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ABSTRACT

Shared governance and its effectiveness continues to be debated among scholars. This study examined the relationship between higher education organizational governance and faculty governance. It was based on two theoretical frameworks: four organizational governance models; and four faculty governance models. Both have been accepted and cited in higher education literature (Heaney, 2010). However, no study has examined the relationship between organizational governance with faculty governance as shared governance.

There were 615 faculty senate leaders contacted nationwide according to institutional type: 207 doctoral; 208 masters; 200 baccalaureate. A total of 71 faculty senate leaders responded: 33 doctoral; 22 masters; and 16 baccalaureate. The study was ex post facto where participants completed the researcher-developed Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument. Data were analyzed according Cronbach’s alpha, descriptive, correlational, $t$-test, and MANOVA statistics.

Results revealed that shared governance is alive and well across colleges and universities, but strongly influenced by a state’s political environment. The shared governance model that emerged is a political/influential model regardless of institutional type. It indicated faculty and administrators need to build coalitions to establish a power base for decisions while dealing with policy and policy change.

The results indicated several implications and insights for future research. State political environments drive how organizational governance models and faculty governance models interact for shared governance. Current lack of resources have forced faculty and administrators to band together in various types of coalitions to build power structures to be more competitive
for resources such as budget allocations, ownership of policies and procedures, curricular decisions, and accountability measures. Thus, shared governance perspectives should be expanded to include senior administrators on campuses. Additionally, although shared governance is present on campuses, information regarding how much sharing takes place and in what areas is lacking. Overall, across the spectrum of shared governance for operations and academics, research should examine the extent to which faculty are involved in decisions pertaining to academics and operations, as well as the extent to which administrators are involved in decisions pertaining to operations and academics. The issue is not so much as who is in control, but how are limited resources distributed?
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION
Background and Setting

Governance in higher education remains a central point of controversy. It is defined as “the possible ways in which policy actors combine to solve collective problems and thus to the ways in which the policy-making process is steered” (Capano, 2011, p. 1625). It has undergone significant change in recent years (Capano, 2011). The change mostly centers on the following question: Who is in control? The literature has examined this question from the perspective of organizational governance. It has also examined it from the perspective of faculty governance. However, it has not examined the relationship between the two (Jones, 2011). Over the years, colleges and universities in the United States have tried to reform their approaches to governance by changing the structure or adjusting the powers and authorities afforded those governing bodies (Tandberg, 2013). Yet a central feature of governance in higher education is the concept of shared governance. Shared governance is referred to as faculty representation in institutional decision making (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010).

This concept of shared governance in higher education is a concept that has long been debated. From the conception of land grant colleges in the late 1800s to the current system of higher education, the debate has escalated and culminated in the attempt to clarify the meaning of shared governance (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010). In 1826, Harvard University determined that the faculty’s role was to have control over student admissions, student discipline, and the code of instruction (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997). In 1966, the canonical “Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities” formally articulated the faculty role in shared governance (Birnbaum, 2003). The statement spelled out the primary responsibility of the
faculty and, additionally, defined primary responsibility to mean that the governing board and president should concur with faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons, which should be stated in detail (Birnbaum, 1988). Over time, the debate concerning governance has been complicated by the changing roles of the university.

Faculty were once charged with student admissions, discipline, and the code of conduct (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997). They are now charged with having to solve social problems, improve schools, prepare a diverse student body, and exist on depleting funds in a legally charged environment (Kezar, 2000). Much of the charge is directed to faculty senates, as a formal governing body representing faculty across their respective campuses. The faculty senates in these institutions reflect the changing roles and responsibilities of the faculty in American institutions today.

The current faculty senate system in higher education was not created to meet the current demands of making the types of decisions that are required to be made in institutions of higher learning (Schuster, Smith, Corak, & Yamada, 1994). This refers to the fact that institutions have become less focused on academics and more focused on education as an industry (Birnbaum, 2003). Ninety percent of the four-year institutions have a faculty governing body that participates in campus governance (Association of Governing Boards, 2009; Gilmour, 1991; Hubbell; 2010; Schachter, 2011). Of these, individuals reported that even though the faculty had a governing body, academic departments, standing faculty committees, and ad hoc committees continued to serve as substantial venues for participation (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 2009; Tierney & Minor, 2003). Burgan (1998) stated that faculty participation in decision-making is ardently associated with institutional ineffectiveness and faculty senates are major stakeholders and strategic partners (Archibald & Conley, 2011).
However, much of the literature on faculty governance is based on the assumption that faculty participation is crucial to effective institutional decision making (Birnbaum, 1988). With more faculty involvement in institutional decision making, it further emphasizes the question: Who is in control?

