ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 6 (June 2026)

Organizational Governance and Operational Efficiency in Construction Service Management

Lynie O. Panganiban[1*] and Glenda G. Mina[1,2]
[1]*Northeastern College*
[*]*lynie.omnes1976@gmail.com*, [2]*minaglenda@yahoo.com*

Date Submitted:
April 27, 2026

Date Accepted:
May 19, 2026

Date Published:
June 14, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.20685304

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the role of organizational governance in strengthening operational efficiency in construction service management. It focused on how leadership direction, accountability, decision-making, internal control, transparency, compliance, and communication were associated with resource utilization, workflow coordination, timeliness, documentation accuracy, service responsiveness, quality control, and problem resolution. A predictive-correlational explanatory design was employed among personnel directly involved in construction service operations. Data were gathered using a validated researcher-made questionnaire, which underwent expert review, pilot testing, and reliability testing. The instrument obtained excellent internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.91 for organizational governance, 0.93 for operational efficiency, and 0.94 for the overall scale. Descriptive statistics, Spearman's rho, ordinal logistic regression, and dominance analysis were used to analyze the data. Results showed that organizational governance was rated high overall, with leadership direction as the strongest dimension and internal control as the weakest. Operational efficiency was also rated high, although resource utilization and timeliness emerged as areas needing improvement. A strong positive and significant relationship was found between organizational governance and operational efficiency. Regression results further revealed that governance significantly predicted higher levels of operational efficiency, with internal control, leadership direction, communication, accountability, and compliance serving as meaningful predictors. Dominance analysis identified internal control as the strongest contributor to operational efficiency. The findings indicate that construction firms may improve service performance by strengthening monitoring systems, documentation practices, resource control, and site-level accountability.

Keywords: *accountability, construction service management, internal control, operational efficiency, organizational governance, resource utilization*

INTRODUCTION

Construction service management has become increasingly important as construction firms are expected to deliver projects that are timely, cost-conscious, safe, compliant, and responsive to client expectations. Unlike ordinary service operations, construction work involves shifting project sites, changing labor and material requirements, strict technical standards, procurement demands, safety risks, and constant coordination among owners, contractors, suppliers, workers, and regulatory bodies. These conditions make construction firms highly dependent on sound organizational governance. Governance provides the direction, control, accountability, and decision-making discipline needed to guide people, resources, and work processes toward the intended project results. In the broader field of organizational management, governance is understood as the system by which

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 6 (June 2026)

organizations are directed, overseen, and held responsible for fulfilling their purpose and obligations to stakeholders (International Organization for Standardization [ISO], 2021). In construction firms, this becomes especially relevant because every decision on manpower deployment, purchasing, supervision, documentation, safety compliance, and project monitoring can directly affect operational efficiency.

Good governance in construction service management is not limited to ownership decisions or top-level control. It is also reflected in how responsibilities are assigned, how work instructions are communicated, how site operations are supervised, how risks are handled, how records are maintained, and how corrective actions are made when problems occur. The World Bank emphasized that infrastructure and construction-related activities require clear rules, transparent processes, sound procurement, and effective contract management because weaknesses in governance often lead to delays, cost overruns, poor quality, and reduced value from investments (Foster et al., 2021; World Bank, 2020). For private construction firms, the same concern applies at the organizational level. Even when a firm has skilled workers and adequate equipment, poor coordination, weak internal control, unclear authority, or inconsistent monitoring can slow operations and reduce the quality-of-service delivery.

Operational efficiency, on the other hand, refers to the ability of an organization to use its resources wisely while maintaining quality and meeting expected outputs. In construction service management, efficiency is commonly seen in the timely completion of tasks, proper use of materials, effective labor deployment, accurate documentation, cost control, client responsiveness, and compliance with technical and safety requirements. Recent construction performance literature shows that project performance should no longer be measured only through the traditional concerns of time, cost, and quality. It should also consider broader indicators such as productivity, stakeholder satisfaction, safety, sustainability, communication, and process reliability (Ibrahim et al., 2024). This is important because construction firms do not operate only to finish projects. They are also expected to maintain trust, manage resources responsibly, and sustain service quality across different projects.

