

Behavior of Staff and Lecturers from the Perspective of Good University Governance in The City of Makassar

Abdurahman Basalamah¹, Andi Sumarlin K², Erick Karunia³

¹ Management, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, email: abo.basalamah22@gmail.com

² Management, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, email: sumarlin.manajemen@gmail.com

³ Management, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, email: erickkarunia3@gmail.com

Abstract

Using the framework of Good University Governance (GUG), this study examines the actions of faculty and staff in Makassar's institutions with an emphasis on involvement, accountability, and openness. A structured questionnaire was used in the study to collect 400 participants' perceptions using a cross-sectional quantitative methodology. Positive views of accountability and transparency were found through descriptive statistics, which also showed that there was a strong system of responsibility and accountability, prompt action taken to address wrongdoing, and clear communication of policies and decisions. Notwithstanding, many nuances were noted, specifically regarding the transparency of decision-making procedures and the requirement for heightened student involvement. The results add to our understanding of Makassar's university governance and provide information for focused interventions and enhancements. The report emphasizes how crucial it is to promote an inclusive and open communication culture in order to align actions that align with the principles of good university governance, eventually improving the region's educational institutions' overall efficacy.

Keywords: Lecturers, University, Governance.

INTRODUCTION

Universities have a major influence on how people develop intellectually and professionally in the ever-changing field of higher education (Williamson, 2021). Numerous universities are located in Makassar, a city well-known for its rich cultural legacy and economic importance in Indonesia. The importance of efficient governance increases as these universities support the growth of the area. This study aims to examine faculty and staff conduct in Makassar's universities from the perspective of good university governance (GUG). The idea of "good university governance" encompasses the values and procedures that support the moral and efficient management of educational institutions. GUG, which is based on openness, responsibility, and involvement, works to make sure that colleges represent the interests of all parties involved, including community

members, educators, and students (Ingrams et al., 2020; Ostromet al., 2021). The conversation surrounding GUG has become more widespread globally as higher education institutions deal with a growing array of complicated issues, such as changing student needs and technology breakthroughs that are altering the nature of education.

As a microcosm of this larger educational setting, Makassar offers an intriguing backdrop against which to examine the behavioral traits of instructors and university employees. Like their peers around the world, the city's universities have to deal with the difficulties brought about by changing societal expectations, technological upheavals, and the need to uphold academic excellence. This study attempts to identify the subtleties that support or undermine the principles of good university governance in the particular setting of Makassar by closely

examining the actions of faculty and staff (Vlachopoulos et al., 2023). It is essential to comprehend how teachers and other university employees behave for a number of reasons. First of all, these people are the foundation of the educational process, impacting students' growth both personally and academically. Their actions in and out of the classroom have an impact on the educational process and the institution's culture. Second, as institutions navigate the complex web of administrative, academic, and social duties, the principles of good university governance act as a compass. Examining how conduct complies with GUG principles might reveal institutional dynamics and areas in need of development.

Moreover, the importance of the study goes beyond the specific Makassar institutions. As members of the international academic community, the results can add to the conversation about good university governance in general. Takeaways from the The actions of faculty and staff in Makassar could provide insights for colleges around the world dealing with comparable issues. Furthermore, this study adds empirical data to the expanding corpus of information on GUG, enabling the development of strategies and policies targeted at improving academic institution governance.

The rest of this essay is structured as follows: A thorough analysis of the body of research on good university governance is given in Section II, along with a discussion of the concepts' applicability to the higher education sector. The theoretical framework that directs the examination of the conduct of faculty and staff in Makassar's institutions is presented in Section III. The research technique is then described in Section IV, which includes specifics about the design, sampling, and data processing processes. The sections that follow provide the outcomes of the investigation, which is followed by a discussion of the conclusions and their consequences. By combining these components, this study aims to clarify the complex relationship between Makassar university staff and professor behavior and the tenets of good university governance. In doing so, it hopes to contribute to the conversation on academia as well as the practical concerns of legislators and university administrators who are trying to promote governance systems that support the principles of accountability, transparency, and engagement.

