The reality of Algerian university governance: a case study of the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences, and Management Sciences at the University of Mascara

Ammar Hamioud [1,*]

[1] Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences and Management Sciences, University of Mascara (Algeria) (ammar.hamioud@univ-mascara.dz)

Summary: This study investigates the present state of university governance within the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences, and Management Sciences at the University of Mascara. The focus of this research encompasses transparency, accountability, participation, independence, and communication effectiveness. The study employs a descriptive-analytical methodology, utilizing questionnaires to gather primary data. A convenience sampling technique was applied by distributing 43 questionnaires to employees of the aforementioned faculty. A total of 24 completed questionnaires were retrieved and deemed valid for analysis. Employing statistical methods, including non-parametric methods, the study concludes that there is a moderate level of agreement regarding the application of governance principles. Notably, significant differences were observed among employees based on their respective departments.

Keywords: Governance; University Governance; Non-parametric statistical Tests.
Jel Classification Codes : K20; I23; C14.

* Ammar Hamioud ammar.hamioud@univ-mascara.dz

I-Introduction:

In light of the rapid transformations witnessed in the higher education sector, university governance has become an essential element to ensure the quality of academic and administrative performance, and to enhance transparency and accountability within university institutions. University governance aims to establish an organizational and administrative framework that ensures the achievement of the university's strategic objectives by instituting principles of independence, effectiveness, participation, and transparency in decision-making. Effective governance relies on adopting clear policies for managing human and material resources and enhancing communication mechanisms among the various actors within the university, including faculty members, students, and administration.

Applying governance in Algerian universities can contribute to improving the quality of higher education, supporting scientific research, and enhancing competitiveness among academic institutions. Like other universities, Algerian universities face several challenges in applying governance principles, including limited resources, weak infrastructure, and limited decision-making autonomy. This study seeks to analyze the extent to which governance principles are applied at one of the Algerian universities, specifically the University of Mascara, by focusing on one of its faculties, the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences, and Management Sciences.

I. 1. Research problem

Based on the previous introduction, the following research question can be raised: What is the reality of applying governance principles in the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences, and Management Sciences at the University of Mascara?

I. 2. Study hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study can be formulated as follows:

-The first main hypothesis is: There is no application of university governance in the faculty of economics, business and management sciences at the university of Mascara.

-The second main hypothesis is: There are no differences in the respondents' answers due to their personal and job characteristics.

I. 3. The importance of study

The importance of this study is as follows:

–The study contributes to evaluating the current status of governance applications in Algerian universities, enabling these institutions to identify strengths and areas for improvement.

–By enhancing governance dimensions such as transparency and accountability, the study helps build greater trust among stakeholders, including students, faculty members, administrators, and the broader civil community.

–The study provides scientific insights on how to improve governance practices, allowing Algerian universities to:

  Enhance their competitiveness both nationally and internationally.

  Increase their attractiveness to students and academics.

I.4. The objectives of study

-The objectives of this study are as follows:

-The study aims to evaluate the current status of governance applications in Algerian universities and identify strengths and areas for improvement.

-The study aims to enhance the dimensions of transparency and accountability within universities, contributing to greater trust among stakeholders.

-The study aims to improve university governance, thereby achieving indirect objectives such as higher levels of quality in higher education.

II- Literature review

II. 1. Guemmou, Helza and Ounnas's (2024) study titled: The extent of dedication of Algerian governmental administrative institutions to corporate governance.

This study examines the prerequisites of corporate governance and its impact on improving institutional and public service performance. It also evaluates the commitment level of Algerian public administrative institutions through the distribution of 62 questionnaires and analysis using SPSS 25. The findings indicate that adherence to corporate governance principles significantly enhances efficiency and transparency in public institutions. However, the study highlights the need to refine specific aspects, particularly in strengthening disclosure and transparency policies and reinforcing the overall governance framework for comprehensive policy implementation. The study underscores the importance of a holistic governance framework in improving institutional performance, promoting effectiveness, and ensuring equity. To achieve this, it recommends enhancing commitment across all governance dimensions, fostering a work environment rooted in integrity and accountability, and supporting sustainable development. (Guemmou, Helza, & Ounnas, 2024)

II. 2. Madani and Bourdache's (2025) study titled: The impact of the governance on our universities-comparative study.

The aim of this study is to analyze the impact of governance on universities, focusing on the relationship between university governance and investment in human capital. The study followed a descriptive and analytical approach, relying on the analysis of data and reports to evaluate the impact of governance on universities globally and regionally, including Algeria. The results showed that university governance positively contributes to improving administrative and academic performance, increasing faculty productivity, and enhancing student levels. The study

emphasized the importance of financial and administrative independence for universities to achieve greater flexibility in decision-making and research development. It also recommended enhancing transparency and accountability, expanding cooperation with the industrial sector, increasing student participation in university decision-making, and focusing on digitizing education and incorporating modern technology into university curricula to achieve greater competitiveness.(Madani & Bourdache, 2025)

II. 3. Abbes's (2019/2020) study titled: University governance and its impact on the quality of higher education outputs to achieve sustainable development - a survey on a sample of professors of the Faculty of Economics, Business and Management Sciences at universities in eastern Algeria.