The issue is further complicated by the different types of colleges and universities in the United States. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has been classifying colleges and universities since 1971 (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). The first classification identified institutions in five areas: (a) doctoral granting; (b) comprehensive; (c) liberal arts; (d) two-year; and (e) professional and other specialized institutions. Doctoral granting institutions focused on research and doctoral programs. Comprehensive institutions focused on master’s programs. Liberal arts institutions focused on undergraduate degrees in the arts and sciences. Two-year institutions are mainly community and junior colleges. Professional and other specialized institutions include seminaries, bible colleges, medical schools and centers, independent schools of engineering and technology, management, art, music, design, law, teachers colleges, and other specialized institutions. Although the classification system has undergone numerous changes through the years (e.g., Classification Description, n.d.), the basic classification (Basic Classification, n.d.) reflects the original classification nomenclature described by McComick and Zhao: (a) research focused and doctoral granting; (b) masters; (c) baccalaureate; (d) associates; and (e) special focus. These classifications also identify colleges and universities as public or private.

Given the different types of college and university classification, the question of control is complex. In general, it is four-pronged. First, what administrative governing structure do colleges and universities operate by? Second, what type of faculty senates do colleges and
universities have? Third, what type of relationship do they have? Finally, how are these relationships distributed across Carnegie classifications? Thus, the overarching question is not so much concerning who is in control, but what types of shared governance relationships exist between administrators and faculty among various classifications of colleges and universities.

The role of governance on college and university campus is described as three functions. First, there is organizational governance. Second, there is faculty governance. Third, there is shared governance. All three function on a continuum with varying degrees of control over different aspects of operations and academics. The following figure helps describe these relationships.

![Shared Governance Model](image)

Figure 1: Shared Governance Model

This research examined the relationship of organizational governance and faculty governance among Carnegie classifications as shared governance. Birnbaum (1988) related that organizational governance differs among different types of institutions. This suggests that the
governance relationship with faculty also differ. However, no comprehensive study has examined the relationship. This study seeks to investigate it.

Statement of the Problem

The literature demonstrates that shared governance continues to be discussed among scholars. Jones (2012) stated that shared governance is the norm among today’s colleges and universities. Although the concept of shared governance remains popular as a function of modern colleges and universities (Swartz, Skinner, Bowen, 2009), Jones further relates a need for further studies on shared governance. Crellin (2012) questions the feasibility of shared governance. Flaherty (2013) further cites concern that shared governance is in tatters. Clearly, shared governance is controversial, even to the point of being considered a legal right for faculty according to the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Numerous cases have challenged the faculty’s protection under the First Amendment, even with regard to institutional governance. However, the ruling in the 2006 Supreme Court case, *Garcetti v Ceballos*, challenged the relationship between academic freedom and the First Amendment and how that relates to institutional governance (Levinson, 2011). If faculty speak in the university setting, they may be offered protection not offered when they speak to the general public. Without this protection, it would be unlikely that faculty could effectively participate in institutional governance on a scale that would benefit the public and the greater good. The complexity is apparent in the literature, as it refers to shared governance, faculty governance, and organizational governance interchangeably.

Governance “refers to the structures and processes through which institutional participants interact with and influence each other and communicate with the larger environment” (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 4). It primarily relates to the role of administration and
management in “decision making or resource acquisition and allocation” (p. 7). Conversely, shared governance refers to the “shared responsibility between administration and faculty for primary decisions about the general means of advancing the general educational policy determined by the school’s charter” (Flynn, 2005, p. 1, as cited in Jones, 2012). Shared responsibility is chiefly grounded in formalized faculty governing bodies. Minor (2004) relates that the primary location for faculty participation in governance is through faculty senates as the formal faculty governing body. Minor also questions the effectiveness of faculty senates in their role in shared governance.

However, Birnbaum (2003), years earlier, purported that shared governance had ended. While Birnbaum acknowledged that faulty senates, presidents, and academic vice presidents operate efficiently and smoothly in academic governance, he also posited that the nature of higher education is changing rapidly and may require a governance structure that operates in a timelier, businesslike manner (Birnbaum, 2003). The risk of this is the disregard of institutional core values, commitment to mission, and long term perspective that is unique to institutions of higher education (Birnbaum, 2003). So the question becomes, “Has shared governance ended or does it need to become more efficient to preserve the nature of academic institutions?” (Birnbaum, 2003, p. 26). One way to examine the issue is to see how models of faculty senates (Minor, 2004) relate to models of college and university governance (Birnbaum, 1988). Minor (2004) develop four models of faculty senates as faculty governance: (a) functional; (b) influential; (c) ceremonial; and (d) subverted. He described how these faculty senates relate to the overall governance functions of institutions in which they operate. Birnbaum (1988), in his seminal work on the cybernetics of academic organization and leadership, developed four models of organizational governance: (a) collegial; (b) bureaucratic; (c) political; and (d)
anarchical. Both Minor’s and Birnbaum’s work have endured through the years and are widely cited. However, this study explores whether a relationship exists between faculty senate models and organizational governance models. That is, is there a pattern between the models of faculty senates and models of organizational governance relative to effectiveness?

