

## **Sustainable Development and Social Responsibility In Territorial Educational Governance of Public Educational Institutions**

**By**

**Violeta Cadenillas Albornoz**

Universidad César Vallejo, Perú

Email: [cadealbo@ucvvirtual.edu.pe](mailto:cadealbo@ucvvirtual.edu.pe)

ORCID 0000-0002-4526-2309

**Carlos Demetrio Álvarez Contreras**

Universidad César Vallejo, Perú

Email: [calvarezco69@ucvvirtual.edu.pe](mailto:calvarezco69@ucvvirtual.edu.pe)

ORCID 0000-0002-2387-4646

**Luis Alberto Santos Álvarez**

Universidad César Vallejo, Perú

Email: [lsantos10@ucvvirtual.edu.pe](mailto:lsantos10@ucvvirtual.edu.pe)

ORCID 0000-0002-0404-4073

**María Victoria Mediano Bazán**

Universidad Privada San Juan Bautista, Perú

Email: [maría.mediano@upsjb.edu.pe](mailto:maría.mediano@upsjb.edu.pe)

ORCID: 0000-0001-9915-4031

**Victor Eduardo Rojas Acevedo**

Universidad Privada San Juan Bautista, Perú

Email: [victore.rojas@upsjb.edu.pe](mailto:victore.rojas@upsjb.edu.pe)

ORCID: 0000-0001-9161-1154

### **Abstract**

An adequate territorial educational governance requires a good level of training in knowledge of sustainable development and social responsibility. Regarding the methodology, the research presented a quantitative approach, of a basic type, hypothetical deductive method and non-experimental design of causal correlational scope. The study population is determined by 261 ratified directors of a Local Educational Management Unit and the sample was 120 directors, selected by means of an intentional non-probabilistic demonstration. The content validity and reliability of Cronbach's Alpha was carried out with a result of 0.961 for the variable training in sustainable development; 0.958 for the social responsibility variable and 0.991 for the territorial educational governance variable. The research concluded that training in sustainable development and university social responsibility significantly affects territorial educational governance with a Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.981; that is, the predictor variables training in sustainable development and university social responsibility presented a 98.1% incidence in the territorial educational governance of public educational institutions.

**Keywords:** sustainable development, social responsibility, governance, territory, education

## Introduction

Territorial educational governance requires that educational communities reflect political and cultural desires and commitments and thus reform learning organizations far beyond the locality and to achieve this requires that educational managers of educational institutions are trained in the knowledge of sustainable development and knowledge of social responsibility. These predictor variables should have been developed throughout their university life or in trainings, inductions to the positions, however the university curricula have not contemplated them and most of them are in the process of considering them; therefore the present study presents relevance for the establishment of variables that are predictors of territorial educational governance.

## Literature Review

### *Problematic Reality*

Currently, in the world, territorial governance in educational institutions is gaining importance, due to the fact that public policy managers, have integrated education into a broader concept of territorial governance (Jahnke, 2019). They have mainly discussed the term territorial governance in the context of European territorial policy in relation to cohesion and convergence policies (Van and Schmitt, 2015). In a broad sense, territorial governance can be defined as the processes of organization and coordination of the various actors in society for the development of territorial capital in a non-destructive way for the purpose of territorial cohesion improvement at various levels (Petersen, 2016). It should be taken into account that a new public management is characterized by centralization, decentralization and disintermediation (Greany, 2020).

Territorial governance problems have been evidenced and governance are the processes through which citizens present the collective resolution of problems and respond to the requirements of society, employs the government as an instrument to perform its tasks (Ferrão, 2013). In this sense, it is necessary to develop or improve the levels of social responsibility, due to the fact that it presents a wide spectrum, thinking that transformative change must be propitiated collectively and in the communities with the purpose of building fair and equitable realities (Bolio and Pinzón, 2019). With good levels of social responsibility, governance can incorporate dynamics of change in society and diminish the palpable restrictions of the state sector; in this way they attend to problems of social economic development and for the case of this study, educational improvement.

