

Demographic Characteristics and the Problems Encountered in the IGP Operation of SUCs in Region VIII

Nelia M. Adora
PhD, Faculty, College of Education
University of Easter Philippines
Cataraman, Northern Samar

Abstract:- Liberating the SUCs from limited resources is a challenge they face; otherwise excellence in the areas of instruction, research, extension, and production will be at stake. As such, they need to establish income generating projects or IGPs. Thus, a descriptive study evaluated the Income Generating Projects (IGPs) of the State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Region VIII. The detailed assessment of the IGPs of the SUCs focused on the profile of the IGP administrators and employees; profile of IGPs of SUCs in Region VIII. Moreover, the amount of revolving fund of the SUCs for its IGPs also differed. From among the many problems encountered, it was on “inadequate funding due to limited ability to access external financing” and “limited internal financial resources due to the deteriorating university financial burden”. Thus, it was recommended that administrators and the entire management of the different SUCs in Region should strengthen the operations of IGPs through giving it as a priority.

Keywords:- IGP, SUCS, Problems, Profile

I. INTRODUCTION

Liberating the SUCs from limited resources is a challenge they face; otherwise excellence in the areas of instruction, research, extension, and production will be at stake. These substantial constraints caused the inception of engaging the SUCs into entrepreneurship. A higher education may engage in any auxiliary enterprise to generate income primarily to finance their educational operations and/or to reduce the need to increase students' fees. Entrepreneurship is the process of creating something different value by devoting the necessary time and effort, assuming the accompanying financial, psychic, and social risk and receiving the resulting rewards of monetary and personal satisfaction (Asor, 2009). The entrepreneurial program through income generating activities of the SUCs can partly resolve the limited infrastructure, facilities and financial resources.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to assess the demographic characteristics and the problems encountered of the income generating projects in the State Universities and Colleges in Region VIII.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

- What is the profile of the IGP administrators and employees in terms of the following:
 - age;
 - sex;
 - civil status;
 - highest educational attainment;
 - position/ designation;
 - number of years in IGP service;
 - number of relevant training attended in the last 3 years; and
 - monthly salary?
- What is the profile of the IGPs of SUCs in region VIII in terms of the following:
 - number of years of existence;
 - number of IGP personnel;
 - number of IGP projects;
 - amount of revolving fund; and
 - annual income?
- What are the problems encountered by the respondents of the IGPs operation of SUCs in Region VIII?

III. METHODOLOGY

The study employed descriptive assessment as method in pursuing the problems posed in the study. The research revolved around the ten (10) SUCs of Region VIII which are located in Samar and Leyte. This study was undertaken during the School Year of 2018-2019. The identified respondents of the study were IGP administrators, employees, and clients of the ten (10) state universities and colleges (SUCs) in Region VIII. There were forty- three (43) administrators, eighty (80) employees, one hundred fifty (150) clients of IGPs products. The total number of

respondents was 273. The study made use of two (2) sets of survey questionnaires which were answered by the respondents. The instrument used in this study was a researcher-made questionnaire. In developing the instrument, various reading materials were resorted to by the researcher in order to come up with a comprehensive set of items in the questionnaire.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

➤ *Profile of the IGP Administrators and Employees*

The profile of the IGP administrators and employees of State Universities in Region VIII was first identified in the study.

Age. Table 1 shows that only 26 (21.10%) belonged to 30 years old and below 31 were in 31 to 40 years old (25.2%), while 38 (30.90%) were 41 to 50 years old, and there were 24 (19.5%) were in 51 to 60 years old, and 4 (3.3%) were 61 years old and above. The mean age was 41.88 with a standard deviation of 11.399 years. The data imply that most IGP administrators and employees were in the age bracket of 41-50 years old which is considered as mature age suitable for their positions. This also implies that the administrators and employees have already acquired sufficient number of years for them to understand the operations of income generating projects and as such, they were deemed credible evaluators of the different aspects of IGP.

Sex. Majority of the respondents were females having 64 or 52 percent of the total respondents and males were only 59 or 48 percent. The data imply that IGP administrators and employees in the SUCs were dominated by female individuals at the time of the conduct of the study. However, since the number were not totally significant in terms of difference, this could also imply that the University, particularly the administration, has regard for gender fairness and offered equal opportunities both for men and women to work in the said office.

Civil Status. Majority of the IGP administrators and employees were married with 80 or 65 percent. The others were single with 39 or 31.71 percent while the rest were widowed, widower or separated. This finding implies that most of the respondents have settled in a married life making them stable and having to raise their own families.