This study examines the impact of university governance on higher education quality and sustainable development in ten Algerian universities. Using a descriptive-analytical approach, data were collected from 478 faculty members through a questionnaire and analyzed via SPSS V23 and AMOS V21. Findings indicate a moderate application of governance principles, with significant variations between universities. Higher education quality and sustainability efforts were generally low. However, governance positively influenced education quality, which, in turn, played a mediating role in achieving sustainable development.(Abbes, 2019/2020).

II. 4. Karaoui's (2020) study titled: The reality of applying the principles of university governance from the students' perspective - Faculty of Economic Sciences, Setif University 1.

This study aims to highlight the level of governance principles implementation in Algerian universities from the students' perspective. The research adopted a descriptive approach, utilizing a questionnaire distributed to a simple random sample of 370 students from the Faculty of Economics at Setif 1 University. The findings indicate that the faculty applies governance principles at a moderate level and strives to enhance their implementation to improve the quality of its academic performance. (Karaoui, 2020)

II. 5. Djegta's (2016/2017) study titled: The role of university governance in improving the quality of higher education From a stakeholder's point of view.

This study aims to investigate the role of university governance in enhancing the quality of higher education according to the perspectives of the faculty members at Setif University-1. To achieve this goal, 250 questionnaires were distributed to a random sample of faculty members, with 220 valid questionnaires returned for analysis using SPSS software. The results revealed that the three governance practices (autonomy, performance evaluation, and participation) implemented at Setif University-1 were not significantly effective in improving the quality of higher education, according to the faculty members' opinions. (Djegta, 2016/2017).

III. University Governance:

III.1. Definition of Governance:

Before presenting the concept of governance through some definitions provided for it, a brief overview of the origin of this term and how interest in it has developed will be presented.

Governance is a term derived from an ancient Greek word that symbolizes the ability of a ship's captain to face all challenges at sea, such as waves and storms, with noble ethics that manifest in preserving the passengers and cargo against pirates. This captain was called the "Good Governor," which means the good ruler when he returns from his mission safely. From here, the word Governance was used in Germany, France, and other countries. In Arabic, the term (Governance) was adopted in 2003 by the Arabic Language Academy (Al-Ghazwi & Al-Hayali, 2015, p. 23).

Interest in corporate governance began in the modern era after successive financial crises that affected East Asian countries between 1997 and 1999, in addition to the financial scandals in American companies during 2001 and 2002 (Issa, 2015, p. 18). The 2008 global financial crisis demonstrated that "the absence of oversight and the failure to apply corporate governance as required, as well as poor corporate governance systems, lead to exacerbating other problems and harming the national economy and global financial stability. Although the circumstances were

different in the countries that experienced these crises, they all suffered from distorted governance structures, which led to inefficiency in economic decision-making" (Al-Ghazwi & Al-Hayali, 2015, p. 47).

As for the definition of governance, there is no unified definition. Some define it as "the establishment of a clear and defined organizational and administrative structure through a set of instructions and relationships that are precisely defined in terms of rights and obligations, operating under a set of binding rules for all parties, and using sound financial and accounting tools that allow for accountability and ensure transparency to build trust among parties with conflicting interests concerned with the company's operations" (Issa, 2015, p. 22).

Others argue that corporate governance can be distinguished by two approaches (Al-Ghazwi & Al-Hayali, 2015, pp. 26-27):

-The Organizational Approach:

   - Governance represents a system that manages the company and its various activities and strategies, whether related to the financial, operational, or strategic aspects, to achieve profits and avoid losses.

   - Governance clarifies all internal and external relationships between the various stakeholders in the company, such as its management, board of directors, and external parties.

   - Corporate governance aims to ensure the interests of all stakeholders in the company are met and protects against manipulation of internal decisions by one party, such as a manager or a board member.

-The Supervisory Approach:

   - Governance ensures that there is no conflict of interest between the company's management and its board of directors by overseeing the performance of both the management and the administrative system.

   - Full disclosure to all shareholders about the compensation and salaries of senior executives, as well as transactions between board members and the company.

   - Monitoring the proper application of decisions in operational and financial aspects, ensuring they serve the company's interests, not the interests of any individual within the board.

According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), "Corporate governance directs how a company is guided and its relations with shareholders and stakeholders. With the correct structures and systems in place, good corporate governance enables companies to create an environment of trust, transparency, and accountability, which enhances long-term patient capital and supports economic growth and financial stability" (OECD, 2024).