The concept of territorial governance has been promoted by the European Commission as a central element of European Regional Policy, it is argued that territorial governance is distinct from but complementary to multilevel governance, as it focuses on mobilizing regional stakeholder groups and integrating knowledge into policy formulation processes. Smart specialization can be considered a territorial governance approach because it promotes bottom-up policy formulation driven by local knowledge. By empowering the subnational level, a territorial governance lens can help mitigate regional disparities and bring regional policymaking closer to citizens. In doing so, territorial governance can help address some of the accountability and legitimacy gaps that have led to growing dissatisfaction with the European project at the regional and local level (Moodie et al., 2021). Thus, a good level of training in sustainable knowledge and social responsibility guarantees territorial educational governance of educational institution managers.

In the Peruvian context, territorial educational governance has been catalogued as a dysfunctional state, the most dysfunctional in Latin America and in most public institutions there is no functioning. The Peruvian system cannot be oblivious to the transformations faced every day to achieve quality standards. One of the main goals of territorial governance should be to improve service to the educational community. The shortcomings of the Peruvian State profoundly affect the existence of the inhabitants, which undermines the sense of prosperity in the population, in public management, the authenticity of legislatures and, therefore, in the framework of popular government and its foundations. Considering the results of the execution inadequacies presented by the state in the lives of citizens and in the administration of the nation's system, is that there is a critical need for modernization in public administration; to ensure that the elements that make up the three degrees of government and act firmly, directing their efforts towards a better overall execution of the approaches and method of dealing with the country in assisting citizens (Bao and Delgado, 2020). As it has been established, there are limitations and disengagements in the current arrangement of public administrations, this issue has a negative impact on the citizen's perception of the performances in governance, governability and Public management of the State in Peru.

In recent times, the government of Peru is seeking inclusive national growth through public administration reforms, including a decentralized government agenda to bring the voice of government to all regions of Peru. It is recognized that the public sector must be more participatory, with transparency, efficient, effective and thus meet the needs of all citizens successfully and meet the challenges required by public educational institutions (OECD, 2016). It is a good practice to seek participation mechanisms considering the educational actors in education, in order to directly address the needs of stakeholders. The territorial approach is of vital importance to guarantee decentralization as well as to create intersectoral and intergovernmental support mechanisms based on the territorial approach, guaranteeing the efficiency and quality of education throughout the national territory.

The educational institutions of regular basic education belonging to a local educational management unit, presents difficulties in the levels of knowledge of sustainable development, since the curricula of the universities did not contemplate the linkage of sustainable development objectives and the educational institutions do not evidence activities of social responsibility of the directors and in that sense the territorial educational governance of the institutions of regular basic education need to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and effectiveness, in addition to quality; having to make a social commitment with the educational actors of the locality (Ríos, 2020).

Therefore, the question of the problem is: What is the incidence of training in sustainable development and social responsibility and its impact on the territorial educational governance of public educational institutions?

### ***Desarrollo sostenible***

La variable independiente desarrollo sostenible responde a una vinculación ética, buscando la participación de la comunidad, considerando dinámicas sociales y culturales que se imponen a los sujetos por la configuración profesional, colectiva y considerando empatía, tolerancia, aspectos que consideran colaboración y responsabilidad para la formación ciudadana (Martínez y Juárez, 2019). En ese sentido, Torres (2020) estableció que el desarrollo de la gobernanza territorial y gobernabilidad comprometen al logro de los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible.

### ***Dimensions of sustainable development***

In the dimensions of sustainable development, the appropriation of knowledge is established, which consists of the acquisition of knowledge on environmental issues, benefits, contributions and actions that guarantee sustainability. The university relationship dimension consists of the links developed in the university period, in which it should have knowledge about sustainability processes that develop and guarantee a good level of sustainable development. The university education dimension consists of the sustainability topics that should be included in the curricula of universities and that teachers promote throughout the university career. The socioeconomic impact dimension, consists of the link or alliances that are established with organizations for the realization of sustainable projects in an economic, social and environmental way (Martínez and Juárez, 2019).