Highest Educational Attainment. Almost half of the administrators and employees graduated only from college with 59 or 47.97 percent while 8 or 6.5 percent have master's units. However, there were 23 or 18.7 percent of the administrators and employees who have graduated from doctorate programs while 17 or 13.82 percent were MA holders. These findings imply that majority of the respondents have not acquired advanced education and

simply contend with the minimum requirements required for them to be hired in the University.

Position/Designation. Of the 43 IGP administrators, 27 or 62.79 percent were designated as managers while the rest were either director (8 or 6.50 percent) or BOM (8 or 6.50 percent). The rest of the respondents were designated as employees in the IGP. Thus, it could be implied that only few were assigned in supervisory or managerial positions and most were assigned as rank and file employees who need to perform the day to day transactions at the office.

Number of Years in IGP-Service. Majority of the respondents (82 or 66.67 percent) have been in their position for a maximum of five years only. Only 24 or 19.51 percent have spent 6 to 10 years in the service while seven or 5.69 have spent 11 to 15 years and 16 to 20 years in the IGP office. Higher number of years of experience have obtained lowest frequencies. This finding implies that most of the employees were still neophytes in the service. As such, despite of their age, they have no extensive knowledge yet on how to operate various income generating projects of the University where they belong.

Number of Relevant Trainings Attended. Majority of the respondents have not attended any relevant trainings for the last three years having obtained a frequency of 64 while only 7 or 5.69 percent have attended six or more relevant trainings. There were, however, 52 or 42.28 percent who have attended 1 to 5 trainings related to IGP. These findings imply that most of the personnel lack the necessary upgrading of their skills and knowledge relating to the operation of income generating projects which could somehow affect, directly or indirectly, on the way the IGP is managed.

Monthly Salary. Almost all of the employees (78 or 97.5 percent) were earning 25,000 below monthly wage while only two or 2.5 percent were earning a monthly income of 25,001 to 50,000. On the part of the administrators, 9 or 20.93 were also earning a maximum salary of 25,000 while 13 or 30.23 percent have 25,001 to 50,000 salary. On the other hand, there were 9 (20.93 percent) administrators were earning 50,001 to 75,000 and 75,001 to 100,000 monthly salary. Only 3 or 6.98 percent have a monthly wage of more than 100,000. These findings imply that almost all employees were only earning minimum wages. This, however, is commensurate to their positions as rank and file employees of the SUC where they belong and considering that majority have not yet earned a considerable number of years in experience and their academic qualifications were only the minimum, then it follows that most have not been promoted yet to a higher level position to warrant increase of salary.

Variables		f	%	f	%	f	%
AGE (in years)	30 and below	25	31.25	1	2.33	26	21.10
	31 – 40	22	27.50	9	20.93	31	25.20
	41 – 50	23	28.75	15	34.88	38	30.90
	51 – 60	10	12.50	14	32.56	24	19.50
	61 and above	0	0.00	4	9.30	4	3.30
TOTALS		80	100.00	43	100.00	123	100.00
Mean Age		38.35 years		48.44 years		41.88 years	
Standard Deviation		10.532 years		10.050 years		11.399 years	
SEX	Male	37	46.30	22	51.16	59	48.00
	Female	43	53.80	21	48.84	64	52.00
TOTALS		80	100.00	43	100.00	123	100.00
CIVIL STATUS	Single	31	38.75	8	18.60	39	31.71
	Married	47	58.75	33	76.74	80	65.04
	Widow/Widower	1	1.25	2	4.65	3	2.44
	Separated	1	1.25	0	0.00	1	0.81
	TOTALS	80	100.00	43	100.00	123	100.00
HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	Bachelor's Degree	55	68.80	4	9.30	59	47.97
	With MA Units	6	7.50	2	4.65	8	6.50
	Master's Degree	7	8.80	10	23.26	17	13.82
	With Doctoral Units	1	1.30	7	16.28	8	6.50
	Doctorate Degree	3	3.80	20	46.51	23	18.70
	Others	8	10.00	0	0.00	8	6.50
	TOTALS	80	100.00	43	100.00	123	100.00
POSITION/DESIGNATION	Employee	80	100.00	0	0.00	80	65.00
	Manager	0	0.00	27	62.79	27	22.00
	Director	0	0.00	8	18.60	8	6.50
	BOM	0	0.00	8	18.60	8	6.50
TOTALS		80	100.00	43	100.00	123	100.00
NUMBER OF YEARS IN IGP SERVICE	5 and below	58	72.50	24	55.81	82	66.67
	6 – 10	11	13.75	13	30.23	24	19.51
	11 – 15	6	7.50	1	2.33	7	5.69
	16 – 20	5	6.25	2	4.65	7	5.66
	21 – 25	0	0.00	2	4.65	2	1.63
	26 and above	0	0.00	1	2.33	1	0.81
TOTALS		80	100.00	43	100.00	123	100.00
Mean Number of Years in IGP Service		4.95 years		6.25 years		5.54 years	
Standard Deviation		4.919 years		6.652 years		5.931 years	
NUMBER OF RELEVANT TRAININGS ATTENDED IN THE LAST 3 YEARS	0	55	68.75	9	20.93	64	52.03
	1 – 5	24	30.00	28	65.12	52	42.28
	6 and above	1	1.25	6	13.95	7	5.69
	TOTALS	80	100.00	43	100.00	123	100.00
Mean Number of Trainings Attended		0.79 trainings		3.30 trainings		1.67 trainings	
Standard Deviation		1.564 trainings		3.284 trainings		2.598 trainings	
MONTHLY SALARY (in pesos)	25,000 and below	78	97.50	9	20.93	87	70.73
	25,001 – 50,000	2	2.50	13	30.23	15	12.20
	50,001 – 75,000	0	0.00	9	20.93	9	7.32
	75,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	9	20.93	9	7.32
	100,001 and above	0	0.00	3	6.98	3	2.44
TOTALS		80	100.00	43	100.00	123	100.00
Mean Monthly Salary		10,312.50 pesos		54,418.60 pesos		25,731.71 pesos	
Standard Deviation		6,147.128 pesos		31,954.954 pesos		28,685.14 pesos	

