increasing access to critical resources, such as funds and donations; and (iii) lowering the economic, social, and political costs associated with investing in a HEI (Elmagrhi et al., 2021).

In summary, good governance can have a significant impact on higher education institutions' ability to deliver high-quality services, and the role of the institution's ad-ministration leaders is critical to this success.

#### Epistemic Community in HEIs

As Sminorva and Yachin (2015) mentioned, epistemic communities promote reputation (shared values) and knowledge while taking into account various characteristics such as political initiative and scientific objectivity. Additionally, it seeks to emphasize the epistemic and symbolic dimensions of practice, whereas disciplinary cultures place a greater emphasis on processes and practices associated with knowledge production (Nerland et al., 2010).

Adapting an epistemic community in higher education institutions (HEIs) entails formulating policies that are collectively implemented in areas such as research, educational innovation, teacher professionalization, and effective technology use (Cabral, 2019). According to Eyles et al. (2009), the complexity and unpredictability of an organization's dimensions and

functions, as well as the involvement of its stakeholders (as a community), wax and wane and influence how policies are implemented in an institution (Mabon et al., 2019).

### Hypothesis formulation

The study proposed that there is significant difference of the stakeholders' satisfaction with PUP president's vision with his 8-point agenda transforming the University into an epistemic community and empirically verified it using non-parametric test.



Figure 1. The study framework

## Method

### Research Design

The research used descriptive quantitative research using survey questionnaires. This assisted the authors in quantifying the problem statements by generating numerical data that could be converted to numerical information (Burns & Grove, 2009).

### Instruments

The research used a two-part survey questionnaire taken from the eight-point agenda (Communication Management Office and the Publications Office, 2013) statements of the University president of PUP. First, determine the demo-graphic profile of the stakeholders. Second, their satisfaction with the eight-point agenda laid and implemented by the University president towards becoming an epistemic community.

### Sampling technique and sample characteristics

Cochran (2005) was used to determine the sample size for the study, and non-probability sampling was used, which also known as convenience is sampling because everyone who was asked was given the option of choosing to be one of the respondents.

The study's respondents included 367 students, 32 faculty members, and 27 administrative personnel from the Poly-technic University of the Philippines. With 23.7 percent, the Quezon City Branch has the most respondents. Furthermore, 246 females and 180 males between the

ages of 19 and 21 responded to the survey (347). At the time of the survey, the majority of respondents had been in PUP for 2-to 3 years (See table 1).

#### Data collection and data analysis

On February 2020, questionnaires were distributed and collected at the PUP Quezon City Branch. During the data collection process, however, the National Capital Region (NCR) implemented enhanced community quarantine in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, a web-based data collection form was used in lieu of the traditional method to the rest of the branches of PUP in the NCR from July to August 2020.

A suitable method of analysis was chosen to ensure that the analysis's output addressed the research problems. The stakeholders' demographic profile was determined using frequency and percentage. The mean and the general weighted mean were used to determine the respondents' satisfaction.

Four-point Likert scale was used to determine respondents' satisfaction with President De Guzman's eight-point agenda (Communication Management Office and the Publications Office, 2013) during his presidency. The use of 4-point Likert scale was more reliable than the 6-point scale. Additionally, adding a scale point does not always imply increased reliability (Chang, 1994). Non-parametric tests: the (i) Kruskal-Wallis H test (Leon et al., 1998) and (ii) Mann-Whitney (Smalheiser, 2010) test was administered to analyze the significance difference between the respondents' profile and respondents' satisfaction.