### ***Social responsibility***

The topic of social responsibility is supported by Bolio and Pinzón (2019) established that social responsibility presents a broad spectrum, thinking that transformative change should be propitiated collectively and in communities with the purpose of building fair and equitable realities. Social responsibility lays its theoretical foundations on social change and leadership development, so they establish that it is developed individually, considering self-awareness, congruencies and commitments, it is developed in groups, considering collaboration, common purposes, in controversies with civility and it is developed in communities, with the development of citizenship and change (Konives, 2017).

### ***Dimensions of social responsibility***

Regarding the dimensions of social responsibility, the dimension of conscience is established, which consists of the aspects related to one's own person and that can be put at the service of others, being able to recognize talents, interests and aspirations, values, as well as limitations and thus contribute to the construction of a more just society. The commitment dimension consists of the commitment to social justice and the ability to put oneself at the service of others, requiring responsibility, persistence and compliance with the commitments made. The dimension of controversy with civility consists of acting with civility, being able to understand disagreements and having the capacity for dialogue and collaborative work with the purpose of building a fairer city. The dimension respect for diversity, consists of respect for difference, becoming aware of interculturalism and multiculturalism, in such a way that coexists with diverse cultural groups (Bolio and Pinzón, 2019).

Similarly continues with the citizenship dimension that, consists of living in the condition of citizens, with the ability to observe the management of what others perform for the execution of activities of public affairs and concerned in the community, with project design and participating in the implementation of these projects. The social justice dimension, consists in the formation of citizens who work dynamically considering social justice, being important to understand the challenges of overcoming poverty, inequalities, discrimination and targeting the most vulnerable areas. The change dimension, consists of carrying out all possible activities to generate changes for a fairer world, being open to the possibilities of building a better world for all (Bolio and Pinzón, 2019).

### ***Territorial educational governance***

Regarding the theories related to the variable territorial educational governance of public systems, it is the way in which power is exercised in the management of economic and social resources of a developing institution. Likewise, it is the capacity of the design, formulation and implementation of public policies and the application in the context of education, facilitating them from a conceptual framework as operational and considering a scheme (López et al., 2017).

In a broad sense territorial governance can be defined as the process of organization and coordination of actors to develop territorial capital in a non-destructive way in order to improve territorial cohesion at different levels (Davoudi et al., 2008). Likewise, governance from the decentralized organizations Ugeles, is divided into two areas; those that are directly responsible for their budgets and those that occur in the education sector, which are responsible for ensuring the educational service in educational institutions, that these operate in a timely and uninterrupted manner. It means that, it must be ensured that educational institutions operate with educational materials and teachers from the first day of classes to the last, complying with the number of hours required according to the curriculum and for each of the levels and finally overcome all difficulties, minimize them, recover from natural or social events (Ríos, 2020).

Educational governance in public systems is the way in which power is exercised in the management of economic and social resources of a developing institution. Likewise, it is the capacity of the design, formulation and implementation of public policies and the application in the context of education, facilitating them from a conceptual and operational framework and considering a descriptive scheme of systemic character (López et al., 2017). Likewise, Gerged and Flhedd (2020) indicated that national governance improves the quality of education and the results of educational institutions.

Governance practices in basic and secondary education institutions are recognized with the educational practices that occur on a daily basis. Great efforts were found for the formation of students built on correct relationships between actors in educational institutions (Yépez, 2020). In this regard, Ríos (2020) established on educational governance that, from the Local Educational Management Units are directly responsible for their budgets and those that occur in the education sector, which are responsible for ensuring the educational service in educational institutions, that these operate in a timely and uninterrupted manner. This means ensuring that educational institutions operate with educational materials and teachers from the first day of classes to the last, complying with the number of hours required according to the curriculum and for each level, and finally overcoming all difficulties, minimizing them, and recovering from natural or social events.

