



Awareness, Acceptance, and Perception of Pangasinan State University's Stakeholders towards its Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives

Jenylyn V. Oboza, PhD¹
Pangasinan State University

Abstract – This study determines the level of awareness, acceptance, and perception of the stakeholders on the Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives (VMGOs) of Pangasinan State University (PSU) and the five programs offered in one of its nine campuses, i.e., Alaminos City Campus. The descriptive survey method was employed in the investigation. A modified questionnaire was used to gather data from the stakeholders of the University which include faculty, non-teaching staff, students, parents, and industry-partners. Results revealed that stakeholders were aware of the VMGOs of PSU-Alaminos City Campus. They were also aware of the dissemination of the VMGOs through bulletin boards, catalogs, manuals, broadcast media, and other materials. Furthermore, they accept and understand the VMGOs and the responsibility of PSU and others concerned in realizing such objectives. Lastly, results revealed that the VMGOs are clearly stated and consistent. Based on these, it is recommended that the administration strengthen and widen its information dissemination campaign to extensively communicate its VMGOs to stakeholders.

Keywords – vision, mission, goals, objectives, awareness, acceptance, perception, stakeholders

INTRODUCTION

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are mandated by the state to contribute to building a quality nation. This mandate necessitates that the HEIs are able to produce quality graduates who possess necessary skills and competencies that will enable them to raise the quality of human life of Filipinos, respond effectively to changing societal needs and conditions, and provide solutions to problems at the local community, regional and national levels (CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, s. 2012).

In furtherance of such mandate, the HEIs have to constantly check themselves against the standards in place and keep themselves abreast of the latest demands of the labor market. This requires that they invest considerable amount of resources to be able to develop their manpower, facilities, and equipment. Accreditation is one way that HEIs keep themselves in check with the standards. Several benefits of accreditation are cited by Corpus (n.d.), to wit: accredited programs lend prestige to member institutions, justified by the possession of quality standards and unremitting efforts to maintain them at high level; help parents to know which program they may send their children to for quality education; make all those engaged in education aware of standards of excellence which they should strive to attain; make possible for those proposing funding and those who are to fund, to know what to support and how much support

is needed; and make possible for an evaluated program to know its strength and weaknesses, and in what aspects it needs to develop.

The Pangasinan State University, like any other state universities in the country, subjects all its curricular programs to Accrediting Agency for Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACCUP) accreditation. As part of the accreditation process, the Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives (VMGO) of the institution are surveyed to check whether the University is responding to its mandate. AACCUP (2006) explains that the VMGO, i.e., Area 1 of the ten (10) areas surveyed, is the most fundamental of all the areas, in that it serves as the bases of all its operations. Further, it states that the institution is only justified to the extent that it realizes its vision and mission. A university is judged by the degree to which its VMGOs are attained, not in comparison to others (AACCUP, 2010). The VMGO are realized only if all stakeholders are aware of them and understand their implications. University of Minnesota (2015) explains that the mission statement communicates the organization's reason for being, and how it aims to serve its key stakeholders which include customers, employees, and investors, government agencies or communities whereas a vision statement is a future-oriented declaration of the organization's purpose and aspirations. Program educational objectives, on the other hand, are broad statements that describe the career and



professional accomplishments that the program is preparing graduates to achieve within three to five years of graduation and these are based on the need of the program's constituencies (CHED Memorandum Order No. 37, s. 2012).

Firms with clearly communicated, widely understood, and collectively shared mission and vision have been shown to perform better than those without them, with the caveat that they related to effectiveness only when strategy and goals and objectives were aligned with them as well (Bart, Bontis, & Taggar, 2001 as cited in University of Minnesota, 2015). The vision and mission statements be widely circulated and discussed often so that their meaning is widely understood, shared, and internalized. The better employees understand an organization's purpose, through its mission and vision, the better able they will be to understand the strategy and its implementation (University of Minnesota, 2015).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Based on the foregoing, this study was conducted to determine the level of stakeholders' awareness, acceptance, and perception towards the VMGOs of Pangasinan State University. These stakeholders include employees, students, parents, alumni, and industry partners. With the demands of the changing environment and to have a competitive edge in the global scene, the new administration finds it necessary to revise its Vision and Mission. The changing of the VMGOs requires that faculty and the administration have to work hand in hand to communicate such to other stakeholders. Thus, this study is, more importantly, needed to gauge whether the new VMGOs are understood and internalized by all of its constituents.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Materials

The researcher adopted and modified the instrument developed by Castillo (2014). The items in the questionnaire were based on the 2010 AACUP Revised Instruments.

Participants

The researcher ensured that all groups of stakeholders, i.e., faculty and non-teaching staff, students, parents, and industry partners, were included in the study. The entire faculty and non-teaching personnel participated in the survey. On the other hand, a non-random convenience sampling was utilized for alumni,

industry partners, and parents. Table 1 shows the number of respondents per group. The student-respondents were further categorized according to their degree programs enrolled in, to wit: Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSE English or Math), Bachelor in Elementary Education (BEED), Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM), Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA), and Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT).