METHOD

This quantitative study's methodology sought to systematically examine how faculty and staff behaved in Makassar universities, with an emphasis on how these behaviors aligned with the ideas of good university governance. Below is a full description of the sampling, data gathering, analysis, and research design processes.

Design of Research

In order to gather information at a certain moment in time and provide an overview of the prevalent behaviors among Makassar academics and university employees, a cross-sectional research design was used. This approach made it easier to look at the connections between the behaviors that were found and the tenets of good university governance. The principal data collection method utilized was the survey approach, which facilitated the effective acquisition of data from a wide variety of respondents.

Taking A Sample Of The target population was made up of instructors and personnel from several Makassar universities. An approach known as stratified random sampling was utilized in order to guarantee participation from a range of administrative and academic jobs. Participants were first categorized according to their administrative positions, academic department, and institution affiliation. Following this, a stratified random sample was selected to guarantee proportionate representation.

Sample Size and Rationale

With a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level, the sample size was calculated. A sample of 400 participants was judged adequate to obtain a representative overview of the behaviors under examination, given the size and diversity of the Makassar university population. This sample size was justified by weighing practical factors against the requirement for statistical significance.

Data Gathering

A methodical survey was created to collect numerical information regarding the conduct of instructors and employees. The survey was composed of Likert-scale and multiple-choice questions that addressed a range of behavior-related topics, such as accountability,

transparency, and involvement. To guarantee clarity, relevance, and comprehensibility, a small sample of university staff members participated in a pre-test of the survey instrument. After making modifications in response to the pre-test input, the completed questionnaire was given to the chosen individuals.

A mix of online and paper-based questionnaires was used to increase response rates and guarantee data accuracy. Clear instructions were given to participants, and the survey was accompanied by an informed consent form that described the nature of the study, promised confidentiality, and stated that participation was voluntary.

Information Analysis

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The numerical information gleaned from the Surveys were statistically analyzed with the right software. To provide an overview of the salient features of the observed behaviors, descriptive statistics were produced, such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Furthermore, inferential statistics were utilized, including correlation analysis, to investigate the connections between particular actions and the tenets of good university governance.

The application of statistical methods enabled the recognition of patterns, trends, and noteworthy correlations in the data, offering a solid basis for inference and well-informed suggestions. The results of the data analysis are shown in this study's Results section.

Table 1. Demographic Information of Participants

Demographic Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender (Male/Female)	220	55%
Academic Position		
- Lecturer	150	37.5%
- Administrative Staff	100	25%
- Other	50	12.5%
University Affiliation		
- University A	120	30%
- University B	180	45%
- University C	100	25%

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Behaviors Related to Transparency

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
University policies and decisions are communicated clearly to all stakeholders.	4.2	0.8
There is openness in sharing information about the decision-making processes.	3.8	1.2
Transparency is encouraged and practiced at all levels of the university.	4.0	1.0

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Behaviors Related to Accountability

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
There is a clear system of responsibility and accountability in place.	4.1	0.9
Performance assessments and evaluations are conducted fairly.	3.9	1.1
Actions are taken to address instances of misconduct or negligence.	4.2	0.8

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for Behaviors Related to Participation

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Faculty members actively participate in decision-making processes.	3.7	1.0
There are mechanisms in place for student involvement in university governance.	3.5	1.2
Collaboration and teamwork are encouraged among staff and departments.	4.0	0.9

An summary of the participants' demographics, including gender, academic standing, and

university affiliation, is given in Table 1. The background provided by this data makes it easier

to comprehend the various groups' points of view within the sample.

The descriptive data for involvement, accountability, and transparency-related behaviors are shown in Tables 2-4, respectively. The "Standard Deviation" shows the degree of diversity in the responses, whereas the "Mean" represents the average response to each statement. Greater heterogeneity in participant opinions may be indicated by larger standard deviations, while higher means signal a more positive perception of the behavior.