The literature suggests that little is known about the relationship between particular models of governance structures in higher education and the role faculty have in institutional decision making in order to create an environment of shared governance. No study has examined the actual types of shared governance present among colleges and universities. Although the topic of shared governance in the literature ranges from the demise of faculty involvement in shared governance to state legislators taking more control, no actual data have been found to show how faculty and administrators actual govern institutions. In other words, what is the relationship between faculty and administrators as this relates to the on-campus control of colleges and universities?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between the four models of higher education organizational governance and the four models of faculty governance (faculty senates), as perceived by the faculty senate leaders. The following questions guided the study:

1. What are the models of organizational governance among institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications?
2. What are the models of faculty governance among institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications?
3. What is the relationship between organizational governance and faculty governance in institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications?

3.1 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.2 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.3 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.4 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

3.5 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.6 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.7 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.8 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

3.9 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.10 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate influential governance?
3.11 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.12 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

3.13 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.14 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.15 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.16 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

Theoretical Framework

The study’s theoretical framework is based on the works of Robert Birnbaum and James Minor. In the book, *How Colleges Work*, Birnbaum (1988) framed colleges and universities organizational governance as models of organizational functioning, defined as the “structures and processes through which institutional participants interact with and influence each other and communicate with the larger environment” (p. 4). It was based on four organizational models for institutions of higher learning. The four organizational models are labeled: (a) collegial institutions; (b) bureaucratic institutions; (c) political institutions; and (d) anarchical institutions. A collegial institution is described as a community of individuals with shared interests where decisions are made by consensus. A bureaucratic institution is referred to as a hierarchical control system where decisions are made through divisions of labor, rights, and responsibilities.
according to rules and regulations. A political institution is a system of coalitions and interest groups where major decisions are based on whichever group is in power according to the timing and type of issues. An anarchical institution pertains to colleges and universities as organized anarchy where decisions tend to be a result of the system rather than clearly controlled structure (Birnbaum, 1988).

In the article, “Understanding Faculty Senates: Moving from Mystery to Models,” Minor (2004) explored the faculty senate as a governing body within a college or university, mainly consisting of faculty. The role of faculty senates is to participate in shared governance and decision making for institutional effectiveness. He divided faculty senates into four models: (a) influential senates; (b) ceremonial senates; (c) subverted senates; and (d) functional senates. The major role of an influential faculty senate is to provide direction on a wide array of issues across campus. The major role of ceremonial faculty senate is to perform latent functions that are not necessarily related to university governance. The major role of a subverted senate is to maintain formal procedures but key decisions are usually made through select faculty in cooperation with administration. The major role of a functional faculty senate is to maintain the campus status quo (Minor, 2004).

Definition of Terms

Shared governance is the set of practices under which college faculty and staff participate in significant decisions concerning the operation of their institutions (American Federation of Teachers, 2006). It is measured by organizational governance and faculty senate governance. For the purpose of this study, shared governance refers to the interaction between the administration and the faculty senate for institutional decision making. Organizational governance is a term that describes the decision making interaction in colleges and universities.
(Birnbaum, 1988). It is the structure and processes through which institutional participants interact with each other and communicate with the larger environment (Birnbaum, 1988). In this context, organizational governance consists of four models: (a) collegial institutions, (b) bureaucratic institutions, (c) political institutions, and (d) anarchical institutions (Birnbaum, 1988). For the purposes of this study, organizational governance referred to the administration and models of organizational governance referenced by Birnbaum (1988).

Faculty senates include four models: (a) influential senates; (b) ceremonial senates; (c) subverted senates; and (d) functional senates (Minor, 2004). For the purpose of this study, the faculty senate referred to the models of faculty senates as presented by Minor (2004).

The Carnegie Classification is a framework for recognizing and describing institutional diversity in the United States (Carnegie Foundation, 2013). All accredited, degree-granting colleges and universities in the United States represented in the National Center for Education Statistics system are eligible to be included in the Carnegie Classifications (Carnegie Foundation, 2013).

Types of Faculty Senates

The construct, influential senate, is defined as a legitimate governing authority within the institution (Minor, 2004). The major role of an influential faculty senate is to provide direction on a wide array of issues across campus (Minor, 2004). The operational definition is measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument and measured with a six-point scale: 1 = completed disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree; and 6 = completely agree. A sample statement to define an influential senate is: Our faculty senate promotes policy change across the institution.
The construct, functional senate, is defined as a traditional form of senate (Minor, 2004). The major role of the functional senate is to represent and protect the interests of the faculty in university decision making (Minor, 2004). The operational definition is measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument and measured with a six-point scale: 1 = completed disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree; and 6 = completely agree. A sample statement to define a functional senate is: Our faculty senate functions as an association that represents primarily faculty interests rather than a lateral partner in campus decision making.