Table 1. Frequency of Respondents per Group

| Group | Frequency | % |
|------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Faculty | 32 | 4% |
| Non-teaching | 10 | 1% |
| Student | 546 | 64% |
| a. BSE | 106 | |
| b. BEED | 119 | |
| c. BSHM | 78 | |
| d. BSBA | 144 | |
| e. BSIT | 100 | |
| Parents/Guardian | 127 | 15% |
| Alumni | 109 | 13% |
| Industry Partner | 33 | 4% |
| TOTAL | 857 | 100% |

Design and Procedure

The descriptive survey method was employed in this study to determine level of awareness, acceptance, and perception of both internal and external stakeholders of PSU towards its Vision, Mission, Goals, and objectives.

The researcher together with her colleagues personally administered the questionnaire to the internal stakeholders, i.e., students, faculty, and non-teaching staff. Majority of the alumni were reached through their Facebook accounts. Others, however, were visited in their houses or workplaces through their relatives who are enrolled in the Campus or those students who are living in the same/neighborhood barangays. Parents and industry partners were given questionnaires through student-aides.

Data gathered were subjected to statistical analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Specifically, mean was used to measure the level of stakeholders' awareness, acceptance, and perception on the University's VMGO. The following scale was used to interpret the findings:

| Rating | Mean | Descriptive Equivalent | | |
|--------|-----------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| | | Awareness | Acceptance | Perception |
| 4 | 3.50-4.00 | Highly Aware | Greatly Accept | Strongly Agree |
| 3 | 2.50-3.49 | Aware | Accept | Agree |
| 2 | 1.50-2.49 | Least Aware | Slightly Accept | Disagree |
| 1 | 1.00-1.49 | Not Aware | Not Accept | Strongly Disagree |

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2 shows stakeholders' awareness regarding the vision, mission, and goals of PSU, and the objectives of the program where they belong. Results revealed that overall the respondents were aware of the VMGOs. The non-teaching staff, faculty, and alumni were highly aware of the VMGOs. Lowest mean ratings (2.47, 2.61) were generated from the responses of the parents on the vision, mission, and goals of PSU. This is understandable because parents do not come to school as frequently as the others. This finding serves as an eye-opener to the administration. It reminds both the administration and its staff of their responsibility to inform parents of what the institution envisions to become or what it aims to accomplish as this will greatly affect how they would respond to any programs, projects, or activities. As noted earlier, realization of the VMGOs will only happen if all stakeholders are aware of them, understand and accept them. Thus, it is recommended that the administration has to conduct extensive information dissemination campaign; involving more parents, students, and industry partners/ linkages/ cooperating agencies in the crafting, revision, or review of the VMGOs. The task of encouraging external stakeholders to attend activities of the University is quite daunting; however, if the institution wants to succeed in fulfilling its vision and mission, it has to involve all people concerned.

Table 2. Awareness on the VMGO

| Indicators | Mean (DE) | | | | | | OWM (DE) |
|------------|-----------|--------------|----------|---------|--------|---|----------|
| | Faculty | Non-Teaching | Students | Parents | Alumni | Industry Partners, Linkages, Cooperating Agencies | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| I am aware of the Vision and Mission of PSU. | 3.63 (HA) | 3.90 (HA) | 3.54 (HA) | 2.47 (LA) | 3.63 (HA) | 3.06 (A) | 3.37 (A) |
| I am aware of the Goals of PSU | 3.71 (HA) | 3.90 (HA) | 3.38 (A) | 2.61 (LA) | 3.55 (HA) | 3.76 (HA) | 3.49 (A) |
| I am aware of the Objectives of the program where I/my child/children belong. | 3.65 (HA) | 3.90 (HA) | 3.31 (A) | 2.57 (A) | 3.52 (HA) | 3.27 (A) | 3.37 (A) |
| OVER ALL | 3.66 (HA) | 3.90 (HA) | 3.41 (A) | 2.55 (A) | 3.57 (HA) | 3.36 (A) | 3.41 (A) |

Legend:

| Mean | Descriptive Equivalent |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 3.50 – 4.00 | Highly Aware (HA) |
| 2.50 – 3.49 | Aware (A) |
| 1.50 – 2.49 | Least Aware (LA) |
| 1.00 – 1.49 | Not Aware (NA) |

On the other hand, Table 3 reveals respondents' level of awareness on the dissemination of the VMGOs. Data affirmed that VMGOs of the University are disseminated to the stakeholders as indicated by the overall weighted mean of 3.13. The non-awareness compared to the faculty, 3.31. This may be attributed to some teachers' confinement to their classes and classrooms and to their business preparing for classroom instruction. Thus, there is a need to remind them especially during meetings and learning enhancement programs of the institution's effort in disseminating the VMGO.