According to the International Finance Corporation, "Good corporate governance helps companies operate more efficiently, improves access to capital, reduces risks, and protects against mismanagement. It makes companies more accountable and transparent to investors and provides them with the tools to address stakeholder concerns" (International Finance Corporation, 2024).

From the above, we can conclude that corporate governance is an independent system operating within an organization to protect the company's interests and those of all related parties from mismanagement and misuse. It ensures the correct and effective implementation of all operational and financial decisions to achieve the company's goals and avoids conflicts arising from the clash of interests between the company's management and its board of directors.

III. 2. What is University Governance?

Some define university governance as "the way universities can direct and manage their activities to ensure quality and excellence in performance by adopting effective plans and methods towards achieving their goals, with the involvement of all relevant parties, including faculty members and staff, in the process of reforming teaching programs and decision-making, while providing an appropriate organizational structure according to the changing environment of the university, in the context of transparency, accountability, independence, and effectiveness" (Abbas, 2019, p. 144).

Others define it as "a modern administrative system that leads to the development of institutional performance and protects the interests of all directly and indirectly involved parties, enabling it to achieve excellence and quality in performance, striving to achieve the strategic goals and objectives of the university and successful organizational and academic management, while respecting the views and objectives of stakeholders" (Zrawala & Abbas, 2022, p. 5).

It is also defined as "an approach based on strategic management and optimal use of available resources to achieve set goals, while considering the common interests of the various stakeholders, so that the institution becomes a source of scientific influence and research to produce the elite expected to lead the development process in all its dimensions" (Ben Tayeb & Thahanout, 2020, p. 246).

University governance is an administrative and organisational approach that aims to establish quality standards within academic institutions. This ensures accurate decision-making, alignment of organisational goals, and the commitment of all members to professional ethics. Achieving this requires the implementation of regulations and policies that support fundamental principles such as autonomy, academic freedom, effective participation in decision-making, as well as transparency and accountability on both the administrative and academic sides. This framework plays a critical role in enhancing organisational efficiency, improving the quality of educational inputs, processes and outcomes, and ultimately achieving the overall goal of ensuring excellence in higher education. (Djegta, 2016/2017, p. 23)

III. 3. The importance of university governance

Governance in academic institutions serves as a fundamental pillar to ensure integrity and ethical soundness. It plays a crucial role in enhancing the university's reputation in the community, reducing internal risks and conflicts that hinder performance quality. Governance contributes to promoting fair administrative and educational practices, separating organizational ownership from management and performance oversight, thus ensuring adherence to standard practices. It also functions as a tool for self-regulation and supervision, ensuring legal compliance with legislation, safeguarding employees' rights, and improving administration. Furthermore, governance helps achieve a balance between strategic and operational responsibilities, enhances universities' competitiveness, prevents administrative and financial corruption, and ensures the optimal use of resources. Governance also enables the administration to develop effective strategies and make well-considered decisions that improve performance efficiency. (Djegta, 2016/2017, pp. 23-24)

III. 4. The objectives of university governance

University governance is a critical factor in ensuring transparency, integrity, and efficiency in the management of educational institutions. It plays a vital role in improving the quality of higher education and enhancing the reputation of universities in the community. The objectives of university governance include: (Djegta, 2016/2017, p. 25)

Enhancing Integrity and Ethical Standards:

Governance contributes to upholding values of integrity and ethics within universities, fostering a healthy educational environment and a positive institutional reputation in the community.

Reducing Risks and Internal Conflicts:

Governance plays a crucial role in mitigating internal risks and conflicts that may hinder the quality of academic and administrative performance.

Promoting Fair Administrative and Educational Practices:

Governance ensures the separation of organizational ownership from management and oversight, leading to adherence to standard practices and fair operations.

Self-Regulation and Supervision Tool:

Governance acts as a mechanism for self-regulation and supervision, ensuring legal compliance with legislation, protecting employees' rights, and improving administration.

Balancing Responsibilities:

Governance helps achieve a balanced distribution of strategic and operational responsibilities, thereby enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of university performance.

Boosting Competitiveness and Preventing Corruption:

Governance enhances universities' competitiveness, prevents administrative and financial corruption, and ensures optimal resource utilization.

Developing Effective Strategies and Informed Decision-Making:

Governance enables the administration to formulate effective strategies and make well-considered decisions that enhance performance efficiency and achieve sustainable institutional goals.

III. 5. Elements of University Governance

University governance comprises several fundamental elements that contribute to its effectiveness. These include: (Abbes, 2019/2020, pp. 18-19).

-Stakeholders in governance and administration, including students, faculty members, administrators, government entities, private sector partners, and civil society organizations.

-Decision-making participation mechanisms, which define how different parties engage in shaping academic and administrative policies.

-Senior management, which encompasses academic leadership, organizational structures, general policies, and decision-making frameworks.

-Institutional and organizational framework, outlining the nature of the institution, its administrative structure, and the levels of decision-making within it.