Table 1: Respondents' profile

	Demographics	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Types of respondents	Student	367	86.2
	Faculty	32	7.5
	Administrative personnel	27	6.3
Campus/ Branch	San Juan Campus	98	23
	Quezon City Branch	101	23.7
	Paranaque Campus	64	15
	Taguig Branch	163	38.3
Gender	Male	180	42.3
	Female	246	57.7
Age	15 to 18 years old	11	2.6
	19 to 21 years old	347	81.5
	22 to 24 years old	30	7
	25 years old and above	38	8.9
Length of years in PUP	Below 1 year	92	21.6
	2-to 3 years	184	43.2
	4-to 5 years	79	18.5
	Above 6 years	18	4.2
	missing	53	12.5

## Results and Discussion

### Results

Stakeholders' satisfaction

Table 2: Agenda One

Pursuing Academic Excellence through Disciplinary Integrity Statements:	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
(a) Research development through disciplinary integrity	3.26	Extremely satisfied
(b) Coupling of Research and Instruction	3.15	Very satisfied
(c) Faculty and Student development through fellowship, exchanges and research involvements (establishing research foundations)	3.29	Extremely satisfied
Grand Weighted Mean	3.23	Very Satisfied

For Agenda 1, as shown in table (2), respondents said that they were 'extremely satisfied' with both statements (a) and (c). While (b) resulted to 'very satisfied'. Overall, the university's pursuance to academic excellence through disciplinary integrity yielded a 'very satisfied' answer.

Table 3: Agenda Two

Embedding a culture of research and instruction (for faculty) Statements:	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
(d) Getting rid of the "turf mentality" in the research and academic sectors is a necessity.	3.12	Very satisfied
(e) In collaboration with the academic and research sectors, a sound research capabilities program in every colleges and campuses is being developed and put in place.	3.29	Extremely satisfied
(f) Providing encouragement and support to outstanding faculty members who wish to pursue research-based graduate degrees at reputable institutions.	3.38	Extremely satisfied
(g) Encourage the recruitment of prospective and established faculty members to help generate research ideas and projects, as well as connect colleges with research ideas and projects, as well as link colleges with the research communities of their discipline.	3.24	Very satisfied

(h) Properly reward achievers in research (research-track, professorship, society of scientists and writers)	3.24	Very satisfied
Grand Weighted Mean	3.25	Very satisfied

For Agenda 2, as shown in table (3), respondents said that they were ‘extremely satisfied’ for statements (e) and (f). While statements (d), (g) and (h) resulted to ‘very satisfied’. Overall, the university’s embedding a culture of research and instruction for faculty yielded a ‘very satisfied’ answer.

Table 4: Agenda Three

Assuring Transparency and Participations in Giving Rewards and Sanctions (for faculty and administrative personnel) Statements:	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
(i) Placing the right people in right positions	3.25	Very satisfied
(j) The procedure of changing one's status and being promoted becomes more and more systematic (rational just)	3.18	Very satisfied
(k) Faculty and staff members' talents are constantly being enhanced in order to prepare them for appropriate professional pathways.	3.34	Extremely satisfied
(l) Providing equal opportunities for faculty and academic exchange	3.25	Very satisfied
(m) Strengthening the capacity and democratic participation of employee and faculty alliances	3.24	Very satisfied
Grand Weighted Mean	3.25	Very satisfied

For Agenda 3, as shown in Table (4), respondents said that they were ‘extremely satisfied’ for statement (k). While the rest of the statements (i), (k), (l) and (m) resulted to a ‘very satisfied’ answer. Overall, the university’s assurance to transparency and participation in giving rewards and sanctions for both faculty and administrative personnel yielded a ‘very satisfied’ answer.

Table 5: Agenda Four

Modernization and upgrading of physical facilities, equipment, library, and campus development Statements:	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
(n) Opening an open-shelves library system to supplement an updated e-library system is underway.	3.10	Very satisfied

(o) Physical facilities and laboratory equipment are being upgraded.	2.97	Very satisfied
(p) Build and renovate classrooms as well as additional facilities for students, instructors, and staff.	3.11	Very satisfied
(q) Information Communication Technology (ICT) facilities that are state-of-the art.	3.00	Very satisfied
(r) Environmentally friendly practices/adequate waste disposal management systems.	3.28	Extremely satisfied
Grand Weighted Mean	3.25	Very satisfied

For Agenda 4, as shown in table (5), respondents said that they were ‘extremely satisfied’ with statement (r). While statements (n), (o), (p), and (q) resulted to a ‘very satisfied’ answer. Overall, the university’s modernization and upgrading of physical facilities, equipment, library, and campus development yielded a ‘very satisfied’ answer.