The relationship between governance and efficiency becomes clearer when construction operations are viewed as a chain of decisions and actions. A project may be delayed not only because of weather or supply issues, but also because of weak planning, unclear accountability, poor contract administration, late reporting, or ineffective monitoring. Studies on project governance suggest that formal mechanisms, such as contracts, procedures, reporting systems, and enforcement, work together with relational elements, such as trust, cooperation, and communication, in shaping project behavior and performance (Han & Yin, 2022). Similarly, contractual governance has been found to influence contractor behavior by encouraging proper performance and limiting opportunistic actions that may harm project outcomes (Luo et al., 2025). These findings point to the practical importance of governance in construction firms, where daily operational decisions can either support efficiency or create avoidable waste.

The Construction Industry Authority of the Philippines serves as the national body that promotes, accelerates, and regulates the construction industry, which shows the sector's recognized role in national development and the need for responsible industry practice (Construction Industry Authority of the Philippines [CIAP], 2026). At the same time, private construction firms face continuing pressures related to material costs, labor availability, equipment utilization, documentation requirements, client demands, project deadlines, and regulatory compliance. These realities make organizational governance a practical concern, not merely an administrative concept. For firms engaged in construction services, governance affects how decisions are made, how work is controlled, how people are supervised, and how resources are protected from misuse or inefficiency.

This study is anchored on the need to understand how governance practices contribute to more efficient construction operations. It recognizes that construction service management depends not only on technical capacity, but also on the quality of leadership, accountability, internal systems, communication, and operational control within the organization. By examining organizational governance and operational efficiency together, the study seeks to provide useful insights for construction firms that aim to improve project delivery, strengthen internal management, and maintain reliable service performance. The study is especially relevant for construction organizations that must balance business sustainability with client satisfaction, workforce coordination, regulatory compliance, and responsible resource management.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 6 (June 2026)

Literature Review

Organizational Governance and Accountability in Construction Firms

Organizational governance in construction service management concerns the way authority, responsibility, decision-making, and accountability are arranged so that projects and daily operations can be directed with discipline. In construction firms, governance is especially important because work is not confined to one office or one repeated process. It moves across project sites, suppliers, workers, clients, permits, budgets, and deadlines. Derakhshan et al. (2019) emphasized that project governance is closely tied to stakeholder roles and relationships, since decisions made at the organizational level influence how external and internal stakeholders are managed at the project level. This means that governance is not only a matter of formal policy, but also a working system that shapes how managers supervise tasks, communicate expectations, monitor progress, and resolve operational concerns.

In the same way, Mohosho et al. (2024) found that governance and governmentality are positively associated with project portfolio success, suggesting that organizations perform better when governance is not merely written in documents but practiced through consistent managerial behavior. For construction firms, this implies that clear authority, transparent reporting, ethical procurement, and defined accountability lines can reduce confusion and help managers act before small operational issues grow into costly delays. Locatelli et al. (2017) also warned that weak governance conditions in project environments can open opportunities for poor decisions, unethical practices, and performance problems. Taken together, these studies show that governance is a practical foundation for construction service management because it strengthens control, responsibility, and trust in project delivery.

Operational Efficiency and Lean Construction Practices

Operational efficiency in construction refers to the capacity of the firm to use labor, materials, equipment, time, and information in a way that produces quality work with minimal waste. This concern is central to construction service management because inefficiency often appears in familiar forms such as idle manpower, late material delivery, rework, unclear work instructions, unnecessary movement of equipment, and delays in decision-making. Lean construction literature provides a useful lens for understanding this issue because it focuses on reducing activities that do not add value while improving workflow, coordination, and client value. Garcés et al. (2025) explained that lean construction supports construction management by improving production systems, reducing delivery time, controlling waste, and strengthening sustainability in project execution. Their review also noted that lean construction becomes more useful when it is linked with systematic planning and intelligent management tools.

For construction service firms, this means that efficiency depends not only on the physical capacity to build, but also on how well the organization plans activities, sequences tasks, controls resources, and prevents repeated errors. Lean practices are therefore connected to governance because efficient operations require managers who can set standards, monitor compliance, and encourage disciplined work habits among teams. In this sense, operational efficiency is not simply about doing work faster. It is about doing work with fewer avoidable losses, better coordination, more reliable output, and stronger control over the resources entrusted to the firm.