### ***Dimensions of territorial educational governance***

Regarding the dimensions of territorial educational governance, the dimension of governance with a holistic and multilevel approach consists of taking into account the relationships and independence between the various systems, individual, institutional and governmental. On the governance dimension with steering capacity, it consists in the provision of a strategic vision in which priorities are very clearly established, granting much relevance in the selection of policy makers and behave with personal implications of the agents responsible for the policies with the educational improvement processes (Lopez et al, 2017).

The governance dimension focused on processes, consists in the realization of an efficient management of resources, exercising correctly the main functions, elaborating an appropriate and quality regulation, likewise it considers the importance to the implementation. The governance dimension based on knowledge, empirical evidence and research, consists of the capacity for flexibility and adaptability, promoting and employing knowledge and research for adequate policy and policy implementations, and the impact of policies should be considered. The governance dimension based on capacity building, consists of the various ways to share with educational actors in relation to educational policies and the implementations involved (Lopez et al, 2017). The governance dimension linked to accountability, is related to the importance given to transparency and establishing accountability mechanisms (López et al, 2017).

### ***Axiology in governmental administration***

The axiology of the phenomenon of sustainable governmental administration consists in the identification of its role and place in the system of value priorities for the development of modern human civilization, as well as the justification of new approaches to international cooperation for the achievement of goals of the global Sustainable Development. It has been formulated a new scientific term and a practical term, separating the direction in the field of science State administration, sustainable governance administration, its subject, peculiarities and modalities of implementation have been determined. Sustainable development governance, public administration propose characteristics of sustainable government administration. Particular attention is paid to the issue of improving participation in the activities of governmental and non-governmental organizations (Lelechenko et al., 2022).

## **Objective of the study**

The research objective: To determine the impact of training in sustainable development and social responsibility on territorial educational governance in public educational institutions.

## **Methodology**

The research paradigm was positivist, from a positivism point of view it represents the thought that affirms that authentic knowledge is scientific knowledge, derived from the contrasting of hypotheses through the modern scientific method, risk is the probability of an adverse event, which brings equally adverse consequences. which raises the possibility of conducting the study within the quantitative approach (Ramos, 2015).

The approach of the present study is quantitative, which makes it possible to collect information through statistical results (Hernández and Mendoza, 2018). The type of study is basic, which considers the theoretical deepening of the variables, in addition to the formulation of hypotheses for the corresponding statistical test and thus contrast the problem to arrive at conclusions (Sánchez and Reyes, 2015).

### ***Research design***

The design of the study was non-experimental, since the variables will not be manipulated and the causal correlational level and establish the cause and effect of the relationship between the variables (Sánchez and Reyes, 2015). As for the method, this consists of the hypothetical deductive method that enables the observation of the problem, the

formulation of the hypotheses, the contrast of the hypotheses to counteract it with reality and finally issue conclusions.

### *Population/Sample*

The study population consisted of 261 ratified managers of a Local Educational Management Unit and the sample selected was 120 managers, selected by means of a non-probabilistic purposive sampling. The instrument of the independent variable training in sustainable development consists of 26 items, the instrument of the social responsibility variable has 40 items and the instrument of territorial educational governance has 60 items that presented content validity and reliability of Cronbach's Alpha with results of 0.961; 0.958 and 0.991 respectively.

## **Results**

### *Descriptive results*

The research presented the following descriptive results:

In Table 1, managers presented 40.8% low training in sustainable development, 30.8% moderate and 28.3% high training. Regarding the appropriation of knowledge of sustainable development, 40.8% of the managers presented low training, 31.7% moderate and 27.5% high training. In relation to sustainable development in university life, 41.7% presented low training, 35.8% moderate training and 22.5% high training. For university education in sustainable development it was found that 39.2% presented low training, 32.5% moderate and 28.3% high training and regarding the training of the socioeconomic impact of sustainable development, 39.2% presented low training, 28.3% moderate and 32.5% high training.