Table 6: Agenda Five

Reconceptualization of academic freedom Statements:	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
(s) Incorporate student and faculty government and publication into the institution.	3.16	Very satisfied
(t) Programs for student and faculty development are being reviewed.	3.23	Very satisfied
(u) Providing opportunities for students to participate in knowledge creation.	3.37	Very satisfied
(v) The creation of platforms for sectoral participation in decision-making.	3.17	Very satisfied
(w) Expansion of scholarship and exchange program	3.22	Very satisfied
Grand Weighted Mean	3.23	Very satisfied

For Agenda 5, as shown in table (6), respondents said that they were ‘very satisfied’ with all statements (s), (t), (u), (v), and (w). Overall, the university’s reconceptualization of academic freedom yielded a ‘very satisfied’ answer.

Table 7: Agenda Six

Institutionalizing civil society engagement and involved extension service program Statements:	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
(x) Engaging social issue in both discourse and practice	3.18	Very satisfied
(y) Developing a strong social consciousness	3.21	Very satisfied



among the various sectors of the PUP.		
(z) Expanding extension and community involvement	3.18	Very satisfied
(aa) Expanding academic and institutional linkages	3.22	Very satisfied
(ab) Redefying our involvement in LGUs and their communities	3.17	Very satisfied
Grand Weighted Mean	3.19	Very satisfied

For Agenda 6, as shown in table (7), respondents said that they were ‘very satisfied’ with all statements (x), (y), (z), (aa), and (ab). Overall, the university’s institutionalization in engaging and involving civil society in its extension program yielded a ‘very satisfied’ answer.

Table 8: Agenda Seven

<b>Fiscal responsibility (for faculty and administrative personnel)</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Verbal Interpretation</b>
<b>Statements:</b>		
(ac) Involving the public of the PUP in funds management	3.06	Very satisfied
(ad) Conscientious observance of fiduciary rules	3.14	Very satisfied
(ae) Prudent allocation of funds—academic and research must be prioritized	3.17	Very satisfied
(af) Transparency in all fiscal transactions	3.13	Very satisfied
Grand Weighted Mean	3.13	Very satisfied

For Agenda 7, as shown in table 8), respondents answered that they were ‘very satisfied’ with all statements (ac), (ad), (ae), and (af). Overall, the university’s fiscal responsibility yielded with a ‘very satisfied’ answer.

Table 9: Agenda Eight

<b>Institutional Process and Critical-Rational Review of the Entire Organization</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>Verbal Interpretation</b>
<b>Statements:</b>		
(ag) Current organizational structures, personnel positions and qualifications, faculty status (academic qualifications, research involvements and specializations), and academic programs are all assessed.	3.18	Very Satisfied
(ah) Review of policies governing faculty and personnel recruitment, as well as the recruitment of new students.	3.25	Very Satisfied

Grand Weighted Mean	3.21	Very Satisfied
---------------------	------	----------------

For Agenda 8, as shown in table (9), respondents answered that they were ‘very satisfied’ with both statements (ag) and (ah). Overall, the university’s institutional process and critical-rational review for the entire organization yielded with a ‘very satisfied’ answer.

Test of comparison on significant differences using Kruskal-Wallis test and Mann-Whitney U test

In testing the hypothesis, this research used two non-parametric test--The Kruskal–Wallis test and Mann-Whitney U test. Kruskal and Wallis in 1952, explained the procedure as a nonparametric approach to the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) in statistics. A dependent variable that is measured on at least an ordinal level is used in conjunction with the procedure to compare three or more groups on a dependent variable. (Leon et al., 1998)

With the Mann-Whitney U test (Smalheiser, 2010), which is a non-parametric version of the t-test, the re-searchers attempted to demonstrate a statistically significant difference between two groups (gender variable).