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage Distribution on the Profile of the IGP Administrators and Employees

➤ Profile of the IGP's of SUCs

Table 2 presents the frequency and percentage distribution on the profile of the IGP's of SUCs in Region VIII. This includes the number of years of existence, number of IGP personnel, number IGP projects, amount of revolving fund and annual income.

Number of years of existence. Out of the seven SUCs involved in this study, one (1) or 14.29 percent has been in operation for nine (9) years while two or 28.57 percent of the SUCs have ten (10) years of its existence. The rest of the SUCs have IGP's for 15, 16, and 19 years in operation. These findings imply that all of the IGP's in the SUCs have been in existence for quite some time already. This is a normal scenario considering that each University needs to augment their source of income from various income generating projects so as to subsidize, if not fund some expenses of the University as well as, provide some benefits of the personnel to be taken from income.

Number of IGP Personnel. Only two (3) or 46.86 percent of the SUCs have 3 personnel. The rest of the SUCs were employing each with 2, 7, 9, and 23 personnel. These

findings imply that each of SUCs in Region VIII employ different number of personnel to operate its IGP depending on the extent of the IGP's operating and the capacity of the University to pay the salaries of the personnel.

Number of IGP Projects. The number of IGP projects differed in each of the SUC in Region VIII. Specifically, three (3) of the SUCs have two (2) IGP projects while others have two (2), four (4) and five (5) projects, respectively. The other SUCs have even 10 and 12 income generating projects. These findings imply that there is no uniform number of projects for each SUC. Each SUC has to create and establish its own income generating project and presumably, the better and more resourceful the management is, the more IGP's are established.

Amount of Revolving Fund. As reflected in the table, the revolving fund also differed in each of the SUCs in Region VIII. Two of the SUCs have five-hundred thousand (500,000) revolving fund, while others have one-hundred thousand (100,000) and two hundred thousand (200,000) revolving funds. However, there were 2 SUCs which have

declared a revolving fund of 1 million. These findings imply that the maximum amount that the administration could allocate for Revolving Fund is only up to 1,000,000 considering also the limited budget of the University. Since most Universities operate only on a meager capital, it follows that IGP management could not also initiate big or higher IGPs that require higher capitalization.

Annual Income. The estimated and average annual income of the SUCs for its IGPs show that only one (1) SUC is earning fourteen million (14,000,000) or 14.29 and two (2) are earning two million (2,000,000). The rest of the

SUCs, are earning seventy-eight thousand (78,000), two-hundred seventy thousand (270,000), five hundred eighty-three thousand (583,000) and seven hundred thousand (700,000). These figures show that each of the SUC concerned have different annual income from its IGPs. It implies that annual income varies depending on the number of IGPs the SUC is operating. It implies that annual income varies depending on the number of IGPs the SUC is operating and the kind of project that the SUC has. However, it can also be gleaned from the table that there were SUCs that earn very minimal incomes while some others were really doing well with their IGPs.