Supply Chain Coordination and Stakeholder Collaboration

Construction operations depend heavily on supply chain coordination because every project requires the timely movement of materials, equipment, labor, information, funds, and technical decisions. Unlike industries with stable production lines, construction firms deal with changing project locations, customized outputs, and many independent actors. Wen et al. (2023) described the construction supply chain as a complex network of information flow, logistics, capital flow, services, and stakeholder relationships, and their bibliometric review showed that research in this field has grown rapidly since 2015 because construction performance is strongly affected by integration, trust, communication, technology, and process optimization. This finding is important for construction service management because delays and inefficiencies often come from weak coordination rather than from

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 6 (June 2026)

technical incapacity alone. For example, a project may slow down when suppliers are not properly scheduled, when site personnel do not receive updated instructions, when procurement decisions are delayed, or when clients and contractors do not share the same expectations. Supply chain management therefore becomes part of organizational governance, since management must create procedures that allow reliable coordination among suppliers, subcontractors, engineers, foremen, workers, clients, and administrative personnel. When communication channels are clear and responsibility for procurement, monitoring, and documentation is properly assigned, construction firms can reduce disruptions and improve operational flow. In this respect, supply chain coordination supports operational efficiency by connecting planning decisions with actual field implementation.

Project Performance, Quality Control, and Risk Management

Project performance in construction is commonly judged through time, cost, quality, safety, and stakeholder satisfaction, but these outcomes are strongly shaped by how the organization manages quality control and operational risks. Construction firms face risks that may arise from weather, design changes, procurement delays, labor shortages, safety incidents, equipment breakdowns, documentation errors, and client-related changes. These risks cannot always be removed, but they can be managed through clear procedures, close supervision, timely reporting, and corrective action. Locatelli et al. (2017) showed that project environments with weak controls may become vulnerable to poor governance practices that harm project performance, especially where procurement, contracts, and accountability mechanisms are not properly managed. Derakhshan et al. (2019) also stressed that project governance must account for stakeholders because project success is affected by the roles, relationships, and expectations of people inside and outside the organization.

This is relevant to construction service management because quality problems and operational delays are rarely caused by one factor alone. They often result from the combined effect of unclear responsibility, weak communication, insufficient monitoring, poor documentation, and delayed decisions. Mohosho et al. (2024) further showed that governance contributes to project portfolio success, which supports the view that construction firms handling several projects need stronger systems for tracking performance across different sites. Thus, quality control and risk management should be treated as governance functions, not only technical activities. When a construction firm has clear standards, accurate records, responsible supervision, and timely problem-solving, it becomes more capable of delivering reliable service and protecting its operational efficiency.

METHODS

Research Design

The study used a predictive-correlational explanatory design to examine how organizational governance was associated with operational efficiency in construction service management. This design was selected because the study did not only describe the level of governance and efficiency, but also tested whether governance practices could explain variations in operational efficiency. The design was appropriate because organizational governance was treated as the predictor variable, while operational efficiency was treated as the outcome variable. Unlike a purely descriptive survey, this approach allowed the study to move beyond simple frequency reporting and determine the strength and direction of the relationship between the major variables. It also provided a basis for identifying which governance dimensions had stronger influence on efficient construction service operations. Since the study gathered data at one point in time without manipulating the work environment, the design remained non-experimental and suitable for an organizational setting.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in the construction service management setting of Extreme Builders, located along Santiago-Diffun Road, Purok 4, Patul, Santiago. The locale was appropriate because the organization operated

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 6 (June 2026)

within the construction service sector, where governance practices, work coordination, resource control, project supervision, documentation, compliance, and service delivery were directly connected to daily operations. The construction context provided a meaningful environment for examining how internal governance systems affected operational efficiency. The location also reflected a local construction firm setting where management decisions, manpower deployment, procurement practices, project monitoring, and client-related transactions were part of actual organizational practice.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants of the study were individuals who had direct knowledge of the organization's construction service operations, governance practices, and project-related processes. They included personnel involved in management, supervision, administrative work, technical coordination, procurement, site operations, and other functions connected with construction service delivery. The study used purposive criterion sampling because the participants had to meet specific inclusion conditions. They were selected based on their involvement in construction-related operations, familiarity with organizational procedures, and capacity to provide informed responses on governance and efficiency. This sampling technique was appropriate because the study required respondents who could meaningfully assess actual practices rather than individuals who had no direct exposure to the firm's operational processes.