As shown in table (10a), Agenda 1, research development through disciplinary integrity (a) and the inclusion of research with instruction (b) in the pursuit of academic excellence among stakeholders both have statistical significance by branch/campus ( $p = 0.010$  and  $0.005$ , respectively). Statement (b) also demonstrated a significant difference by gender ( $p = 0.019$ ) and age ( $p = 0.003$ ). The number of years spent at university did not predict substantial differences in stakeholder satisfaction ( $p > 0.005$ ).

Table 10a: Hypothesis test results

	Statements	Type of respondents	Branch/ Campus	Gender	Age	Length of Years in PUP
Agenda 1	(a)	p 0.451*	p 0.010**	p 0.101*	p 0.163*	p 0.509*
	(b)	p 0.790*	p 0.005**	p 0.019**	p 0.003**	p 0.133*
	(c)	p 0.736*	p 0.079*	p 0.358*	p 0.315*	p 0.297*
Agenda 2	(d)	n/a	p 0.515*	p 0.939*	p 0.185*	p 0.904*
	(e)	n/a	p 0.373*	p 0.889*	p 0.200*	p 0.184*
	(f)	n/a	p 0.315*	p 0.610*	p 0.832*	p 0.885*
	(g)	n/a	p 0.717*	p	p	p

				0.872*	0.725*	0.932*
	(h)	n/a	p 0.988*	p 0.522*	p 0.811*	p 0.566*
	(i)	p 0.818*	p 0.589*	p 0.977*	p 0.858*	p 0.387*
	(j)	p 0.095*	p 0.400*	p 0.048**	p 0.660*	p 0.160*
Agenda	(k)	p 0.512*	p 0.942*	p 0.054*	p 0.696*	p 0.721*
3	(l)	p 0.858*	p 0.631*	p 0.484*	p 0.660*	p 0.160*
	(m)	p 0.420*	p 0.601*	p 0.553*	p 0.744*	p 0.683*
	(n)	p 0.977*	p 0.000**	p 0.433*	p 0.429*	p 0.203*
	(o)	p 0.565*	p 0.000**	p 0.375*	p 0.950*	p 0.987*
Agenda	(p)	p 0.889*	p 0.025**	p 0.143*	p 0.944*	p 0.428*
4	(q)	p 0.974*	p 0.000**	p 0.864*	p 0.645*	p 0.665*
	(r)	p 0.982*	p 0.111*	p 0.706*	p 0.759*	p 0.189*
	(s)	p 0.993*	p 0.001**	p 0.919*	p 0.653*	p 0.869*
	(t)	p 0.827*	p 0.011**	p 0.676*	p 0.585*	p 0.199*
Agenda	(u)	p 0.455*	p 0.026**	p 0.022**	p 0.138*	p 0.415*
5	(v)	p 0.766*	p 0.005**	p 0.558*	p 0.967*	p 0.655*
	(w)	p 0.138*	p 0.002**	p 0.634*	p 0.230*	p 0.331*

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance (0.05) \*\*reject Ho. Otherwise, \*failed to reject Ho.

None of the comparisons in Agenda 2 were statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). For Agenda 3, statement (j) revealed a significant gender difference in stakeholder satisfaction ( $p = 0.048$ ). For Agenda 4, the satisfaction of stakeholders with ( $p < 0.001$ ) results indicate that the branch/campus to which they belong makes a highly significant difference in statements (n), (o), (p), and (q). Contrary to statement (r), none of the comparisons are significant. In table 10a, Agenda 5 for statements (s), (t), (u), (v), and (w) have all shown statistical significance by branch/campus with p-values (0.001, 0.011, 0.026, 0.005, and 0.002) respectively. Gender difference was also a significant predictor in statement (u) with a p-value of 0.022.