Variables		Frequency	Percentage
NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXISTENCE			
	9	1	14.29
	10	2	28.57
	11	1	14.29
	15	1	14.29
	16	1	14.29
	19	1	14.29
TOTALS		7	100.00
Mean Years of Existence		12.86 years	
Standard Deviation		3.604 years	
NUMBER OF IGP PERSONNEL			
	4	2	28.57
	5	1	14.29
	6	1	14.29
	13	1	14.29
	17	1	14.29
	30	1	14.29
TOTALS		7	100.00
Mean Number of IGP Personnel		11.29 personnel	
Standard Deviation		9.656 personnel	
NUMBER OF IGP PROJECTS			
	2	1	14.29
	3	1	14.29
	4	1	14.29
	5	1	14.29
	10	1	14.29
	12	1	14.29
	30	1	14.29
TOTALS		7	100.00
Mean Number of IGP Projects		9.43 projects	
Standard Deviation		9.798 projects	
AMOUNT OF REVOLVING FUND (in pesos)			
	5,000	1	14.29
	100,000	1	14.29
	500,000	1	14.29
	1,000,000	2	28.57
	2,000,000	1	14.29
	No Answer	1	14.29
TOTALS		7	100.00
Mean Amount of Revolving Fund		767,500.00 pesos	
Standard Deviation		736,334,274 pesos	
ANNUAL INCOME (in pesos)			
	78,000.00	1	14.29
	270,000.00	1	14.29
	583,000.00	1	14.29
	700,000.00	1	14.29
	2,000,000.00	2	28.57
	14,000,000.00	1	14.29
TOTALS		7	100.00
Mean Annual Income		2,804,428.57 pesos	
Standard Deviation		4,997,585.012 pesos	

Table 2: Frequency and Percentage Distribution on the Profile of the IGPs of State Universities and Colleges in Region VIII

➤ *Problems Encountered by the IGPs of SUCs*

Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations on the problems encountered by the IGPs of state universities and Colleges in Region VIII. As indicated in the results, it

was the clients who have perceived higher ratings or higher frequency of these problems to have occurred as compared to the administrators and employees.

Conditions	IGP Employees		IGP Administrators			Clients			Overall			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Frequency	Mean	SD	Frequency	Mean	SD	Frequency	
Inadequate funding due to limited ability to access external financing	3.45	SM	1.211	3.30	SM	1.337	4.45	O	0.773	3.97	O	1.142
Limited internal financial resources due to the deteriorating university financial burden	3.48	SM	1.169	3.00	SM	1.414	4.31	O	0.794	3.86	O	1.150
Inadequate marketing strategies	3.29	SM	1.234	3.12	SM	1.313	4.27	O	0.874	3.80	O	1.184
Limited entrepreneurial culture	3.34	SM	1.282	3.12	SM	1.384	4.24	O	0.841	3.80	O	1.185
Partial strategy implementation and inadequate monitoring and evaluation practices	3.28	SM	1.263	2.93	SM	1.261	4.25	O	0.874	3.75	O	1.198
Conflicting legal framework	3.28	SM	1.302	2.91	SM	1.360	4.18	O	0.935	3.71	O	1.239
Lack of comprehensive human resources policy	3.21	SM	1.299	3.02	SM	1.263	4.07	O	0.997	3.66	O	1.224
Inadequate partnership with industry	3.28	SM	1.283	3.00	SM	1.345	4.11	O	0.994	3.69	O	1.234
Tenuous relationship among key internal stakeholders/clientele	3.28	SM	1.292	2.93	SM	1.334	4.19	O	0.974	3.73	O	1.249
Ineffective organizational processes, systems and infrastructure, including inadequate managerial and financial accounting systems, inadequate information and communication technology (ICT) infrastructure and poor credit management	3.28	SM	1.350	2.86	SM	1.320	4.17	O	1.022	3.70	O	1.288
Unsatisfactory service delivery to internal and external customers	3.20	SM	1.326	2.81	SM	1.314	4.39	O	0.881	3.79	O	1.285
OVERALL	3.45	SM	1.211	3.30	SM	1.337	4.45	O	0.773	3.97	O	1.142

Legends:
 4.51 – 5.00 (A) Always
 3.51 – 4.50 (O) Often
 2.51 – 3.50 (SM) Sometimes
 1.51 – 2.50 (S) Seldom
 1.00 – 1.50 (N) Never