Research Instrument

The study used a researcher-made structured questionnaire that measured organizational governance and operational efficiency in construction service management. The instrument was divided into two major sections. The first section measured organizational governance in terms of leadership direction, accountability, decision-making, internal control, transparency, compliance, and communication. The second section measured operational efficiency in terms of resource utilization, workflow coordination, timeliness, documentation accuracy, service responsiveness, quality control, and problem resolution. A five-point Likert scale was used to capture the degree of agreement with each statement. To establish content validity, the instrument was reviewed by experts in business management, construction operations, and research methods. Their comments were used to refine unclear statements, remove overlapping items, and align the indicators with the objectives of the study. A pilot test was conducted among construction-related personnel who were not part of the actual study participants but had comparable work exposure. The reliability of the instrument was tested using Cronbach's alpha. The organizational governance scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.91, while the operational efficiency scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.93. The overall reliability coefficient was 0.94, which indicated excellent internal consistency. These results showed that the items were reliable for measuring the intended constructs.

Data Gathering

Before the conduct of the study, permission was secured from the appropriate authority of the organization. After approval was granted, the participants were informed about the purpose of the study, the nature of their participation, and the confidentiality of their responses. The questionnaire was administered either through printed copies or a secured digital form, depending on the availability and convenience of the participants. Clear instructions were provided to avoid confusion in answering the items. The researcher personally coordinated the distribution and retrieval of the instruments to ensure completeness and proper handling of responses. Completed questionnaires were checked for missing entries, inconsistent responses, and usability. Only properly accomplished questionnaires were included in the final data set for analysis.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. Mean and standard deviation were used to describe the level of organizational governance and operational efficiency. Instead of relying only on ordinary correlation, the study applied Spearman's rho to determine the association between the variables because Likert-scale responses were ordinal in nature and the data were not assumed to be normally distributed. To provide

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 6 (June 2026)

a deeper analysis, ordinal logistic regression was used to determine whether organizational governance significantly predicted operational efficiency. This treatment was appropriate because the dependent variable was measured through ordered response categories. It also allowed the study to identify the extent to which governance practices increased the likelihood of higher operational efficiency. In addition, dominance analysis was used to determine which governance dimension contributed the strongest explanatory value to operational efficiency. This provided a more useful interpretation than simply identifying significant predictors because it showed the relative importance of each governance area in explaining efficiency outcomes. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

Ethical Consideration

The study observed ethical standards in the conduct of organizational research. Participation was voluntary, and the participants were informed that they could refuse or withdraw from the study without penalty. Informed consent was secured before the questionnaire was answered. The researcher ensured that no personal profile or identifying information was required in the instrument. The responses were treated with confidentiality and were used only for academic and research purposes. The data were stored securely and were accessed only by the researcher. Results were presented in summarized form so that no individual participant could be identified. The study also avoided any procedure that could disrupt regular work operations or place participants in an uncomfortable position. Honesty, transparency, respect for participants, and responsible handling of information were maintained throughout the research process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. *Level of Organizational Governance in Construction Service Management*

Organizational Governance Dimensions	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Leadership Direction	4.21	0.54	Very High	1
Accountability	4.05	0.61	High	2
Communication	3.98	0.63	High	3
Decision-Making	3.91	0.66	High	4
Transparency	3.83	0.68	High	5
Compliance	3.76	0.71	High	6
Internal Control	3.48	0.79	High	7
Overall Mean	3.89	0.66	High	

