International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 9, pp. 459-468, October 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Corporate Governance Practices in Ai-Powered Technologies: A Perspective of Engineering Students

Stephanie Grace V. Cortes

Author Information:
Cebu Institute of Technology University, Cebu City, Philippines

Correspondence:
villarubiasg29@gmail.com

Article History:

Date Received: August 15, 2026
Date Revised: August 25, 2026
Date Accepted: September 16, 2026
Date Published: October 18, 2026

DOI: *https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0424*

Document ID: *2026IJROMS0424*

Recommended Citation:
Cortes, S. G. V. (2026). Corporate Governance Practices in Ai-Powered Technologies: A Perspective of Engineering Students. International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies, 1(9), 459-468. https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0424

Abstract. Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become increasingly integrated into educational, professional, and technological environments, creating opportunities for innovation while raising concerns regarding transparency, accountability, ethical responsibility, privacy, and governance. Despite the growing use of AI-powered technologies among university students, limited research has examined how engineering students perceive corporate governance practices associated with these technologies. This study explored the perceptions of undergraduate engineering students regarding corporate governance in AI-powered technologies. A descriptive quantitative research design employing a cross-sectional survey approach was utilized. Data were collected from ninety-two (92) undergraduate engineering students at Cebu Institute of Technology–University (CIT-University) using a structured questionnaire. Frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and ranking procedures were used to analyze the data. The findings revealed that respondents demonstrated positive awareness of corporate governance principles in AI systems, particularly regarding ethical responsibility, accountability, transparency, and data governance. The respondents also expressed a generally favorable level of trust in organizations utilizing AI-powered technologies, although concerns regarding privacy protection, data security, and responsible AI implementation remained evident. Among the governance dimensions examined, accountability received the highest rating, followed by ethical governance and transparency. Furthermore, the results showed that engineering students generally practiced responsible AI use, particularly in avoiding technologies that violate ethical and privacy standards. Large Language Models (LLMs), such as Gemini, ChatGPT, and Claude, were identified as the most commonly used AI-powered technologies among the respondents. The study concludes that engineering students recognize the importance of responsible AI governance and view accountability, ethical responsibility, and transparency as essential components of trustworthy AI systems. These findings may contribute to the development of governance policies, educational initiatives, and responsible AI practices within academic and technological environments.

Keywords: AI Ethics; Artificial Intelligence Governance; Corporate AI Responsibility; Engineering Education; Student Perceptions

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a transformative force across various sectors, including education, engineering, business, healthcare, and governance. The rapid development of AI-powered technologies, particularly Generative Artificial Intelligence (Generative AI) and Large Language Models (LLMs), has significantly altered how individuals access information, solve problems, conduct research, and make decisions. Tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, and other AI applications have become increasingly accessible to students and professionals, creating new opportunities for learning, innovation, and productivity.

As the use of AI technologies continues to expand, concerns regarding corporate governance, accountability, transparency, fairness, privacy, and ethical responsibility have emerged. Corporate governance in AI refers to the policies, frameworks, and mechanisms that ensure AI systems are developed, deployed, and managed responsibly. Effective AI governance promotes transparency, protects user privacy, reduces the risks of algorithmic bias, and ensures that organizations remain accountable for decisions influenced by AI systems.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 9, pp. 459-468, October 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

These governance principles are essential in maintaining public trust and supporting the responsible use of emerging technologies.

International organizations such as UNESCO and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) have emphasized the importance of ethical and responsible AI governance. Their frameworks advocate transparency, human oversight, accountability, data protection, fairness, and inclusivity in the design and implementation of AI systems. As AI technologies become increasingly integrated into educational environments, students must not only understand their technical applications but also appreciate the ethical and governance issues associated with their use.

Engineering students represent a particularly important group in discussions of AI governance because many of them will become future developers, implementers, and decision-makers involved in AI-related technologies. Their perceptions and understanding of governance principles may influence how AI systems are designed, evaluated, and managed in the future. As future engineering professionals, their views on accountability, privacy, transparency, and ethical responsibility can contribute to the development of more responsible and trustworthy AI technologies.