-Administrative and financial systems, covering budgeting, academic policies, human resource development plans, and other organizational aspects that support university operations.

IV– Methods and Materials:

IV. 1. Methodology

The study employed a descriptive-analytical methodology.

IV. 2. Population of study

The population of this study is A convenient sample was used by distributing 43 questionnaires to employees of the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences, and Management Sciences at the University of Mascara

IV. 3. Sample of study

This study relied on a convenience sample, which relates to the respondents who voluntarily provided their answers and co-operated in answering the questionnaire, which numbered 24 employees working at the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences, and Management Sciences at the University of Mascara.

This research relied on convenience sampling, Among the studies that used this type of sample are (Robert & Dwight, 2014), which included university college students, (Park, Velez, Kannan, & Chorpita, 2020), a study that relied on convenience sampling to identify individuals' suffering and response to stress associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, and (Leiner, 2014) used convenience sampling to collect the opinions of volunteer respondents, consisting of undergraduate and doctoral students to answer through the SoSci panel created by SoSci Survey, a popular English-language platform in Germany that has been used to create questionnaires since 2011, where convenience sampling is one type of sampling (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2012).

IV. 4. Study tool:

The study relied on a questionnaire to collect primary information. The questionnaire was designed by relying on some previous studies. Among the previous studies are (Abbes, 2019/2020) and (Djegta, 2016/2017).

IV. 5. Statistical tools and methods

This study relied on the following tools: the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation in order to identify the degree of agreement of the answers of the study sample members to the questionnaire questions. The study also relied on the Cronbach's alpha test to identify the reliability of the study tool, and it also relied on the Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests to identify The extent to which there are differences in the answers of study sample members depending on personal and job characteristics.

IV. 6. Nonparametric Statistical Tests

Since the study's data did not meet the assumptions required for parametric tests, nonparametric statistical methods were used. These methods, which do not require data normality or homogeneity of variances, are more appropriate given the convenience sampling approach. The study applies two key tests: the Mann-Whitney U test, which compares differences between two groups, and the Kruskal-Wallis test, which examines differences among more than two groups. These statistical techniques ensure the validity of the findings despite the dataset's limitations.

IV. 7. Cases of Choosing a Comparison Method

Table 5 outlines the appropriate statistical test based on the number of groups being compared. If the comparison involves only two groups, the Mann-Whitney U test is used, which is a nonparametric alternative to the independent samples t-test. However, if the comparison involves more than two groups, the Kruskal-Wallis test is applied, which serves as a nonparametric equivalent to one-way ANOVA. This methodological framework ensures that the correct statistical approach is used, given the nature of the data and the study's reliance on nonparametric methods

IV. 8. Fields of Agreement

Table 3 defines the scale used to interpret respondents' answers, based on past studies and the current study's methodology. Responses are measured on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Different classification methods categorize the responses into levels such as too low, low, medium, high, and too high degrees of agreement. The current study establishes that a mean score below 2.61 indicates a low degree of agreement, a score between 2.61 and 3.40 represents a medium degree, and a score above 3.40 signifies a high degree. This categorization ensures that the study's findings are clearly interpreted and aligned with existing literature.

V- Results and discussion:

V.1. Results

V. 1.1. Descriptive Statistics of Participants

The descriptive statistics in table 1 provide an overview of the study participants, highlighting key demographic characteristics such as gender, age, department, job rank, and years of experience. The sample consists of 24 individuals, with a slightly higher proportion of female respondents (54.2%) compared to males (45.8%). The majority of participants (62.5%) fall within the 30-40 age range, while most belong to the Business Sciences department (37.5%). In terms of job rank, a significant portion (62.5%) is categorized under "Other," and experience levels are evenly distributed between 10-15 years and 15 years or more (both 33.3%). These characteristics provide a diverse representation of university employees, ensuring a comprehensive assessment of governance perceptions.

V. 1.2. Reliability Statistics

Based on table 2 The reliability of the survey constructs was evaluated using Cronbach's Alpha, which measures internal consistency. All variables exhibit high reliability, with values exceeding the 0.7 threshold. Notably, Transparency and Disclosures (0.929), Participation (0.920), and Independence and Academic Freedom (0.925) demonstrate very high reliability, ensuring that the survey items used to measure these constructs provide consistent results. The overall University

Governance variable has the highest reliability (0.965), indicating that the responses are highly stable. These findings confirm that the study's survey instrument is well-structured and suitable for assessing university governance.

V. 1. 3. Descriptive Statistics of Respondents' Answers

Based on the results in Table 4 the respondents' Answers will be explained as follows.

V. 1. 3. 1. The variable transparency and Disclosure

Transparency and disclosure are crucial factors in university governance. The study results indicate a moderate level of satisfaction with the clarity of information provided by the college (mean = 2.96). The highest mean within this variable was for the timely provision of necessary information to professors (mean = 3.50), reflecting high efficiency in delivering organizational and educational information. Conversely, the lowest mean was related to the college's publication of information on its future projects (mean = 2.58), highlighting the need for greater transparency in strategic planning.