The results show that organizational governance in construction service management was generally rated high, with an overall mean of 3.89. This means that the firm had established governance practices that were visible in leadership, accountability, communication, decision-making, transparency, compliance, and internal control. Among the dimensions, leadership direction obtained the highest mean of 4.21, interpreted as very high. This suggests that the organization had a clear managerial direction and that personnel generally understood work priorities, project expectations, and operational targets. Accountability also received a high rating, which indicates that roles and responsibilities were generally observed in the workplace. However, internal control obtained the lowest mean of 3.48. Although still interpreted as high, this result reveals an area that needed closer attention. It suggests that while governance structures were present, some control procedures may not have been consistently applied in monitoring materials, validating reports, checking documentation, and following up corrective actions. This is important in construction service management because weak internal control can result in wastage, delayed detection of errors, and uneven compliance across project activities.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 6 (June 2026)

Table 2. *Level of Operational Efficiency in Construction Service Management*

Operational Efficiency Dimensions	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Service Responsiveness	4.09	0.58	High	1
Quality Control	3.96	0.62	High	2
Problem Resolution	3.88	0.67	High	3
Workflow Coordination	3.81	0.70	High	4
Documentation Accuracy	3.57	0.76	High	5
Timeliness	3.46	0.81	High	6
Resource Utilization	3.39	0.84	Moderate	7
Overall Mean	3.74	0.71	High	

The level of operational efficiency was also rated high, with an overall mean of 3.74. This indicates that the firm was generally able to deliver construction services with acceptable efficiency in terms of responsiveness, quality control, problem resolution, workflow coordination, documentation, timeliness, and resource use. Service responsiveness had the highest mean of 4.09, showing that the organization was able to respond to client needs, site concerns, and operational requests in a timely and professional manner. Quality control also received a high rating, which suggests that construction outputs were generally monitored for compliance with expected standards. However, resource utilization obtained the lowest mean of 3.39 and was interpreted as moderate. This result points to a practical concern in the organization. It suggests that while the firm performed well in many service areas, there were still inefficiencies in the use of materials, equipment, manpower, or project time. Timeliness also received a relatively lower mean of 3.46, which may be connected to delays in procurement, manpower availability, site coordination, weather interruptions, or late documentation. These results show that the organization was efficient overall, but its operational performance could still be strengthened by improving resource tracking, work scheduling, and control over avoidable waste.

Table 3. *Spearman's Rho Correlation Between Organizational Governance and Operational Efficiency*

Variables	Spearman's rho	p-value	Strength of Relationship	Decision
Organizational Governance and Operational Efficiency	0.681	<0.001	Strong Positive Relationship	Significant

The Spearman's rho result shows a strong positive and significant relationship between organizational governance and operational efficiency, rho = 0.681, $p < 0.001$. This means that stronger governance practices were associated with higher operational efficiency in construction service management. The positive direction of the relationship indicates that as governance improved, particularly in terms of leadership, accountability, communication, decision-making, transparency, compliance, and internal control, operational efficiency also tended to improve. This result is meaningful in a construction firm because efficiency does not depend only on technical skills or physical resources. It also depends on how work is directed, monitored, communicated, and controlled. The significant relationship further suggests that governance practices were not separate from daily operations. Instead, they were closely connected with the firm's ability to respond to clients, coordinate workflow, control quality, resolve problems, maintain documentation, and manage resources. The finding also confirms the practical issue shown in the earlier tables. Since internal control and resource utilization obtained the lowest ratings in their respective categories, improving governance controls may also help address inefficiencies in resource use and project timeliness.

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 6 (June 2026)

Table 4. *Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis of Organizational Governance as Predictor of Operational Efficiency*

Predictor	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald χ^2	Odds Ratio	p-value	Interpretation
Leadership Direction	0.512	0.188	7.41	1.67	0.006	Significant Predictor
Accountability	0.436	0.171	6.50	1.55	0.011	Significant Predictor
Decision-Making	0.298	0.165	3.26	1.35	0.071	Not Significant
Internal Control	0.621	0.203	9.36	1.86	0.002	Significant Predictor
Transparency	0.219	0.158	1.92	1.24	0.166	Not Significant
Compliance	0.337	0.161	4.38	1.40	0.036	Significant Predictor
Communication	0.404	0.176	5.27	1.50	0.022	Significant Predictor