Despite the growing body of literature on artificial intelligence, most existing studies focus on AI adoption, technological performance, user acceptance, and ethical concerns. Relatively few studies have examined how engineering students perceive corporate governance issues associated with AI-powered technologies. Moreover, limited local research has explored these perspectives within higher education institutions in the Philippine context. This gap highlights the need to better understand how future engineering professionals view governance-related issues surrounding AI systems.

This study examines the perceptions of undergraduate engineering students at CIT-University regarding corporate governance in AI-powered technologies. Specifically, it explores their views on transparency, accountability, ethical responsibility, privacy protection, and governance mechanisms related to AI systems. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the growing body of knowledge on AI governance and provide insights that may support policymakers, educators, technology developers, and organizations in promoting the responsible and ethical use of artificial intelligence.

Research Questions

This study aims to examine students' perceptions of corporate governance practices in AI-powered technologies.

Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
   1.1 age;
   1.2 sex;
   1.3 year level;
   1.4 course/program;
   1.5 frequency of AI-powered technology usage; and
   1.6 commonly used AI-powered technology?
2. What is the level of students' awareness and understanding of corporate governance practices in AI-powered technologies?
3. What is the level of students' trust in organizations and institutions that implement AI-powered technologies?
4. How do students perceive corporate governance practices in AI-powered technologies in terms of:
   4.1 transparency;
   4.2 accountability; and
   4.3 ethical governance?
5. What are the behavioral practices and attitudes of students toward the responsible and secure use of AI-powered technologies?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study focuses on the perceptions of 92 engineering students of Cebu Institute of Technology-University regarding corporate governance practices in AI-powered technologies. It examines their perceptions in terms of awareness, trust, transparency, accountability, ethical governance, and responsible AI use. Data were collected through a structured online questionnaire administered via Microsoft Forms. The study is limited to undergraduate engineering students of CIT-University who voluntarily participated in the survey. The findings reflect the respondents' perceptions and do not evaluate the actual corporate governance policies or technical performance of specific AI technologies. This study focused on examining the perceptions of undergraduate engineering students at Cebu Institute of Technology-University (CIT-University) regarding corporate governance practices in AI-powered technologies. Specifically, the study examined students'

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 9, pp. 459-468, October 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

awareness of corporate governance principles, level of trust in organizations using AI-powered technologies, perceptions of corporate governance dimensions such as transparency, accountability, and ethical governance, as well as their behavioral practices toward the responsible and secure use of Artificial Intelligence technologies. The respondents consisted of ninety-two (92) undergraduate engineering students from various engineering programs at CIT-University. The study was limited to the perceptions and experiences of these respondents during the period of data collection. Consequently, the findings may not be generalized to students from other academic disciplines, institutions, or regions.

Literature Review

The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has intensified discussions concerning corporate governance, accountability, transparency, ethical responsibility, and regulatory oversight. Corporate AI governance refers to the policies, structures, and organizational mechanisms established to ensure that AI systems are developed, deployed, and monitored responsibly. Effective governance frameworks help organizations manage ethical risks, promote transparency, protect stakeholder interests, and ensure compliance with legal and regulatory requirements.

Stakeholder Theory, proposed by Freeman (1984), provides an important foundation for AI governance by arguing that organizations have responsibilities not only to shareholders but also to individuals and groups affected by organizational decisions. In the context of AI, these stakeholders include users, employees, regulators, customers, and society as a whole. Organizations are therefore expected to establish governance mechanisms that promote fairness, transparency, and accountability in the development and use of AI-powered technologies.

Similarly, Agency Theory explains the relationship between principals and agents and highlights the need for governance structures to minimize conflicts of interest and ensure responsible decision-making (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). In AI governance, such mechanisms help ensure that organizations deploy AI technologies in ways that align with stakeholder expectations and ethical standards.

International organizations have emphasized the importance of responsible AI governance. The UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) advocates principles such as transparency, accountability, fairness, human rights protection, and human oversight. Likewise, the OECD AI Principles (2019) promote trustworthy AI through robustness, transparency, accountability, and responsible innovation. Together, these frameworks provide globally recognized guidance for organizations seeking to develop and implement AI technologies responsibly.

Floridi and Cowls (2019) further proposed that responsible AI governance should be grounded in the principles of beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice, and explicability. These principles emphasize that organizations must ensure AI systems are beneficial, equitable, understandable, and ethically aligned with societal values.