V. 1. 3. 2. The variable accountability and Control

Accountability and control reflect the college's commitment to implementing performance monitoring and discipline systems. The results show a moderate level of satisfaction (mean = 3.19). Accountability for absences and program progress recorded the highest mean (mean = 3.75), indicating the effectiveness of monitoring systems in this area. However, the lowest mean was in the objective application of accountability results (mean = 2.96), suggesting the need to enhance transparency and fairness in implementing accountability.

V. 1. 3. 3. The variable participation

Engaging students and professors in decision-making is an important factor in improving university governance. The results indicate a moderate level of satisfaction (mean = 2.82), with ease of access to officials scoring the highest mean (mean = 3.17), reflecting an acceptable communication environment. On the other hand, the lowest mean was related to participation in solving college problems (mean = 2.63), emphasizing the need to strengthen participation mechanisms in decision-making.

V. 1. 3. 4. The variable academic Autonomy and Freedom

Academic independence is essential in enhancing the quality of education and research. The results indicate a moderate overall mean for this variable (mean = 3.10). The highest indicator was the freedom of department heads to propose specializations (mean = 3.25), reflecting a certain level of independence in academic decisions. In contrast, the lowest mean was for opening doctoral programs based on labour market needs (mean = 2.83), highlighting the need for better alignment between academic programs and market requirements.

V. 1. 3. 5. The variable of efficiency and Communication Effectiveness and its items

Effectiveness Communication effectiveness reflects the extent to which the university utilizes modern and traditional communication methods to ensure the flow of information. The results indicate a moderate level of satisfaction (mean = 3.26), with the use of modern communication methods ranking the highest (mean = 3.63), demonstrating high satisfaction with the university's digital infrastructure. Conversely, the lowest mean was for the availability of internet rooms for students and professors (mean = 2.79), indicating the need to improve technical facilities.

V. 1. 3. 6.The main variable: university governance

From Table 4, it is clear that the responses of the study sample achieved a mean of 3.0699 and a standard deviation of 0.81500, and hence, the degree of agreement is medium. The overall results indicate an acceptable level of satisfaction regarding the university governance system in the college. The mean of 3.0699 and standard deviation of 0.81500 reflect the presence of an effective system that can be improved to achieve a higher level of transparency, accountability, participation, autonomy, and efficiency in all aspects of the academic and administrative process in the college.

Based on the previous explanation we reach that Table 4 summarizes respondents' perceptions of various governance aspects in their university. Most responses fall within the medium degree of

agreement, suggesting that governance processes are moderately effective. Higher agreement levels are observed for statements regarding the provision of teaching schedules (mean = 3.5), accountability for absences (mean = 3.75), and the use of modern communication methods such as email (mean = 3.625). Conversely, the lowest level of agreement is found in the statement about the university publishing future plans and projects (mean = 2.58). These results indicate that while some aspects of governance are well-implemented, improvements are needed in transparency and long-term planning.

From the above, we can reject the first main hypothesis that states that There is no application of university governance in the faculty of economics, business and management sciences at the university of Mascara and replace it with the alternative hypothesis that there is an acceptable application of university governance in the faculty of economics, business and management sciences at the university of Mascara.

V. 1.4. Testing the extent to which there are differences in the answers of study sample members depending on personal and functional variables

Based on the results in Tables 6, 7 ,8 differences in the answers of study sample members depending on personal and functional variables will be explained as follow.

V. 1.4. 1. Testing the extent to which there are differences in the answers of study sample members depending on Employee Gender

Table 6 presents the results of the Mann-Whitney U test comparing perceptions of university governance between male and female respondents. The test evaluates differences across six key governance variables: transparency and disclosures, accountability and control, participation, independence and academic freedom, efficiency and communication effectiveness, and overall university governance. The results indicate that none of the variables show a statistically significant difference between genders, as all p-values exceed 0.05. This suggests that male and female employees generally perceive university governance in a similar manner, reinforcing the idea that governance policies and their implementation do not vary significantly based on gender.

V. 1.4 .2. Testing the extent to which there are differences in the answers of study sample members depending on Employee Characteristics

The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to examine differences in governance perceptions based on four employee characteristics: age, department, experience, and job rank. The results in Table 7 indicate that most governance variables do not show significant differences across these categories, meaning that respondents, regardless of their background, generally share similar views on university governance. However, a statistically significant difference (p = 0.041) is observed in the Independence and Academic Freedom variable when comparing employees from different departments. This suggests that some departments experience greater academic autonomy than others, which may indicate discrepancies in institutional policies or leadership approaches across departments.