**Table 1.** *Levels of training in sustainable development and dimensions*

Variable/Dimensions	Low training		Moderate training		High training		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Training in sustainable development	49	40.8	37	30.8	34	28.3	120	100
Appropriation of knowledge	49	40.8	38	31.7	33	27.5	120	100
Relationship with university life	50	41.7	43	35.8	27	22.5	120	100
University education	47	39.2	39	32.5	34	28.3	120	100
Socio-economic impact	47	39.2	34	28.3	39	32.5	120	100

In Table 2, the managers presented 41.7% of inadequate university social responsibility, 37.5% were regular and 20.8% were at an adequate level. In the awareness of university social responsibility, 41.7% presented an inadequate level, 32.5% a regular level and 25.8% an adequate level. In terms of commitment to university social responsibility, 39.2% of the managers obtained an inadequate level, 37.5% a regular level and 23.3% an adequate level. In the controversy with civility, the managers obtained a 39.2% inadequate level, 36.7% were fair and 24.2% were adequate. For respect for the diversity of university social responsibility, 40% were inadequate, 40.8% were fair and 19.2% were adequate. For citizenship of university social responsibility, 38.3% were inadequate, 38.3% were fair and 23.3% were adequate. In social justice of social responsibility, 41.7% were inadequate, 39.2% were fair and 19.2% were adequate. In the change of university social responsibility, 44.2% were inadequate, 30.8% were fair and 25% were adequate.

**Table 2.** *Levels of university social responsibility and its dimensions*

Variable/Dimensions	Inadequate		Regular		Adequate		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
University social responsibility	50	41.7	45	37.5	25	20.8	120	100
Awareness	50	41.7	39	32.5	31	25.8	120	100
Commitment	47	39.2	45	37.5	28	23.3	120	100
Controversy with civility	47	39.2	44	36.7	29	24.2	120	100
Respect for diversity	48	40.0	49	40.8	23	19.2	120	100
Citizenship	46	38.3	46	38.3	28	23.3	120	100
Social justice	50	41.7	47	39.2	23	19.2	120	100
Change	53	44.2	37	30.8	30	25.0	120	100

In Table 3, 41.7% of the managers presented a low level of territorial educational governance, 35.8% a medium level and 22.5% a high level. In governance with a holistic and multilevel approach, 41.7% presented a low level, 31.7% a medium level and 26.7% a high level. In governance with leadership capacity, 42.5% presented a low level, 30% a medium level and 27.5% a high level. In process-centered governance, 43.3% were low, 30.8% were medium and 25.8% were high. In knowledge-based governance, 41.7% presented a low level, 31.7% a medium level and 26.7% a high level. In governance based on capacity building, 40.8% of managers obtained a low level, 29.2% a medium level and 30% a high level, and in governance linked to accountability, 42.5% of managers obtained a low level, 32.5% a medium level and 25% a high level.

**Table 3.** *Levels of territorial educational governance and dimensions*

Variable/Dimensiones	Low		Medium		High		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Territorial educational governance	50	41.7	43	35.8	27	22.5	120	100
Governance with a holistic and multilevel approach	50	41.7	38	31.7	32	26.7	120	100
Governance with leadership capacity	51	42.5	36	30.0	33	27.5	120	100
Process-centered governance	52	43.3	37	30.8	31	25.8	120	100
Knowledge-based governance	50	41.7	38	31.7	32	26.7	120	100
Governance based on capacity building	49	40.8	35	29.2	36	30.0	120	100
Accountability-based governance	51	42.5	39	32.5	30	25.0	120	100

### **Hypothesis test**

In Table 4 it was found that the model fit presented a Chi square of 240.426 and  $p < 0.001$ , therefore, it is determined that the logistic regression model is adequate for the research carried out. The result of Nagelkerke's Pseudo R<sup>2</sup> is 0.981; it is established that training in sustainable development and university social responsibility have an impact of 98.1% on territorial educational governance, evidencing a high percentage of incidence of these predictor variables for territorial educational governance.