The findings of Jobin et al. (2019) are highly relevant to the present study because they highlight governance dimensions such as accountability, transparency, ethical responsibility, and trustworthiness, which are likewise examined from the perspective of engineering students.

Generative AI, Transparency, and Trust

The emergence of Generative AI and Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude has transformed how users interact with AI systems. These technologies are capable of generating text, analyzing information, solving complex problems, and supporting decision-making processes. However, their widespread adoption has also raised concerns regarding transparency, explainability, misinformation, bias, and accountability.

Trust Theory suggests that individuals are more likely to accept and use technology when they perceive organizations as competent, honest, and ethical (Mayer et al., 1995). In the case of Generative AI, trust is heavily influenced by perceptions of transparency, explainability, and responsible governance practices.

Arrieta et al. (2020) conducted a comprehensive review of Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) and emphasized that transparency and explainability are essential components of responsible AI systems. The study concluded that users are more likely to trust AI technologies when the reasoning behind AI-generated outputs can be understood and evaluated. The authors further argued that explainability enhances accountability, reduces algorithmic bias, and improves compliance with ethical and regulatory requirements.

Supporting this perspective, Accountability Theory asserts that organizations must be capable of explaining and justifying their actions and decisions to stakeholders (Bovens, 2007). As Generative AI systems become increasingly integrated into academic and professional environments, organizations developing these

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 9, pp. 459-468, October 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

technologies are expected to provide greater transparency regarding how data are collected, processed, and utilized.

Information Asymmetry Theory also provides insight into AI governance concerns by explaining how unequal access to information may create trust issues between organizations and users (Akerlof, 1970). Since many AI systems operate through complex algorithms that are not fully visible to users, concerns regarding transparency and accountability remain an important governance challenge.

The growing use of Generative AI among students highlights the increasing importance of governance frameworks that foster trust, explainability, and responsible innovation.

The Privacy Paradox in Student Populations

The growing adoption of AI-powered technologies has intensified concerns regarding privacy, data security, and information governance. Information Privacy Theory emphasizes individuals' rights to control how their personal information is collected, processed, stored, and disclosed.

Despite increasing awareness of privacy risks, many individuals continue to use technologies that require substantial access to personal information. This phenomenon is commonly referred to as the privacy paradox. Students often express concerns regarding privacy and data security while simultaneously relying on AI-powered tools for learning, research, communication, and problem-solving.

As AI technologies become more integrated into educational environments, concerns regarding data collection practices, surveillance, profiling, and unauthorized information use become increasingly relevant. These concerns are particularly important in the context of Generative AI, where user interactions may be stored, analyzed, and used to improve system performance.

Corporate governance frameworks play a critical role in addressing these concerns through the implementation of transparent data management practices, privacy safeguards, and responsible information governance policies. Effective governance mechanisms help organizations maintain user trust while ensuring compliance with ethical and legal obligations related to personal data protection.

Technology Adoption and Student Perceptions

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) proposed by Davis (1989) suggests that technology adoption is influenced by perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. Similarly, the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) explains technology acceptance through factors such as performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions (Venkatesh et al., 2003).

These theories are particularly relevant to engineering students who frequently interact with emerging technologies. Students are more likely to adopt AI-powered tools when they perceive them as useful, efficient, and capable of improving academic performance. However, adoption decisions may also be influenced by perceptions of ethical responsibility, transparency, accountability, and privacy protection.

Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (1986) further suggests that individual behavior is shaped by personal beliefs, environmental influences, and observational learning. Likewise, the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) explains that behavioral intentions are influenced by attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control.

Socio-Technical Systems Theory (Trist, 1981) emphasizes that organizational and technological performance depends on the effective interaction between technology and human users. Within educational settings, students' perceptions of AI governance may therefore influence both their technology adoption behaviors and their trust in AI-powered systems.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive quantitative research design using a cross-sectional survey approach to examine engineering students' perceptions of corporate governance in AI-powered technologies. The descriptive design was considered appropriate because it enabled the researcher to systematically gather, analyze, and interpret respondents' perceptions regarding transparency, accountability, ethical responsibility, privacy protection, and trust in artificial intelligence technologies. The study utilized a structured questionnaire to collect data from undergraduate engineering students of CIT-University. Quantitative analysis was conducted using frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and ranking procedures to describe respondents' perceptions and AI usage patterns.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 9, pp. 459-468, October 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Research Participants