Table 10a: Hypothesis test results

	Statements	Type of respondents	Branch/ Campus	Gender	Age	Length of Years in PUP
Agenda 6	(x)	p 0.667*	p 0.019**	p 0.682*	p 0.585*	p 0.216*
	(y)	p 0.930*	p 0.020**	p 0.781*	p 0.659*	p 0.342*
	(z)	p 0.640*	p 0.009**	p 0.694*	p 0.994*	p 0.873*
	(aa)	p 0.678*	p 0.001**	p 0.990*	p 0.953*	p 0.836*
	(ab)	p 0.815*	p 0.000**	p 0.523*	p 0.566*	p 0.878*
	(ac)	p 0.577*	p 0.408*	p 0.684*	p 0.458*	p 0.038**
	(ad)	p 0.760*	p 0.659*	p 0.856*	p 0.822*	p 0.090*
Agenda 7	(ae)	p 0.548*	p 0.831*	p 0.291*	p 0.747*	p 0.326*
	(af)	p 0.308*	p 0.512*	p 0.523*	p 0.869*	p 0.245*
Agenda 8	(ag)	p 0.474*	p 0.000**	p 0.726*	p 0.775*	p 0.192*
	(ah)	p 0.688*	p 0.000**	p 0.600*	p 0.301*	p 0.873*

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance (0.05) \*\*reject Ho. Otherwise, \*failed to reject Ho.

As shown in table (10b), in Agenda 6 there was a significant difference by branch/campus for statements (x), (y), (z), (aa) and (ab) with p-values (0.019, 0.020, 0.009, and 0.001) respectively. Statement (ab) revealed a highly significant difference on the stakeholders' satisfaction with a p-value less than .001. Meanwhile, in Agenda 7, the length of year in the University among the stakeholders showed significant difference ( $p = 0.038$ ). Agenda 8 for both statements (ag) and (ah) showed highly significant by branch/campus with p-value less than 0.001.

## Discussion

The study investigated stakeholders' satisfaction with a state-run university's attempt to transform into an epistemic community. As part of the University president's good governance approach, the implementation of the eight-point agenda was examined and analyzed. It determined the statistical significance of stakeholder satisfaction based on their

demographic profile. On this basis, the study attempted to draw various implications to improve various implications for higher education institution key officials and policymakers.

To summarize the empirical results, first, the stake-holders' response to the implementation of the eight-point agenda as part of the university president's good governance approach yielded a 'very satisfied' (3.197) answer. A leader's vision and the development of a roadmap are critical components of good governance practice. Unlike other public offices, the higher education institutions (HEIs) not only incorporate the voice and accountability of its stakeholders into the system, but also ensures its primary role in shaping and enhancing quality education—thereby preparing the nation's citizens to embrace the global economy.

Second, in testing of the hypothesis, there were statistical significance on most of the eight-point agenda statements, particularly by branch/campus to which respondents belonged. Modernization of infrastructure, library, and university improvement resulted to be highly significant by branch/campus; similar findings were also noted in the stakeholders' involvement in the local government units and to their community, and on the critical review of the University organization's institutional processes.

Third, gender and age differences were also found to be significant when it came to combining research and instruction, as well as in some areas of assuring transparency (gender); students' participation in knowledge creation (gender). According to some studies, female researchers used to have a lower global impact than male researchers. Additionally, the literature suggests that gender disparities in university research productivity are related to family and marriage formation.

By linking research to policy and practice, research is dramatically altering the landscape of education reform. Empirical studies help us understand the impact of evaluation (i.e., to instruction) by utilizing what research can tell us about what works for various students of diverse situations.

University systems continue to evolve, administration priorities continue to shift downward, and institutional governance structure enhancement has become a research focus among higher education institutions. The world university ranking has gained popularity as a means of comparing universities' performance in terms of high-quality research publications and citations.