Table 3. Awareness on the VMGO Dissemination

| Indicators | Mean (DE) | | | | | | Weighted Mean (DE) |
|------------|-----------|--------------|----------|---------|--------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Non-Teaching | Students | Parents | Alumni | Industry Partners | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | rs, Linka ges, Coope rating Agenci es | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|---|----------|
| I am aware that the VMGO are displayed in bulletin boards. | 3.66 (HA) | 3.70 (HA) | 3.58 (HA) | 2.60 (A) | 3.45 (A) | 3.03 (A) | 3.34 (A) |
| I am aware that the VMGO are printed in catalogs, manuals, and other materials. | 3.53 (HA) | 3.30 (A) | 3.44 (A) | 2.47 (L) | 3.46 (A) | 3.12 (A) | 3.22 (A) |
| I am aware that the VMGO are broadcast in media and/or internet /website. | 2.97 (A) | 3.30 (A) | 2.98 (A) | 2.33 (L) | 3.19 (A) | 2.70 (A) | 2.91 (A) |
| I am aware that the VMGO are widely disseminated to different agencies, institutions, industry, and the community as a whole. | 3.06 (A) | 3.80 (HA) | 2.99 (A) | 2.52 (A) | 3.21 (A) | 2.70 (A) | 3.05 (A) |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| OVERALL | 3.31 (A) | 3.53 (HA) | 3.25 (A) | 2.48 (L) | 3.33 (A) | 2.89 (A) | 3.13 (A) |
|---------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

Legend:

| Mean | Descriptive Equivalent |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 3.50 – 4.00 | Highly Aware (HA) |
| 2.50 – 3.49 | Aware (A) |
| 1.50 – 2.49 | Least Aware (LA) |
| 1.00 – 1.49 | Not Aware (NA) |

Table 4 shows stakeholders' understanding and acceptance of the VMGO. It can be gleaned from the table that all stakeholders understand and accept (OWM = 3.39) the VMGO of the university. Among the respondents, industry partners, linkages and cooperating agencies had the lowest level (OWM = 2.93) of understanding and acceptance of the institutions' VMGO. It is worth noting that the non-teaching staff had the highest mean average (3.76) than the faculty (OWM = 3.55). This implies that they have instilled in their minds the institution's VMGO as they are the performers of frontline services to the clientele.

Table 4. Understanding and Acceptance of the VMGO

| INDICATORS | MEAN (DE) | | | | | | WEIGHTED MEAN (DE) |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------|-----------|---|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Non-Teaching | Students | Parents | Alumni | Industry Partners, Linkages, Cooperating Agencies | |
| I understand and accept the VMGO of Pangasinan State University. | 3.59 (GA) | 3.70 (GA) | 3.59 (GA) | 2.96 (A) | 3.66 (GA) | 2.97 (A) | 3.41 (A) |
| I understand and accept the Goals of the Institution. | 3.53 (GA) | 3.78 (GA) | 3.56 (GA) | 3.02 (A) | 3.58 (GA) | 2.79 (A) | 3.38 (A) |
| I understand and accept the Objectives of the Program where I/my child/ren belong and the responsibility | 3.52 (GA) | 3.80 (GA) | 3.47 (A) | 3.14 (A) | 3.40 (A) | 3.03 (A) | 3.39 (A) |



of PSU and others concerned in realizing such objectives.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| OVERALL | 3.55 (GA) | 3.76 (GA) | 3.54 (GA) | 3.04 (A) | 3.55 (GA) | 2.93 (A) | 3.39 (A) |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|

Legend:

| Mean | Descriptive Equivalent |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 3.50 – 4.00 | Greatly Accept (GA) |
| 2.50 – 3.49 | Accept (A) |
| 1.50 – 2.49 | Slightly Accept (SA) |
| 1.00 – 1.49 | Not Accept (NA) |

Table 5 reveals respondents' perceptions toward VMGOs clarity and consistency. Generally, the respondents agree that the VMGO are clearly stated and are consistent with the institution's legal and educational mandate with an overall weighted mean of 3.37. With a difference of .02, faculty (OWM = 3.58) and non-teaching staff (OWM = 3.60) strongly agree that the VMGO are indeed clear and consistent.