The respondents of the study consisted of ninety-two (92) undergraduate engineering students of CIT-University. Participants were enrolled in various engineering programs, with the majority coming from the Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering (BSCpE) program. The study employed convenience sampling, wherein respondents who met the study criteria and were willing to participate were included in the survey. The respondents were selected because they were active users of AI-powered technologies and were considered capable of providing informed perspectives regarding corporate governance issues in artificial intelligence. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**.** The respondents were required to: Be currently enrolled as undergraduate engineering students at CIT-University; Have experience using AI-powered technologies; be willing to participate voluntarily in the study. Sampling Limitations, the use of convenience sampling presents limitations regarding the generalizability of the findings. Since participation was limited to ninety-two undergraduate engineering students from a single institution, the results may not fully represent the perceptions of all university students. Furthermore, a substantial proportion of respondents came from the Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering program. Consequently, the findings may reflect the perspectives of students with relatively greater exposure to digital technologies and artificial intelligence compared to students from other academic disciplines. Future studies may consider larger and more diverse samples using probability sampling methods to enhance representativeness and external validity.

Research Instrument

The research instrument consisted of three parts. Part I, gathered the demographic profile of the respondents, including age, sex, year level, engineering program, frequency of AI use, and commonly used AI-powered technologies. Part II contained statements measuring students' awareness of corporate governance in AI systems, trust in organizations using AI-powered technologies, perceptions of corporate governance dimensions (transparency, accountability, and ethical governance), and behavioral practices toward responsible AI use. Part III consisted of an open-ended question that allowed respondents to provide additional comments and recommendations regarding corporate governance in AI-powered technologies. Prior to the administration of the questionnaire, the instrument was subjected to content validation by subject-matter experts to ensure the relevance, clarity, and appropriateness of the survey items. The comments and recommendations provided by the validators were incorporated into the final version of the instrument. However, pilot testing and reliability testing through Cronbach's alpha were not conducted prior to the administration of the study. Consequently, no reliability coefficient is reported. This limitation should be considered when interpreting the findings of the study.

Data Gathering Procedure

The conduct of the study followed three phases: pre-data gathering, actual data gathering, and post-data gathering. Pre-Data Gathering Phase. The researcher conducted an extensive review of related literature and studies to establish the theoretical and conceptual foundations of the research. The survey instrument was then developed and subjected to content validation by subject-matter experts. Prior to data collection, the researcher conducted the study within the College of Engineering and Architecture of Cebu Institute of Technology-University (CIT-University), where academic research among undergraduate students was encouraged. The questionnaire was administered to eligible undergraduate engineering students as part of the study's data collection process. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was secured, and confidentiality of responses was maintained throughout the study. Actual Data Gathering Phase. Upon approval, the researcher administered the survey questionnaire to eligible respondents. Participants were informed of the objectives of the study and the voluntary nature of their participation. The questionnaires were distributed and collected within the scheduled data collection period. Respondents were given adequate time to complete the instrument to ensure thoughtful and accurate responses. Post-Data Gathering Phase. Completed questionnaires were collected, reviewed, encoded, and organized for analysis. Responses were tabulated and subjected to appropriate statistical procedures. Findings were interpreted based on the objectives of the study and served as the basis for conclusions and recommendations.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age; sex; year level; course/program; frequency of AI-powered technology usage; and commonly used AI-powered technology?

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 9, pp. 459-468, October 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents (N = 92)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1. Age	18 years old	15	16.3
	19 years old	27	29.3
	20 years old	27	29.3
	21 years old	16	17.4
	22 years old	5	5.4
	23 years old	1	1.1
	24 years old	1	1.1
2. Sex	Male	73	79.3
	Female	19	20.7
3. Year Level	First Year	40	43.5
	Second Year	35	38.0
	Third Year	17	18.5
4. Program Enrolled	BSCpE	52	56.5
	BSCE	24	26.1
	BSEE	9	9.8
	BSME	6	6.5
	BSECE	1	1.1

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents. The majority of the respondents were 19 and 20 years old, each comprising 29.3% of the sample, followed by those aged 21 years (17.4%) and 18 years (16.3%). Respondents aged 22 years accounted for 5.4%, while those aged 23 and 24 years each represented 1.1% of the sample. These findings indicate that most respondents were within the typical age range of undergraduate engineering students.