V. 1.4. 3. Testing the extent to which there are differences in the answers of study sample members depending on based on Department

Table 8 specifically examines differences in responses to the academic autonomy and freedom variable based on department. The results indicate significant differences between the Department of Economics and the Department of Finance and Accounting (p = 0.042), suggesting that employees in these two departments perceive academic autonomy differently. While other comparisons do not reach statistical significance, this finding raises important questions about the standardisation of academic governance policies across disciplines. Ensuring equitable academic

freedom between departments is critical to maintaining a balanced and fair university governance system.

From the above, we can reject the second main hypothesis that states that There are no differences in the respondents' answers due to their personal and job characteristics and replace it with the alternative hypothesis that there is There are differences between the responses of employees belonging to the Department of Economics and those belonging to the Department of Finance and Accounting with regard to the variable of autonomy and academic freedom.

V.2. discussion

The current study reflects the level of governance implementation in Algerian universities, indicating that governance principles are applied at a moderate level, with variations across academic departments. This finding aligns with the results of Madani & Bourdache (2025) and Abbes (2019/2020), both of which confirmed that university governance plays a positive role in enhancing academic and administrative performance and emphasized the importance of strengthening transparency, accountability, and independence in higher education institutions. However, the current study differs in its scope, as it focuses exclusively on the University of Mascara, whereas the two previous studies examined university governance at regional and international levels. This gives the findings of the current study a more specific dimension within the context of the university under investigation.

Furthermore, the current study is consistent with Karaoui (2020) in concluding that governance implementation in Algerian universities is moderate. However, the two studies differ in terms of perspective; while the current study is based on the views of administrative and academic staff, Karaoui's study relied on students' perspectives to assess the extent of governance implementation. Consequently, the current study contributes a new viewpoint by examining the impact of governance from the perspective of university staff, complementing previous studies that focused on different groups within the university.

Conversely, the current study differs from Djegta (2016/2017), which concluded that university governance practices were not significantly effective in improving the quality of higher education. While the current study suggests a moderate level of governance application, it acknowledges disparities between departments, which may partially explain the negative results found in Djegta's study within the context of a different university.

Moreover, the current study differs from Guemmou, Helza & Ounnas (2024), which focused on governance in public administrative institutions rather than universities. While both studies employed questionnaires and statistical analysis to evaluate governance principles, the difference in the nature of the institutions studied makes a direct comparison difficult. However, both studies highlight the need to enhance transparency and accountability as fundamental pillars of effective governance.

Based on the comparison with previous studies, the current study highlights that the level of governance implementation in Algerian universities is moderate, with variations across academic departments, partially reflecting the findings of some previous research. However, differences in research scope and evaluation methodologies among these studies emphasize the need for further comparative research on the impact of university governance in different academic contexts. These findings reaffirm the necessity of strengthening transparency, accountability, and independence in university administration to improve higher education quality and achieve institutional objectives more effectively.

VI- Conclusion:

Algerian review of economic development
ARED

The analysis of university governance, based on responses from faculty and administrative staff, reveals moderate levels of agreement across most governance dimensions. The reliability of the survey is confirmed by high Cronbach's Alpha values, indicating strong internal consistency. Statistical tests suggest no significant gender-based differences in governance perceptions, but some departmental variations exist, particularly in academic independence. The findings imply that while governance structures are generally perceived as fair, there are areas requiring improvement, especially regarding transparency, participation, and communication strategies. Addressing these disparities will contribute to a more effective and inclusive governance system within the university.

Based on the analysis, it is recommended to enhance transparency, encourage broader participation, and improve communication strategies within the university. By addressing these areas, the university can foster a more effective and inclusive governance system that meets the needs of all stakeholders.

- Appendices:

Table (1): Descriptive statistics of participants.

Characteristics		Frequency	%	Characteristics		Frequency	%
Gender	Male	11	45,8	Department	Economic Sciences	7	29,2
	Female	13	54,2		Business Sciences	9	37,5
	Total	24	100		Management Sciences	4	16,7
Age	Less than 30 years	1	4,2		Finance and Accounting	4	16,7
	From 30 and less than 40 years	15	62,5		Total	24	100
	From 40 and less than 50 years	6	25,0		State Engineer	1	4,2
	From 50 years and more	2	8,3		Technician	2	8,3
	Total	24	100	Job rank	Senior Technician	3	12,5
Experience	Less than 5 years	2	8,3		Technical Assistant	1	4,2
	From 5 and less than 10 years	6	25,0		Secretarial	2	8,3
	From 10 and less than 15 years	8	33,3		Other	15	62,5
	From 15 years and more	8	33,3		Total	24	100
	Total	24	100				

The source: Achieved based on spss outputs.

Table (2): Reliability Statistics

variable	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Transparency and disclosures	7	0.929
Accountability and control	4	0.826
Participation	6	0.920
Independence and academic freedom	6	0.925
Efficiency and communication effectiveness	6	0.825
University governance	29	0.965

The source: Achieved based on spss outputs.

Table (3): Fields of agreement.