Table 5. Perceptions toward VMGO's Clarity and Consistency

| Indicators | Mean (De) | | | | | Industry Partners, Linkages, Cooperating Agencies | Weighted Mean (De) |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Non-Teaching | Students | Parents | Alumni | | |
| The Vision clearly reflects what PSU hopes to become in the future. | 3.72 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.65 (SA) | 3.12 (A) | 3.58 (SA) | 3.06 (A) | 3.46 (A) |
| The Mission clearly reflects PSU's legal and educational mandate | 3.66 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.58 (SA) | 3.13 (A) | 3.53 (SA) | 2.88 (A) | 3.40 (A) |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| The Goals of the Institution are clearly stated and are consistent with the VMG of PSU. | 3.59 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.52 (SA) | 3.13 (A) | 3.50 (SA) | 2.76 (A) | 3.35 (A) |
| The Program Objectives are consistent with the Goals of Alaminos City Campus and the University. | 3.56 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.43 (A) | 3.10 (A) | 3.50 (SA) | 3.00 (A) | 3.37 (A) |
| The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of competencies or technical skills of students and graduates. | 3.50 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.41 (A) | 3.13 (A) | 3.47 (A) | 2.97 (A) | 3.35 (A) |
| The Program Objectives clearly state the expected outcomes in terms of research | 3.56 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.43 (A) | 3.13 (A) | 3.57 (SA) | 2.94 (A) | 3.37 (A) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| and extensio n capabili ties of students and graduat es. | | | | | | | | |
| The Progra m Objecti ves clearly state the expecte d outcom es in terms of students ' own ideas, desirabl e attitudes and personal discipli ne. | 3.53 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.43 (A) | 3.14 (A) | 3.50 (SA) | 2.94 (A) | 3.37 (A) | |
| The Progra m Objecti ves clearly state the expecte d outcom es in terms of moral characte r. | 3.59 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.46 (A) | 3.16 (A) | 3.51 (SA) | 2.94 (A) | 3.38 (A) | |
| The Progra m Objecti ves clearly state the expecte d outcom es in terms of critical thinking skills. | 3.56 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.43 (A) | 3.10 (A) | 3.54 (SA) | 2.73 (A) | 3.33 (A) | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| The Progra m Objecti ves clearly state the expecte d outcom es in terms of aestheti c and cultural values. | 3.53 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.42 (A) | 3.09 (A) | 3.48 (A) | 2.88 (A) | 3.33 (A) | |
| OVERALL | 3.58 (SA) | 3.60 (SA) | 3.48 (A) | 3.12 (A) | 3.52 (SA) | 2.91 (A) | 3.37 (A) | |

Legend:

| Mean | Descriptive Equivalent |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 3.50 – 4.00 | Strongly Agree (SA) |
| 2.50 – 3.49 | Agree (A) |
| 1.50 – 2.49 | Disagree (D) |
| 1.00 – 1.49 | Strongly Disagree (SD) |

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the data gathered, results revealed that stakeholders, both internal and external which include faculty, non-teaching staff, students, parents, alumni, industry partners, are aware of the VMGOs of PSU. However, it was also shown that not all parents are informed of the VMGOs.

As regards awareness on dissemination of the VMGOs through bulletin boards, manuals, catalogs, brochures, internet, and broadcast media, parents are least aware compared to other stakeholders. Non-teaching staff are more aware on the VMGO dissemination than faculty.

All stakeholders accept and understand the VMGOs. They also agree that the VMGOs are clear and are reflective of the mandate of the University.

Considering these, the researcher recommends that the University and the Campus should double its efforts in disseminating the VMGOs to stakeholders. Widen its info-dissemination campaign and use variety of forms to reach more stakeholders especially the parents who are strong partners of the institution in attaining its objectives. The use of Facebook as well as other social networking sites must be considered as these rapidly spread information.

All faculty members must actively participate in the dissemination of the VMGOs. They must understand that their role in VMGO dissemination is necessary in the realization of the University's objectives.



External stakeholders such as the parents, alumni, and industry partners must be involved in the crafting of the VMGOs. Likewise, the University should conduct forum more regularly with them to present and discuss the VMGO. They should be invited to the Campus more often to increase their awareness on the VMGOs.

Similar research must be conducted more periodically to ensure that stakeholders understand the VMGOs

REFERENCES

- Accrediting Agency for Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines [AACUP] (2010). Evaluation Instrument.
- Bart, C. K., Bontis, N., & Taggar, S. (2001). A model of the impact of mission statements on firm performance. *Management Decision*, 39(1), 19–35.
- Castillo, R. C. (2014). Awareness, Acceptance, and Perception of Batangas State University Stakeholders towards its Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, ISSN 2307-4531.
- Commission on Higher Education [CHED] Memorandum Order 37, s. 2012. Retrieved from <http://ched.gov.ph/cmo-37-s-2012/>.
- Commission on Higher Education [CHED] Memorandum Order 46, s. 2012. Retrieved from <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CMO-No.46-s2012.pdf>
- Corpus, M. T. (n.d.) Benefits of Accreditation. Retrieved from <http://www.aacupqa.org.ph/index.php/aacup-accreditation/benefits-of-accreditation>.
- University of Minnesota (2015). Principles of Management. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.24926/8668.1801>.