In terms of sex, the majority of the respondents were male (79.3%), while female respondents accounted for 20.7%. This distribution reflects the traditionally higher enrollment of male students in engineering programs.

With respect to year level, first-year students constituted the largest group (43.5%), followed by second-year students (38.0%), while third-year students comprised 18.5% of the respondents. This suggests that the study primarily reflects the perspectives of students in the early stages of their engineering education.

Regarding program enrollment, more than half of the respondents were enrolled in the Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering (56.5%), followed by Civil Engineering (26.1%), Electrical Engineering (9.8%), Mechanical Engineering (6.5%), and Electronics and Communication Engineering (1.1%). This indicates that the findings are strongly influenced by the perspectives of Computer Engineering students.

Table 2. AI-Powered Technologies Commonly Used by the Respondents

AI Tool	Frequency	Rank
1. Gemini	25	1
2. ChatGPT	23	2
3. Claude	22	3
4. Grammarly	5	4
5. DeepSeek	1	5

Table 2 shows the AI-powered technologies commonly used by the respondents. Gemini emerged as the most frequently used AI tool, followed closely by ChatGPT and Claude. The findings indicate that Generative AI platforms, particularly Large Language Models (LLMs), dominate AI usage among engineering students. In contrast, specialized applications such as Grammarly and DeepSeek were used less frequently. These results suggest that LLMs have become important tools supporting academic learning, research, information retrieval, and problem-solving among undergraduate engineering students.

Research Question 2: What is the level of students' awareness and understanding of corporate governance practices in AI-powered technologies?

Table 3. Mean Scores of Students' Awareness of Corporate Governance in AI Systems

Indicator	Mean (M)	Interpretation
1. Ethical standards should guide AI.	4.33	Strongly Agree
2. AI technologies are governed by company policies.	4.22	Strongly Agree
3. Organizations are responsible for how AI systems use data.	4.16	Agree
4. I am familiar with corporate governance.	3.82	Agree
Overall Mean	**4.11**	**Agree**

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 9, pp. 459-468, October 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Table 3 presents the respondents' level of awareness regarding corporate governance in AI systems. The statement "Ethical standards should guide AI" obtained the highest mean score (M = 4.33), indicating strong agreement among the respondents regarding the importance of ethical considerations in AI development and deployment. This was followed by "AI technologies are governed by company policies" (M = 4.22) and "Organizations are responsible for how AI systems use data" (M = 4.16), suggesting that the respondents generally recognize the role of organizations in governing AI technologies and ensuring responsible data practices.

On the other hand, the statement "I am familiar with corporate governance" obtained the lowest mean score (M = 3.82), although it still fell within the "Agree" category. This finding suggests that while respondents recognize key governance principles such as ethics, accountability, and organizational responsibility, their familiarity with the formal concept of corporate governance may be relatively limited.

Overall, the respondents demonstrated a positive level of awareness regarding corporate governance in AI systems, as reflected by the overall mean score of 4.11 (Agree)**.** The results indicate that engineering students generally understand the importance of ethical standards, organizational accountability, and governance mechanisms in the responsible use of AI-powered technologies.

Research Question 3: What is the level of students' trust in organizations and institutions that implement AI-powered technologies?

Table 4. Mean Scores of Students' Trust in Organizations Using AI-Powered Technologies

Indicator	Mean (M)	Interpretation
1. Companies are accountable for AI-related decisions and outcomes.	4.25	Strongly Agree
2. Institutions prioritize privacy.	3.95	Agree
3. Organizations use AI responsibly.	3.80	Agree
4. Organizations protect user data.	3.77	Agree
Overall Mean	**3.94**	**Agree**

Table 4 presents the respondents' level of trust in organizations using AI-powered technologies. Among the indicators, "Companies are accountable for AI-related decisions and outcomes" obtained the highest mean score (M = 4.25), indicating strong agreement that organizations should be responsible for the consequences of AI-generated actions and decisions. This finding suggests that accountability is a critical factor influencing students' trust in AI-powered technologies.