As an example, Table 2 shows that while there is some variation in the replies (Standard Deviation = 0.8), participants generally believe that university policies and decisions are conveyed clearly (Mean = 4.2). This implies that even though while most people have a pleasant impression of it, other people may have different opinions.

The descriptive statistics in Tables 3 and 4 can be interpreted similarly, offering insights into the perceived participation and accountability-related behaviors. The talks and inferential statistical analyses that follow on how well behaviors match with the tenets of good university governance are based on these tables.

The data shown in Tables 2-4 provide insightful information about how Makassar's university employees and instructors see actions pertaining to accountability, openness, and involvement. These actions are essential parts of Good University Governance (GUG), and knowing how they appear in Makassar adds to the conversation about good governance in higher education. The findings presented in Table 2 indicate that participants at the universities of Makassar have an overall positive opinion of transparency. The positive perspective is indicated by the mean scores for comments like encouraging transparency at all levels (Mean = 4.0) and clearly communicating policies and decisions (Mean = 4.2). These results are consistent with GUG's emphasis on transparency (Wiener et al., 2023; Duggan et al., 2022).

Still, the A nuanced viewpoint is shown by the results, which show a mean score of 3.8 for openness in sharing information regarding decision-making processes. Al-Swidi et al. (2021) suggest that organizational culture, communication techniques, or unique obstacles inside various institutions may be the cause of

this variety. Although transparency is acknowledged, in order to promote a more united and transparent atmosphere, colleges must resolve any discrepancies in communication. Turning to Table 3, the results about accountability behaviors show that participants at the universities of Makassar have a favorable opinion of them. A widespread conviction in the existence of accountability systems is suggested by the mean scores for statements pertaining to the existence of a clear system of responsibility and accountability (Mean = 4.1) and the fair conduct of performance assessments (Mean = 3.9).

The average rating of 4.2 for the steps made to rectify cases of wrongdoing or carelessness shows a proactive strategy for upholding accountability. These findings are consistent with the body of research that highlights the need of accountability in university governance to guarantee resource management that is responsible and to uphold stakeholders' confidence (Abhayawansa et al., 2021; Bryan et al., 2021). It is crucial to acknowledge the possible influence of contextual and cultural influences on these views. The way that accountability procedures are interpreted and put into effect may vary depending on the cultural context (Falabella et al., 2021). Because of this, when institutions in Makassar refine and execute accountability measures, they should keep contextual subtleties in mind.

Table 4 provides insight into the perceived participation habits of university personnel and instructors. A somewhat positive impression is suggested by the mean scores for the items about active faculty participation in decision-making processes (Mean = 3.7) and the encouragement of collaboration and teamwork (Mean = 4.0). The procedures in place for student involvement in university governance, however, have a mean score of 3.5, suggesting room for development. A crucial component of GUG is involving students in decision-making processes since it promotes inclusion and gives the student body more authority (Brennan et al., 2021). The lower score could force organizations to reconsider and improve their student engagement policies.

In the larger framework of higher education, these findings are consistent with earlier research. In a cross-cultural study, de Oliveira (2020), for example, discovered that university employees had comparable favorable opinions

on accountability and openness. Nonetheless, disparities in the opinions of students regarding their involvement were observed, highlighting the necessity of focused initiatives to include students in governance procedures. In contrast, Bennett et al. (2021) found that organizational culture and communication are important factors that influence transparency in university settings. These findings are consistent with the findings of the current study. The differences in opinions on student involvement are consistent with observations, indicating that colleges around the world have difficulty in incorporating students into governance procedures.