Model Fit: $\chi^2 = 48.72$, $p < 0.001$
Pseudo R^2: Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.46$
Test of Parallel Lines: $p = 0.214$

The ordinal logistic regression result indicates that organizational governance significantly predicted operational efficiency, $\chi^2 = 48.72$, $p < 0.001$. The Nagelkerke R^2 value of 0.46 suggests that governance dimensions explained a substantial portion of the variation in operational efficiency. This means that governance practices had a meaningful influence on the likelihood of achieving higher operational efficiency in construction service management. Among the predictors, internal control had the highest odds ratio of 1.86 and was statistically significant. This means that improvements in internal control increased the likelihood of higher operational efficiency by 86 percent, holding other governance dimensions constant. This finding is important because internal control was also the lowest-rated governance dimension in Table 1. The result suggests that internal control was both a weakness and a key area for improvement. Leadership direction, accountability, compliance, and communication were also significant predictors, showing that efficient operations were more likely when workers received clear direction, understood their responsibilities, followed requirements, and communicated effectively. Decision-making and transparency were not significant predictors in the model, although they remained positively related to efficiency. This may mean that they supported operational performance indirectly, but their effect became weaker when stronger variables such as internal control, leadership, and communication were considered together.

Table 5. Dominance Analysis of Organizational Governance Dimensions on Operational Efficiency

Governance Dimension	General Dominance Weight	Relative Contribution	Rank
Internal Control	0.128	27.83%	1
Leadership Direction	0.097	21.09%	2
Communication	0.074	16.09%	3
Accountability	0.068	14.78%	4
Compliance	0.052	11.30%	5
Decision-Making	0.024	5.22%	6
Transparency	0.017	3.69%	7
Total Explained Contribution	0.460	100.00%	

The dominance analysis further clarifies which governance dimensions contributed most to operational efficiency. Internal control had the highest relative contribution at 27.83 percent, followed by leadership direction at 21.09 percent and communication at 16.09 percent. These results show that operational efficiency was most strongly supported by the organization's ability to monitor work, check compliance, verify records, control resources, and correct issues before they affected project delivery. Leadership direction also played a major role because construction workers, supervisors, and administrative personnel needed clear instructions and priorities to

ISSN: 3116-3475
International Journal
of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives
Volume 2 Issue 6 (June 2026)

avoid confusion in the field. Communication ranked third, which shows the importance of timely coordination among management, site personnel, suppliers, and clients. Accountability and compliance also contributed to efficiency, although to a slightly lesser extent. Decision-making and transparency had smaller contributions, which may indicate that these practices were present but not yet strongly translated into measurable operational outcomes. Overall, the dominance analysis shows that the most useful improvement area for the firm was not simply to introduce more policies, but to strengthen the actual control and communication systems that guide daily construction operations.

Table 6. *Summary of Major Findings*

Targeted Result	Main Finding	Implication
Level of Organizational Governance	High overall, with leadership direction as the strongest dimension and internal control as the weakest dimension	Governance was generally established, but monitoring and control procedures needed strengthening
Level of Operational Efficiency	High overall, with service responsiveness as the strongest dimension and resource utilization as the weakest dimension	The firm delivered services effectively, but resource use and timeliness remained areas of concern
Relationship Between Variables	Organizational governance had a strong positive and significant relationship with operational efficiency	Better governance was associated with better operational performance
Predictive Effect	Governance significantly predicted operational efficiency	Governance practices helped explain variations in efficiency outcomes
Strongest Governance Contributor	Internal control had the highest contribution based on dominance analysis	Improving internal control may produce the most practical gain in operational efficiency

The overall results reveal that the organization had a generally strong governance and efficiency profile, but not without operational concerns. The firm appeared to perform well in leadership direction, responsiveness, quality control, and problem resolution. However, the lower ratings in internal control, resource utilization, and timeliness suggest that efficiency problems may still occur in the day-to-day management of materials, equipment, manpower schedules, documentation, and follow-through actions. The correlation, regression, and dominance analysis results all point to one clear direction: organizational governance was a significant driver of operational efficiency. More specifically, internal control emerged as the most important governance dimension because it directly affected how resources were checked, how errors were prevented, how reports were validated, and how operations were kept on track. The best result of the study was the strong evidence that governance was not merely administrative in nature. It had a measurable connection with operational performance. However, the results also show that the organization needed to improve the consistency of its control systems so that efficiency would not depend only on leadership effort or personal supervision, but on reliable procedures that could be followed across different construction activities and project sites.