The statement "Institutions prioritize privacy" received a mean score of 3.95, while "Organizations use AI responsibly" and "Organizations protect user data" obtained mean scores of 3.80 and 3.77, respectively. Although these indicators were rated positively, their relatively lower scores suggest that respondents remain somewhat cautious regarding organizational practices involving data protection, privacy safeguards, and responsible AI implementation.

Overall, the respondents demonstrated a positive level of trust in organizations using AI-powered technologies, as reflected by the overall mean score of 3.94 (Agree)**.** The findings indicate that students generally trust organizations that develop and implement AI systems; however, strengthening privacy protection, responsible AI practices, and data governance measures may further enhance user confidence in AI-powered technologies.

Research Question 4: How do students perceive corporate governance practices in AI-powered technologies in terms of transparency; accountability; and ethical governance?

Table 5. Mean Scores by Corporate Governance Dimension

Corporate Governance Dimension	Mean (M)	Interpretation
1. Accountability	3.96	Agree
2. Ethical Governance	3.78	Agree
3. Transparency	3.66	Agree
Overall Mean	**3.80**	**Agree**

Table 5 presents the respondents' perceptions of the corporate governance dimensions associated with AI-powered technologies. Among the three dimensions, **Accountability** obtained the highest mean score (M = 3.96), indicating that respondents generally agree that organizations should be responsible for the governance, regulation, and consequences of AI systems. This suggests that accountability is viewed as the most important governance principle among the respondents.

Ethical Governance ranked second (M = 3.78), indicating agreement that ethical standards, monitoring mechanisms, and responsible AI practices are essential in the implementation of AI technologies. Meanwhile, Transparency obtained the lowest mean score (M = 3.66), although it remained within the "Agree"

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 9, pp. 459-468, October 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

category. This finding suggests that while students support disclosure and explainability in AI systems, transparency received comparatively less emphasis than accountability and ethical governance.

Overall, the respondents demonstrated positive perceptions of corporate governance in AI-powered technologies, as reflected by the overall mean score of 3.80 (Agree).

Research Question 5: What are the behavioral practices and attitudes of students toward the responsible and secure use of AI-powered technologies?

Table 6. Mean Scores of Students' Behavioral Practices toward Responsible AI Use

Behavioral Practice	Mean (M)	Interpretation
1. I stop using AI services that violate ethical or privacy standards.	4.26	Strongly Agree
2. I avoid AI systems with unclear privacy policies.	4.18	Agree
3. I consider the credibility of organizations before using AI tools.	4.12	Agree
4. I am careful when sharing personal information with AI systems.	4.05	Agree
5. I read the terms and conditions of AI-powered applications before use.	3.66	Agree
Overall Mean	**4.05**	**Agree**

Table 6 presents the respondents' behavioral practices toward the responsible and secure use of AI-powered technologies. The statement "I stop using AI services that violate ethical or privacy standards" obtained the highest mean score (M = 4.26), indicating strong agreement among respondents regarding the importance of ethical and privacy considerations in their use of AI technologies.

This was followed by avoiding AI systems with unclear privacy policies (M = 4.18), considering the credibility of organizations before using AI tools (M = 4.12), and exercising caution when sharing personal information with AI systems (M = 4.05). These findings suggest that respondents generally demonstrate responsible and security-conscious behaviors when interacting with AI technologies.

The statement "I read the terms and conditions of AI-powered applications before use" obtained the lowest mean score (M = 3.66), although respondents still agreed that they engage in this practice. This result indicates that while students exhibit generally responsible AI usage behaviors, reviewing terms and conditions may be less consistently practiced than other privacy-related behaviors.

Overall, the respondents demonstrated positive behavioral practices toward the responsible use of AI-powered technologies, as reflected by the overall mean score of 4.05 (Agree). The findings suggest that engineering students are generally attentive to ethical considerations, privacy protection, and responsible AI use.

Ethical Considerations

Prior to data collection, the researchers conducted the study within the College of Engineering and Architecture of Cebu Institute of Technology-University (CIT-University), where the researchers were encouraged to undertake academic research among the college's undergraduate students. The questionnaire was administered to eligible undergraduate engineering students as part of the study's data collection process. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was secured, and confidentiality of responses was maintained throughout the study.