In table 4 it was found that the model adjustment presented a Chi square of 240.426 and  $p < 0.001$ , therefore, it is determined that the logistic regression model is adequate for the research conducted. The result of Nagelkerke's Pseudo R<sup>2</sup> is 0.981; it is established that training in sustainable development and university social responsibility have an impact of 98.1% on territorial educational governance, evidencing a high percentage of incidence of these predictor variables for territorial educational governance.

**Table 4.** *Ajuste del modelo y Pseudo R<sup>2</sup> de la formación en desarrollo sostenible y responsabilidad social universitaria en la gobernanza educativa territorial*

Model	Log likelihood -2	Chi-square	gl	Sig.	Pseudo R squared
Intersection only	240,426				Cox and Snell ,865
Final	,000	240,426	4	,000	Nagelkerke McFadden ,981 ,938

In Table 5 it was found that the deviation obtained a significance of 0.894 and  $p > 0.05$ , being very close to 1; therefore, the data fit the model adequately.

**Table 5.** *Consistency of fit of training in sustainable development and university social responsibility in territorial educational governance.*

Consistency of fit			
	Chi-square	gl	Sig.
Pearson	1,538	6	,957
Desvianza	2,263	6	,894

Función de enlace: Logit.

In Table 6 it was found that the variable university social responsibility with Wald = 13.336 and  $p = 0.000$ , with greater significance and training in sustainable development with Wald = 5.700 and  $p = 0.016$  predict the dependent variable territorial educational governance.

**Table 6.** *Parameter estimates of training in sustainable development and university social responsibility in territorial educational governance.*

Parameter estimates								
		Estimation	Desv. Error	Wald	gl	Sig.	95% confidence interval	
							Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Threshold	[Gob_Ed_Te = 1]	-25,068	809,223	,001	1	,975	-1611,116	1560,979
	[Gob_Ed_Te = 2]	-3,694	1,187	9,688	1	,002	-6,020	-1,368
	[For_Des_Sos=1]	-3,361	7660,444	,000	1	1,000	-	15017,555 15010,832
	[For_Des_Sos=2]	-3,361	1,401	5,760	1	,016	-6,106	-,616
Location	[For_Des_Sos=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Res_soc=1]	-39,574	7626,506	,000	1	,996	-	14987,251 14908,102
	[Res_soc=2]	-4,749	1,300	13,336	1	,000	-7,298	-2,200
	[Res_soc=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

## Discussion

The study found that training in sustainable development and university social responsibility have a significant impact on the territorial educational governance of the directors of public educational institutions, with a Nagelkerke's R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.981; that is, the predictor variables training in sustainable development and university social responsibility had a 98.1% impact on the territorial educational governance of public educational institutions. In the same sense, Torres (2020) found that the development of territorial governance and governance commit to the achievement of sustainable development objectives; that is, sustainable development is related to territorial governance and governance.

In this sense, Gerged and Flhedd (2020) indicated that territorial educational governance improves the quality of education and the results of educational institutions. In this regard, Ríos (2020) established that the Local Educational Management Units are directly responsible for their budgets and those in the education sector, which are responsible for ensuring the educational service in educational institutions, that these operate in a timely and uninterrupted manner. This means ensuring that educational institutions operate with educational materials and teachers from the first day of classes to the last, complying with the required number of hours according to the curriculum and for each level, and finally overcoming all difficulties, minimizing them, and recovering from natural or social events.