CONCLUSION

Organizational governance played a significant role in improving operational efficiency in construction service management, as shown by the high level of governance practices, the high level of operational efficiency, and the strong positive relationship between the two variables. The results further indicated that while the organization demonstrated clear leadership direction, accountability, communication, service responsiveness, and quality control, some operational concerns remained, particularly in internal control, resource utilization, documentation consistency, and timeliness. Thus, the study recommends that the construction firm strengthen its internal control system by improving material monitoring, equipment tracking, site documentation, work progress

reporting, and regular compliance checking. Management should also institutionalize clearer workflow procedures, assign accountable personnel for resource control, conduct periodic operational audits, and use simple but reliable digital tools for inventory, scheduling, procurement, and project monitoring. Supervisors and site personnel should be given regular orientation on documentation, safety compliance, quality standards, and reporting protocols to ensure that governance practices are consistently applied in daily operations. Overall, construction service management may become more efficient when governance is not treated only as an administrative function, but as a practical operating system that guides decisions, controls resources, strengthens accountability, and supports timely and quality project completion.

References

Construction Industry Authority of the Philippines. (n.d.). *Construction Industry Authority of the Philippines*. Department of Trade and Industry. https://construction.gov.ph/

Derakhshan, R., Turner, R., & Mancini, M. (2019). Project governance and stakeholders: A literature review. *International Journal of Project Management, 37*(1), 98–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2018.10.007

Foster, V., Hawkesworth, I., Harris, C., Brumby, J., Sobjak, A., Tejada Ibanez, M., Rana, A., & Bilous, A. (2021). *Infrastructure Governance Assessment Framework December 2020*. World Bank. https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/96550c14d62154355b6edc367d4d7f33-0080012021/infrastructure-governance-assessment-framework-december-2020

Garcés, G., Forcael, E., Osorio, C., Castañeda, K., & Sánchez, O. (2025). Systematic review of Lean Construction: An approach to sustainability and efficiency in construction management. *Journal of Infrastructure Preservation and Resilience, 6*(1), Article 6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43065-025-00119-1

Han, W., & Yin, Y. (2022). Influence of project governance on opportunistic behavior: Taking a dynamic perspective. *Buildings, 12*(10), Article 1659. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12101659

Ibrahim, A., Zayed, T., & Lafhaj, Z. (2024). Enhancing construction performance: A critical review of performance measurement practices at the project level. *Buildings, 14*(7), Article 1988. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14071988

International Organization for Standardization. (2021). *ISO 37000:2021 Governance of organizations: Guidance*. International Organization for Standardization. https://www.iso.org/standard/65036.html

Locatelli, G., Mariani, G., Sainati, T., & Greco, M. (2017). Corruption in public projects and megaprojects: There is an elephant in the room! *International Journal of Project Management, 35*(3), 252–268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.09.010

Luo, Y., & Chen, Y. (2025). How does contractual governance affect construction project performance? The mediating role of the contractor's behavior. *Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering, 24*(5). https://doi.org/10.1080/13467581.2024.2396606

Mohosho, J. S., Nyandongo, K. M., & Dube, S. (2024). The effect of governance and governmentality on project portfolio success. *Acta Commercii, 24*(1), Article a1230. https://doi.org/10.4102/ac.v24i1.1230

Wen, S., Tang, H., Ying, F., & Wu, G. (2023). Exploring the global research trends of supply chain management of construction projects based on a bibliometric analysis: Current status and future prospects. *Buildings, 13*(2), Article 373. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13020373

World Bank. (2020). *Benchmarking Infrastructure Development 2020: Assessing regulatory quality to prepare, procure, and manage PPPs and traditional public investment in infrastructure projects*. World Bank. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/369621602050134332