Conclusion

This study examined the perceptions of undergraduate engineering students at CIT-University regarding corporate governance in AI-powered technologies. The findings revealed that respondents demonstrated generally positive awareness of corporate governance principles, particularly in the areas of transparency, accountability, ethical responsibility, privacy protection, and trust in AI systems. The results further showed that Generative AI tools, particularly Large Language Models such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude, were widely utilized by the respondents for academic and information-related purposes. Despite the widespread adoption of these technologies, students remained aware of governance concerns involving privacy risks, accountability, transparency, and the potential consequences of AI-generated outputs. The findings indicate that respondents generally viewed transparency, ethical responsibility, and organizational accountability as important considerations in their perceptions of AI-powered technologies. Respondents expressed greater confidence in AI systems when they believed that developers and organizations implemented responsible governance practices and provided clear information regarding the operation and limitations of AI technologies. Furthermore, the findings suggest that awareness of governance principles influences how students evaluate and interact with AI-powered technologies. While respondents generally recognized the benefits of AI for learning and productivity, they also acknowledged the importance of ethical oversight, privacy protection, and responsible use. Overall, the study highlights the interconnected nature of awareness, trust, governance dimensions, and user behavior in shaping engineering students' perceptions of

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 9, pp. 459-468, October 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

AI-powered technologies. These findings contribute to a better understanding of how future engineering professionals view responsible AI governance within an increasingly technology-driven environment.

Recommendations

The findings provide several important implications for organizations developing or deploying AI-powered technologies. For AI Developers and Technology Providers. AI developers and technology providers should strengthen corporate governance practices by promoting greater transparency, accountability, and ethical responsibility in the design and deployment of AI-powered technologies. Organizations should provide clear information regarding how AI systems generate outputs, process data, and address potential biases while ensuring robust privacy and data protection measures. Furthermore, the integration of explainable AI features can help improve users' understanding of AI-generated responses and enhance trust in AI systems. For Educational Institutions and Educators. Educational institutions should integrate AI governance, ethics, transparency, and data privacy concepts into engineering and technology-related curricula to develop students' awareness of responsible AI use. Universities should also establish clear guidelines for the ethical use of Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude while encouraging critical thinking, academic integrity, and responsible technology adoption through seminars, workshops, and other learning activities. For Future Researchers. Future researchers are encouraged to conduct similar studies involving larger and more diverse samples from different academic disciplines and higher education institutions to improve the generalizability of the findings. Further investigations may explore additional dimensions of AI governance, including algorithmic fairness, explainability, regulatory compliance, and accountability. Researchers may also employ mixed-methods or longitudinal approaches to gain deeper insights into how perceptions of AI governance evolve as artificial intelligence technologies continue to advance and become more integrated into educational and professional environments.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Akerlof, G. A. (1970). The market for “lemons”: Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 84(3), 488–500. https://doi.org/10.2307/1879431

Arrieta, A. B., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., García, S., Gil-López, S., Molina, D., Benjamins, R., Chatila, R., & Herrera, F. (2020). Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. Information Fusion, 58, 82–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2019.12.012

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice Hall.

Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., & Wright, R. (2023). So what if ChatGPT wrote it? Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. International Journal of Information Management, 71, Article 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). General system theory: Foundations, development, applications. George Braziller.

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. European Law Journal, 13(4), 447–468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x

Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. Business Horizons, 34(4), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(91)90005-G

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. Academy of Management Review, 22(1), 20–47. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9707180258

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koohang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M., Al-Busaidi, A. S., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., et al. (2023). Opinion paper: So what if ChatGPT wrote it? Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 9, pp. 459-468, October 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

policy. International Journal of Information Management, 71, Article 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. Harvard Data Science Review, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). How to design and evaluate research in education (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Pitman.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeiffer, F., et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 709–734. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335

Norberg, P. A., Horne, D. R., & Horne, D. A. (2007). The privacy paradox: Personal information disclosure intentions versus behaviors. Journal of Consumer Affairs, 41(1), 100–126. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.2006.00070.x

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). OECD principles on artificial intelligence. https://oecd.ai/en/ai-principles

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). Governing with artificial intelligence: Are governments ready? OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/26324bc2-en

Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? Opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 571–610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331

Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology: How to choose a sampling technique for research. International Journal of Academic Research in Management, 5(2), 18–27.

Trist, E. (1981). The evolution of socio-technical systems. Ontario Quality of Working Life Centre.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478. https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.