To ensure that educational governance is developed at appropriate levels, it is necessary that managers are trained in the knowledge of sustainable development; since sustainable development responds to an ethical linkage, seeking the participation of the community, considering social and cultural dynamics that are imposed on the subjects by the professional, collective configuration and considering empathy, tolerance, aspects that consider collaboration and responsibility for citizen training (Martínez and Juárez, 2019). Necessary characteristics for an adequate execution of territorial educational governance. Considering that, territorial governance is defined as the processes of organization and coordination of the various actors of society for the development of territorial capital in a non-destructive manner in order to improve territorial cohesion at various levels (Petersen, 2016). In that sense, it is required that educational communities reflect political and cultural desires and commitments and thus reform learning organizations far beyond the locality.

Likewise, managers require training in social responsibility, which should have been acquired at the university stage, since social responsibility promotes transformative change collectively and in communities in order to build fair and equitable realities. Social responsibility lays its theoretical foundations in social change and leadership development, so they establish that it is developed individually, considering self-awareness, congruencies and commitments, it is developed in group form, considering collaboration, common purposes, in controversies with civility and it is developed in community form, with the development of citizenship and change (Konives, 2017). Social responsibility guarantees an adequate execution of territorial educational governance.

## Conclusions

Training in sustainable development and university social responsibility have a significant impact on territorial educational governance with a Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.981; that is, the predictor variables training in sustainable development and university social responsibility had a 98.1% impact on the territorial educational governance of public

educational institutions. Therefore, there is a need for training in the knowledge of sustainable development and university social responsibility because they are determinants for an adequate territorial educational governance of the directors of public educational institutions.

## References

- Bao, C. y Delgado, J. (2020). Gobernanza con análisis territorial en Emergencia COVID-19. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*, 4(2), 1-26. [https://doi.org/10.37811/cl\\_rem.v4i2.119](https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rem.v4i2.119) p. 801 (Accessed: December 1, 2022)
- Bolio, V. y Pinzón, L. (2019). Construcción y Validación de un Instrumento para Evaluar las Características de la Responsabilidad Social. *Revista Internacional De Educación Para La Justicia Social*, 8(1). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.15366/riejs2019.8.1.005> (Accessed: December 12, 2022)
- Carney, S. & Klerides, E. (2020). Governance and the Evolving Global Education Order. *European Education* 5(2), 81-86. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10564934.2020.1769308> (Accessed: December 22, 2022)
- Davoudi, S., Evans, N., Governa, F., & Santangelo, M. (2008). Territorial governance in the making: Approaches, methodologies, practices. *Boletín de la A.G.E.*, 46, 33-52. Available at: <https://www.age-geografia.es/ojs/index.php/bage/article/viewFile/677/631> (Accessed: December 16, 2022)
- Ferrão, J. (2013). Governança, governo e ordenamento do território em contextos metropolitanos Rio de Janeiro. Brasil: Editora Consequência. <http://hdl.handle.net/10451/10853> (Accessed: December 1, 2022)
- Flores Ledesma, K. N., Montoya Vargas, A., Vasquez Llamo, C. E., y Cánez Palomino, R. W. (2021). Gestión educativa descentralizada con enfoque territorial. *Revista Venezolana De Gerencia*, 26(5), 65-76. Available at: (Accessed: December 1, 2022)
- Gerged, A. y Elheddad, M. (2020). How Can National Governance affect Education Quality in Western Europe? Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-10-2019-0314> (Accessed: December 1, 2022)
- Greany, T. (2020). Place-based governance and leadership in decentralized school systems: evidence from England. *Journal of Education Policy*, 37(2), 247-268. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2020.1792554> (Accessed: December 1, 2022)
- Hernández, R., & Mendoza, C. P. (2018). Metodología de la Investigación. Las rutas Cuantitativa Cualitativa y Mixta. Universidad Tecnológica Laja Bajío. (Accessed: December 8, 2022)
- Jahnke, H. (2019). Territorial Governance of Schooling and Education in Rural Areas: Case Studies from Northern Germany. *Geographies of Schooling*, 14, 19-33. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-18799-6\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-18799-6_2) (Accessed: December 1, 2022)
- Konives, S. (2017). Leadership for a better world. Understanding the social change model. Available at: [https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/blogs.umb.edu/dist/b/1275/files/2014/11/leadership\\_for\\_a\\_better\\_world-q4hyb1.pdf](https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/blogs.umb.edu/dist/b/1275/files/2014/11/leadership_for_a_better_world-q4hyb1.pdf) (Accessed: December 16, 2022)
- Lelechenko, A., Lebedinska, O., Somin, S., Derun, T. & Ivanisiva, M. (2022). Axiology of the Phenomenon “Sustainable Government Administration” and Interaction of Ukraine with International Organizations in the Field of Environmental Safety. Available at: <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/940/1/012067/pdf> (Accessed: December 16, 2022)
- López, F., García, I. y Expósito, E. (2017). La calidad de la gobernanza del sistema educativo español. Un estudio empírico. Available at:

- <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=6345096> (Accessed: December 16, 2022)
- Martínez, M. y Juárez, L. (2019). Diseño y validación de un instrumento para evaluar la formación en sostenibilidad en estudiantes de educación. *Revista de investigación educativa de la Rediech*, 10(19). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.33010/ierierediech.v10i19.501> (Accessed: December 6, 2022)
- Moodie, J., Wøien, M., Salenius, V. & Kull, M. (2021). Territorial governance and Smart Specialization: empowering the sub-national level in EU regional policy. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 5. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2021.190554> (Accessed: December 12, 2022)
- OCDE. (2016). Estudios de la OCDE sobre Gobernanza Pública. PERÚ. Available at: <https://sgp.pcm.gob.pe/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Estudios-de-la-OCDE-sobre-Gobernanza-P%C3%BAblica.-Per%C3%BA.-Gobernanza-Integrada-para-un-Crecimiento-Inclusivo.pdf> (Accessed: December 22, 2022)
- Petersen, J. (2016). European territorial governance: Method e europäischer Raumentwicklung [European territorial governance: A method for European spatial development]. *Studien zum Völker- und Europarecht*, 137. Hamburg, Germany. Available at: [https://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/21622/1/Petersen\\_Jesko.pdf](https://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/21622/1/Petersen_Jesko.pdf) (Accessed: December 13, 2022)
- Ramos, (2015). Los paradigmas de la investigación científica. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.33539/avpsicol.2015.v23n1.167> (Accessed: December 16, 2022)
- Ríos, A. (2020). Gobernabilidad y gobernanza en las Unidades de Gestión Educativa Local del Perú: una mirada desde el conocimiento de sus funciones. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 83(1), 97-119. Available at: <https://rieoei.org/RIE/article/view/3832> (Accessed: December 12, 2022)
- Sánchez H. y Reyes C. (2015) *Metodología y diseños en la investigación científica*. (5ta ed.). Lima-Perú: Business Support Aneth S.R.L. (Accessed: December 16, 2022)
- Torres, E. (2020). Perspectivas de desarrollo de la gobernanza territorial y gobernabilidad democrática en la región Ayacucho al 2030. Available at: <https://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/handle/20.500.12692/47640> (Accessed: December 16, 2022)
- Van Well, L., & Schmitt, P. (2015). Understanding territorial governance: Conceptual and practical implications. *Europa Regional*, 21(4), 209–221. Available at: <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-457127> (Accessed: December 12, 2022)
- Yépez, L. (2020). Prácticas de gobernabilidad en las instituciones de educación básica y media. Estado y desafíos en el contexto actual. [Tesis Doctoral, Universidad de La Salle, Bogotá]. Available at: [https://ciencia.lasalle.edu.co/doct\\_educacion\\_sociedad/39](https://ciencia.lasalle.edu.co/doct_educacion_sociedad/39) (Accessed: December 13, 2022)