Fourth, public involvement in the University fund (fiscal) management (length in service) was also noted to be statistically significant. The open-access technology, which includes the on-demand virtual community, enables citizens to assert more and obtain detailed information about how governments (e.g., state-run universities) allocate public funds. It is a more recent and less widely accepted evolution that citizens have a right to participate in budgetary decision-making in addition to having access to information

## **Conclusion**

The following implications were concluded. First, the study showed statistical difference on the stakeholders' satisfaction on combining research and instruction.

The findings of the study regarding the statistical significance of the branch/campus to which the respondents belonged imply the importance of collaborative governance. Collaboration requires a multi-stakeholder approach (Provan & Milward, 2001). Collaboration is influenced by a variety of factors, one of which is the institutional environment. The organization's interaction with and adaptation to the environment in which it operates is essential (Shafritz et al., 2016). Satisfaction with these stakeholders demonstrates the multifaceted nature of effective collaborative governance (Ran & Qi, 2017).

Enhancing the governance structure of colleges and universities entails strengthening the internal control system (Baird, 2015; Chen & Lin, 2021) and incorporating information technology into the governance structure of the university. Accelerate the modernization of school governance systems and capabilities and establish a general trend toward governance that serves the greatest public good, ensuring the foundational direction of higher education governance to serve the people (Chen & Lin, 2021).

Universities must maintain a degree of 'dis-fit' or de-liberate misalignment with market and other forces in order to retain their defining characteristics over time. Additionally, university administrators must develop a better understanding of how inextricably linked universities are to their broader social, cultural, and economic environments, as well as how these environments can influence internal governance decisions (Baird, 2015). The advancement of the university network and linkages is a strategy for increasing connectivity between stakeholders at all levels of the system in order to achieve defined educational goals—the university being the primary source of a country's human capital.

In conclusion, the implications of the study's findings can be explored further in future empirical research, including how being an epistemic community contributes to the advancement of university-wide research culture policies and the effective use of technology in flexible learning modes among higher education students.

### **Acknowledgements or Notes**

The authors would like to acknowledge the support of the PUP Quezon City Branch, PUP San Juan Branch, PUP Taguig Branch and PUP Paranaque administration for allowing the conduct of data gathering.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

### **References**

1. ADB (Asian Development Bank). (2012, May). Administration and Governance of Higher Education in Asia Patterns and Implications. Asian Development Bank. Retrieved April 15, 2021, from <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/29956/administration-governance-higher-education.pdf>.

2. Baird, J. (2015). University governance for the longer-term. *International Journal of Chinese Education*, 4(1), 105–127. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22125868-12340047>
3. Burns, N., & Grove, S. K. (2009). *The practice of Nursing Research: Conduct, critique, and Utilization*. Elsevier, Saunders.
4. Cabral, J. J. (2019). Epistemic communities to consolidate educational policies in the internal planning of teacher training college. *European Journal of Education*, 2(1), 43. <https://doi.org/10.26417/ejed-2019.v2i1-53>
5. Chang, L. (1994). A psychometric evaluation of 4-point and 6-point likert-type scales in relation to reliability and validity. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 18(3), 205–215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014662169401800302>
6. CHED (Commission on Higher Education). (2019, September 24). Higher Education Indicators 2019. Commission on Higher Education. Retrieved April 15, 2021, from <https://ched.gov.ph/higher-education-indicators-2019/>.
7. Chen, W., & Lin, F. (2021). Application of information technology in college governance structure system and governance. *The International Journal of Electrical Engineering & Education*, 002072092098466. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020720920984665>
8. Cochran, W. G. (2005). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). Wiley.
9. Communication Management Office (CMO) and the Publications Office. (2013, March). *The President’s Report: The PUP Community’s collective Accomplishments and Achievements*. Manila, Philippines; <https://www.pup.edu.ph/president/files/ThePresidentsReport20122013.pdf>.
10. Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (ERIA). (2019, June 11). *ASEAN Vision 2040: Towards a Bolder and Stronger ASEAN Community*. ERIA Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia. Retrieved January 15, 2021, from [https://www.eria.org/uploads/media/0.AV2040\\_VOL1.pdf](https://www.eria.org/uploads/media/0.AV2040_VOL1.pdf).
11. Elmagghi, M. H., Ntim, C. G., Wang, Y., Elamer, A. A., & Crossley, R. (2021). The effect of vice-chancellor characteristics and internal governance mechanisms on voluntary disclosures in UK higher education institutions. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, 100428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intaccaudtax.2021.100428>
12. Eyles, J., Robinson, K., & Elliott, S. (2009). An epistemic community comes and goes? local and national expressions of Heart Health Promotion in Canada. *BMC Health Services Research*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-9-35>
13. Fontana, G. (2017, August 23). Higher Education, developmental leadership and good governance. K4D Helpdesk Report. Retrieved December 2, 2020, from <https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/186-Higher-Education-Developmental-Leadership-and-Good-Governance.pdf>.
14. Hénard, F., & Mitterle, A. (2010). Governance as a tool to improve quality - OECD. *OECD Better Policies for Better Lives*. Retrieved December 30, 2020, from <https://www.oecd.org/education/imhe/46064461.pdf>.