Answers	strongly	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

	disagree				
Degree	1	2	3	4	5

Based on (mkadem, dehmani, & ahed, 2021), (Nouar & Sofi, 2024)

Fields of agreement	1-1.80 Too low degree	1.81-2.60 low degree	2.61-3. 40 Medium degree	3.41-4.20 High degree	4.21-5 Too high degree

Based on (Ben ksir, 2022), (Ben arima & Boukhalwa, 2024)

Fields of agreement	1-2.33 Low degree	2.34-3.67 Medium degree	3.68-5 High degree

the current study

Fields of agreement	If the answer < 2.61 low degree	If the answer between 2.61-3. 40 Medium degree	If the answer > 3.40 High degree

The source: Achieved based on some previous studies.

Table (4): Descriptive statistics of respondents' answers (N=24)

Items and variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	Degree of agreement
The information provided by the college is clear.	2,9583	1,23285	Medium
The college publishes information related to its future plans and projects.	2,5833	1,24819	low
Problems in the college are resolved with full transparency.	2,9167	1,28255	Medium
The college informs you about scientific internships.	2,7917	1,31807	Medium
The administrative and organizational procedures in the college are clear and easy.	2,7500	1,22474	Medium
The college provides necessary information to professors in a timely manner (teaching schedules, programs, exams).	3,5000	,97802	High
There are administrative procedures in the college for filing complaints and grievances.	3,2500	1,11316	Medium
Transparency and disclosures	2,9643	1,00773	Medium
The college effectively implements an accountability system (students, employees, professors) at all levels.	2,9167	1,17646	Medium
The college enforces the accountability system based on reliable information.	3,1667	1,16718	Medium
The college applies the results of the accountability process with complete objectivity.	2,9583	1,08264	Medium
You are held accountable in the college regarding (absences, progress in programs).	3,7500	1,11316	High
Accountability an dcontrol	3,1979	,92071	Medium
The college follows a dialogue approach in decision-making.	2,8750	1,22696	Medium
The college allows you to participate in	2,6250	1,27901	Medium

expressing your opinion on solving problems that hinder the college's operations.			
The college involves representatives of students, administration, and professors in managing college affairs.	2,7917	1,10253	Medium
The college announces administrative vacancies in a timely manner.	2,7500	1,32698	Medium
Access to officials by students, professors, and administrative staff does not require complicated procedures.	3,1667	1,34056	Medium
Work rules in the college are established through the participation of everyone.	2,7500	1,11316	Medium
Participation	2,8264	1,04313	Medium
The college determines the number of admitted students according to its material and human resources.	3,3333	1,09014	Medium
The college opens Bachelor's and Master's programs based on labor market needs.	3,0000	1,06322	Medium
The college opens doctoral programs based on labor market needs.	2,8333	,86811	Medium
The college grants faculty members academic freedom to provide consultations to private entities without restrictions.	2,9583	,85867	Medium
The college grants scientific committee members the authority and freedom to design and modify the department's study plans.	3,2083	,88363	Medium
The college grants department heads the freedom to propose certain specialties.	3,2500	,98907	Medium
Independence and academic freedom	3,0972	,82227	Medium
The college uses traditional communication methods (paper announcements, notices) to inform you of new developments (meetings, exams, study programs).	3,3333	1,23945	Medium
The college uses modern communication methods (email, the college's interactive website) to inform you of new developments.	3,6250	1,13492	High
The college provides open communication channels with institutions related to the university.	3,0417	1,12208	Medium
The college continuously updates its website (e.g., uploading lectures).	3,2917	1,12208	Medium
The college uses information technology in registration processes.	3,5000	1,14208	High
The college has an adequate number of internet rooms dedicated to students and professors.	2,7917	1,25036	Medium
Efficiency and communication effectiveness	3,2639	,85397	Medium
University governance	3,0699	,81500	Medium

The source: Achieved based on spss outputs.

Table (5): Cases of choosing a comparison method

	The comparison method
If the comparison variable contains only two groups	Mann-Whitney test
If the comparison variable contains more than 2 groups	Krukal-Wallis test

Achieved based   The source:

on some previous studies.

Table (6): Mann-Whitney U test results based on employee gender

	Mann-Whitney U	Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]
Transparency and disclosures	45	0,134
Accountability and control	42,5	0,093
Participation	47	0,167
Independence and academic freedom	66,5	0,776
Efficiency and communication effectiveness	60	0,531
Universitygovernance	49	0,207

The source: Achieved based on spss outputs.