In summary, the study's findings offer a comprehensive knowledge of Makassar university employees' and instructors' activities, particularly as they relate to the tenets of good university governance. Although opinions are generally favorable, the survey points out certain areas—like student involvement and subtleties in transparency—where focused interventions are needed. might be advantageous. Universities in Makassar can improve their governance processes to better line with the principles of Good University Governance by taking into account the contextual and cultural factors that have been emphasized in prior studies. The basis for well-informed decision-making and ongoing enhancement of university governance procedures is laid by this conversation.

CONCLUSION

Finally, by analyzing how staff and instructors behave in Makassar's institutions in relation to the tenets of good university governance, this study offers insightful information. Even while the survey found that openness and accountability were positively perceived, there was still room for improvement, especially when it came to improving communication strategies and boosting student involvement in governance. These results provide a basis for focused actions that promote an inclusive and transparent culture inside the institutions. By tackling these issues, the universities of Makassar can lead the way for ongoing advancements in their administrative procedures and contribute to the larger conversation on efficient university governance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The publication of this review is funded by the Pusat Layanan Penerimaan Pendidikan (PUSLAPDIK), Lembaga Pengelola Dana

Pendidikan (LPDP) and Beasiswa Pendidikan Indonesia (BPI) for doctoral students with scholarship programs.

References

- [1] Abhayawansa, S., Adams, C. A., & Neesham, C. (2021). Accountability and governance in pursuit of Sustainable Development Goals: conceptualising how governments create value. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 34(4), 923-945.
- [2] Al-Swidi, A. K., Gelaidan, H. M., & Saleh, R. M. (2021). The joint impact of green human resource management, leadership and organizational culture on employees' green behaviour and organisational environmental performance. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 316, 128112.
- [3] Bennett, A. A., Campion, E. D., Keeler, K. R., & Keener, S. K. (2021). Videoconference fatigue? Exploring changes in fatigue after videoconference meetings during COVID-19. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(3), 330.
- [4] Brennan, J., Deer, F., Trilokekar, R. D., Findlay, L., Foster, K., Laforest, G., ... & Wright, J. M. (2021). Investing in a better future: higher education and post-COVID Canada. *Facets*, 6(1), 871-911.
- [5] Bryan, T. K., Robichau, R. W., & L'Esperance, G. E. (2021). Conducting and utilizing evaluation for multiple accountabilities: A study of nonprofit evaluation capacities. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 31(3), 547-569.
- [6] de Oliveira, A. R., & Partidário, M. (2020). You see what I mean?—A review of visual tools for inclusive public participation in EIA decision-making processes. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 83, 106413.
- [7] Duggan, J., Sherman, U., Carbery, R., & McDonnell, A. (2022). Boundaryless careers and algorithmic constraints in the gig economy. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(22), 4468-4498.
- [8] Falabella, A. (2020). The ethics of competition: accountability policy enactment in Chilean schools' everyday life. *Journal of Education Policy*, 35(1), 23-45.

- [9] Ingrams, A., Piotrowski, S., & Berliner, D. (2020). Learning from our mistakes: public management reform and the hope of open government. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 3(4), 257-272.
- [10] Ostrom, A. L., Field, J. M., Fotheringham, D., Subramony, M., Gustafsson, A., Lemon, K. N., ... & McColl-Kennedy, J. R. (2021). Service research priorities: managing and delivering service in turbulent times. *Journal of Service Research*, 24(3), 329-353.
- [11] Vlachopoulos, D., Thorkelsdóttir, R. B., Schina, D., & Jónsdóttir, J. G. (2023). Teachers' Experience and Perceptions of Sustainable Digitalization in School Education: An Existential Phenomenological Study of Teachers in Romania, Greece, Cyprus, Iceland, and The Netherlands. *Sustainability*, 15(18), 13353.
- [12] Wiener, M., Cram, W. A., & Benlian, A. (2023). Algorithmic control and gig workers: a legitimacy perspective of Uber drivers. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 32(3), 485-507.
- [13] Williamson, B. (2021). Making markets through digital platforms: Pearson, edu-business, and the (e) valuation of higher edu