15. Kadir, A. N. J. (2019). Good Governance Issues in Education System and Management of Secondary Schools in Kwara State, Nigeria. ERIC Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved November 24, 2020, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1234494.pdf>.
16. Keping, Y. (2017). Governance and good governance: A new framework for political analysis. *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40647-017-0197-4>
17. Leon, A. C. (1998). 3.12 Descriptive and Inferential Statistics. In *Comprehensive clinical psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 243–285). Essay, Elsevier Science.
18. Mabon, L., Shih, W.-Y., Kondo, K., Kanekiyo, H., & Hayabuchi, Y. (2019). What is the role of epistemic communities in Shaping Local Environmental Policy? managing environmental change through planning and Greenspace in Fukuoka City, Japan. *Geoforum*, 104, 158–169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.04.024>
19. Mok, K. H., & Lo, Y. W. (2014). The Impacts of Neo-Liberalism on China's Higher Education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 5(1), 318–348. Retrieved September 29, 2021, from <http://www.jceps.com/archives/tag/volume-5-number-1>.
20. Nerland, M., Jensen, K., & Bekele, T. A. (2010). Changing cultures of knowledge and learning in higher education A literature review. *Semantic Scholar*. Retrieved October 24, 2021, from [https://www.uv.uio.no/iped/forskning/prosjekter/eie-utd2020forprosjekt/HEIK-Utd2020-Part2-Changing\\_cultures.pdf](https://www.uv.uio.no/iped/forskning/prosjekter/eie-utd2020forprosjekt/HEIK-Utd2020-Part2-Changing_cultures.pdf)
21. Provan, K. G., & Milward, H. B. (2001). Do networks really work? A framework for evaluating public-sector organizational networks. *Public Administration Review*, 61(4), 414–423. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00045>
22. Ran, B., & Qi, H. (2017). Contingencies of Power Sharing in collaborative governance. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 48(8), 836–851. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074017745355>
23. Smirnova, M. Y., & Yachin, S. Y. (2015). Epistemic communities and epistemic operating mode. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 5(7), 646–650. <https://doi.org/10.7763/ijssh.2015.v5.533>
24. Shafritz, J. M., Jang, Y. S., & Ott, J. S. (2016). *Classics of organization theory*. Cengage Learning.
25. Smalheiser, N. R. (2010). Chapter 12 - Nonparametric Tests. In *MRCPSY study guides: Companion to Psychiatric Studies* (8th edition) (pp. 157–167). essay, Elsevier Health Sciences.
26. Zaman, K. (2015). Quality guidelines for good governance in Higher Education across the Globe. *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psrb.2016.01.001>