Table 3: Means and Standard Deviations on the Problems Encountered by IGPS of State Universities and Colleges in Region VIII

V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The following were the major findings of the study:

- Findings on the profile of the administrators and employees show that majority of the administrators and employees belonged in the age bracket of 41-50 years old, dominated by female individuals. As regard to the civil status, majority of the IGP administrators and employees were married who graduated from college who were holding positions either as manager, member of the BOM or employees. As to number of years in IGP-Service, majority of the respondents have been in their position for a maximum of five years only. In terms of relevant trainings attended, majority of the respondents did not attend trainings for the last three years and almost all of the employees were earning 25,000 below monthly wage.
- As regards to the profile of the IGPs of SUCs in Region VIII, out of ten SUCs involved in the study, each SUC has its own distinct number of years of IGP operation ranging from 9-16 years while two (2) of the SUCs have 10 years of IGP operations existence. The rest of the SUCs have IGPs for 15, 16, and 19 years in operation. In terms of number of IGP personnel, two (2) or 28.57 percent of the SUCs have three (3) personnel and the rest of the SUCs were employing either 2, 7, 9, 13, and 23 personnel. The number of IGP projects differed in each of the SUC in Region VIII ranging from two to five projects. The other SUCs have even 10 and 12 income generating projects.
- Moreover, the amount of revolving fund of the SUCs for its IGPs, has two (2) SUCs with allocated revolving fund of two million (2,000,000) while others have five

thousand (5,000), one-hundred thousand (100,000), five-hundred thousand (500,000) and one million (1,000,000).

- In addition, the annual income of the SUCs for its IGPs show that only one (1) SUC is earning fourteen million (14,000,000) or 14.29 and two (2) are earning two million (2,000,000). The rest of the SUCs, are earning seventy-eight thousand (78,000), two-hundred seventy thousand (270,000), five hundred eighty-three thousand (583,000) and seven hundred thousand (700,000). These figures show that each of the SUC concerned have different annual income from its IGPs.
- From among the many problems encountered, it was on “inadequate funding due to limited ability to access external financing” and “limited internal financial resources due to the deteriorating university financial burden” that respondents have felt the most having obtained the highest mean ratings while the problem on “lack of comprehensive human resources policy” was felt to be the least. Nevertheless, in terms of occurrence or frequency, all conditions presented were perceived to be oftentimes occurring or felt.

Moreover, here are also conclusions drawn out from the findings of the study:

- Despite of the age of the respondents which were already mature, most of them were still novice in the field of IGP operations.
- Sex and civil status were not major considerations when hiring or identifying an individual to work at the IGP office.
- High or advanced educational qualifications was not really a requirement when working at the IGP for as long

as the employee or personnel has already met the minimum requirements which is bachelor's degree then were already qualified to be in the position.

- Salaries of most of the personnel in the IGP were not really high and dependent upon the academic and/or position of the employees.
- Most of some problems encountered were finance or budget related.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following were the recommendations advanced based on the findings and conclusions:

- The administrators and employees of IGP need to attend trainings related to IGP operations in order to enhance their skills and capabilities as operators of income generating projects.
- Administrators may consider increase the salary of employees above the minimum wage. This would somehow motivate the employees to work hard for the IGP operations.
- The administrators may attend trainings in self-management for them to be able to sense other people's perspective of IGP and understand their views which would consequently lead them to produce a good rapport with the stakeholders of the university.
- The IGP administrators may seek the help of an accountant to enhance the financial accounting system. Provision of technology in the office could provide efficiency in the financial flow.
- The IGP administrators may tap or seek external funding to increase its capitalization. Partnership with industries near the SUC could help boost its fund and increase profitability.
- The IGP administrators may seek the help of an accountant to enhance the financial accounting system. Provision of technology in the office could provide efficiency in the financial flow.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Asor, Winefreda T. (2009). *Entrepreneurship in the Philippine Setting*, Rex Book Store, Manila.
- [2]. Manasan, Rosario G., Ma. Laarni D. Revilla (2015). *Assessment of Sources and Utilization of Funding of State Universities and Colleges*, Philippine Institute for Development Studies, Department of Budget and Management.
- [3]. *Manual of Operations for Income Generating Projects of State Universities and Colleges in Region VIII*, (2001), Tacloban City.
- [4]. Miranda, Asterio, et. al (2016). *The IGPs of a Government Academic Institution in the Philippines. The Case of the University of Eastern Philippines*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 10, No. 1.