Table (7): Kruskal-Wallis test results based on employee characteristics.

variable	Based on	Kruskal-Wallis H	df	Asymp. Sig.
Transparency and disclosures	Age	0,069	3	0,995
Accountability and control		2,892	3	0,409
Participation		1,884	3	0,597
Independence and academic freedom		0,738	3	0,864
Efficiency and communication effectiveness		1,180	3	0,758
University governance		1,103	3	0,776
Transparency and disclosures	Department	3,592	3	0,309
Accountability and control		2,297	3	0,513
Participation		5,779	3	0,123
Independence and academic freedom		8,269	3	0,041
Efficiency and communication effectiveness		1,815	3	0,612
University governance		5,345	3	0,148
Transparency and disclosures	experience	2,452	3	0,484
Accountability and control		3,561	3	0,313

Participation		2,567	3	0,463
Independence and academic freedom		0,401	3	0,940
Efficiency and communication effectiveness		0,972	3	0,808
University governance		1,593	3	0,661
Transparency and disclosures		4,885	4	0,299
Accountability and control		3,658	4	0,454
Participation	Job runk	4,552	4	0,336
Independence and academic freedom		6,454	4	0,168
Efficiency and communication effectiveness		6,456	4	0,168
University governance		5,444	4	0,245

The source: Achieved based on spss outputs.

Table (8): Results of the Mann-Whitney U test to determine the job ranks of the respondents, based on which a difference was obtained among them in their answers to the independence and academic freedom variable.

	Business Sciences	Management Sciences	Finance and Accounting
Economic Sciences	[14,000] (0,071)	[4,000] (0,073)	[3,000] (0,042)
Business Sciences		[13,000] (0,503)	[7,500] (0,106)
Management Sciences			[4,000] (0,343)

[]: The statistical value of the test.
():Significance level
The source: Achieved based on spss outputs.

Referrals and references:

1 Abbes, Z. (2019/2020). University governance and its impact on the quality of higher education outputs to achieve sustainable development - a survey on a sample of professors of the Faculty of Economics, Business and Management Sciences at universities in eastern Algeria. Algeria (Written in Arabic).

2 Ben arima, n., & Boukhalwa, B. (2024). The impact of information technology on knowledge sharing – a Applied study at the Sona gas foundation in Ouargla-. *Algerian review of economic development , 11* (01), pp. 01-16 (Written in Arabic).

3 Ben ksir, I. (2022). Innovation in small and medium enterprises- A field study of a group of small and medium enterprises in the state of Batna -. *Algerian business performance magazine , 10* (02), pp. 119-134 (Written in Arabic).

4 Djegta, s. (2016/2017). The role of university governance in improving the quality of higher education From a stakeholder's point of view. Faculty of Economics, Business and Management Sciences Setif University, Algeria (Written in Arabic).

5 Guemmou, A., Helza, M., & Ounnas, K. (2024). The extent of dedication of Algerian governmental administrative institutions to corporate governance. *11* (02), pp. 145-162.

6 Karaoui, A. (2020). The reality of applying the principles of university governance from the students' perspective - Faculty of Economic Sciences, Setif University 1. *Governance, Social Responsibility and Sustainable Development Review , 02* (02), 39-60 (Written in Arabic).

7 Leiner, D. J. (2014, January). *Convenience Samples from Online Respondent Pools: A case study of the SoSci Panel.* Consulté le april 08, 2023, sur Research Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259669050

8 Madani, Z., & Bourdache, c. (2025). The impact of the governance on our universities-comparative study. *Journal of Contemporary Business and Economic Studies , 08* (01), 89-103.

9 mkadem, a., dehmani, m. e., & ahed, b. m. (2021). Entrepreneurial Intention and Incentives to Create a New Business: A Case Study of a Sample of Enterprises in Sidi Bel Abbes City. *Powdex Notebooks Magazine , 10* (01), pp. 267-291 (Written in Arabic).

10 Nouar, N., & Sofi, A. (2024). The professional quality of life of the Algerian worker in the light of the changing experience and professional rank – field study of the Public Institution METAL Tlemcen. *rawaiz , 08* (01), pp. 122-143 (Written in Arabic).

11 Park, A. L., Velez, C. V., Kannan, K., & Chorpita, B. F. (2020). Stress, functioning, and coping during the COVID-19 pandemic:Results from an online convenience sample. *Behavior Therapy Journal , 42* (6), 210-216.

12 Razali, N. M., Shamsuddin, N. R., Azid, N., Hadi, A. A., & Ismail, A. (2012). A comparison of normality tests using SPSS, SAS and MINITAB: An application to health related quality of life data. *Internationa Conference: Statistics in Science, Business, and Engineering (ICSSBE), 2012.*

13 Robert, A. P., & Dwight, R. M. (2014). Convenience samples of college students and research reproducibility. *Journal of Business Research* , pp. 1035–1041.

14 Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research methods for business students* (6th Edition ed.). Harlow: Pearson Ltd.

15 Zahediasl, S., & Ghasemi, A. (International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism). Normality Tests for Statistical Analysis: A Guide for Non-Statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism , 10* (02), 486-489.

16 Zulfiqar, A., & S Bala, B. (2016). Basic statistical tools in research and data analysis. *Indian Journal of Anaesthesia , 60* (9), 662-669.