The construct, ceremonial senate, is defined as a relatively inactive and inoperable with a low level of organization (Minor, 2004). The major indicator of ceremonial senates is the inactivity and disorganization of the senate. The operational definition is measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument and measured with a six-point scale: 1 = completed disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree; and 6 = completely agree. A sample statement to define ceremonial senate is: The faculty senate at our institution operates in name only.

The subverted senate construct is defined as the informal process through which faculty make their decisions (Minor, 2004). The major indicator of the subverted senate is that the senate maintains an operable structure but uses informal processes for decision making (Minor, 2004). The operational definition was measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument and measured with a six-point scale: 1 = completed disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree; and 6 = completely agree. A sample statement to define a subverted senate is: Our senate’s decisions are habitually influenced by small groups of trusted faculty.
Types of Organizational Governance

The construct, collegial institution, is defined as the hierarchy of the institution (Birnbaum, 1988). The major indicators for a collegial institution involve a democratic decision making process (Birnbaum, 1988). The operational definition was measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument and measured with a six-point scale: 1 = completed disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree; and 6 = completely agree. A sample statement to define a collegial institution is: Our organizational functioning does not require consensus in decision making.

The bureaucratic institution construct is defined as the utilization of formal lines of communication and chains of authority (Birnbaum, 1988). The major indicators for a bureaucratic institution involve decisions being based on a hierarchical basis (Birnbaum, 1988). The operational definition was measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument and measured with a six-point scale: 1 = completed disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree; and 6 = completely agree. A sample statement to define a bureaucratic institution is: Our institution’s organizational functioning relies on an organizational chart.

The construct for political institution is defined as groups that operate autonomously but work interdependently (Birnbaum, 1988). The major indicator of the political institutions is that groups acquire, develop, and use power to obtain outcomes when groups disagree (Birnbaum, 1988). The operational definition was measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument and measured with a six-point scale: 1 = completed disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree; and 6 = completely agree. A sample statement to
define a political institution is: Our organizational functioning involves groups that are autonomous but interdependent.

The anarchical institution construct is defined as organized anarchy that has problematic goals, unclear technology, and fluid participation (Birnbaum, 1988). Unclear interdependence is a major indicator of the organizational functioning of an anarchical institution (Birnbaum, 1988). The operational definition is measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument and measured with a six-point scale: 1 = completely disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree; and 6 = completely agree. A sample statement to define an anarchical institution is: Our organization’s function is characterized by a loose coupling of problems, solutions, and participants.

Carnegie Classifications

The Carnegie classification system has undergone changes through the years. For the purpose of understanding the relationship between organizational and faculty governance, the basic Carnegie classification is used.

The construct for a baccalaureate institution is defined as an institution that primarily offers undergraduate degrees, fewer than 50 master’s degrees or 20 doctoral degrees annually (Basic Classification, n.d.). The operational definition is measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument, with an option for respondents to select a classification that best describes their college or university: Associates, Baccalaureate, Masters, or Doctoral/Research.

The construct for master’s institution is defined as an institution that has a focus on master’s level graduate degrees, with 50 or more, and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees annually (Basic Classification, n.d.). The operational definition is measured on the Higher Education
Shared Governance Instrument, with an option for respondents to select a classification that best described their college or university: Associates, Baccalaureate, Masters, or Doctoral/Research.

A doctoral/research institution construct is defined as an institution with an emphasis on research and doctoral degrees, awarding at least 20 doctoral degrees annually, excluding professional doctorates, such as JD, MD, etc. (Basic Classification, n.d.). The operational definition is measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument, with an option for respondents to select a classification that best described their college or university: Associates, Baccalaureate, Masters, or Doctoral/Research.

The construct for a private or public institution is defined as an institution’s self-identification as a state institution or not (Basic Classification, n.d.). The operational definition is measured on the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument, with an option for respondents to select a classification as public or private.

Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions

The study is delimited to (a) the colleges and universities classified according to the Carnegie Classification system, (b) the outcome measure of type of faculty senate, and (c) the predictor variable of type of organizational functioning. The assumptions are that the Carnegie Classifications were correct, the senate leaders would complete the survey correctly, and that the characteristics of the four organizational models and four senate types were correctly included in the survey. The results were generalizable to institutions of higher learning that are classified according the Carnegie Classification system.

Significance of the Study

Colleges and universities have been influenced by technology, demographic changes, globalization, and funding, yet governance has changed little (Gayle, Tewarie, & White, Jr.,
As long as the demands placed on institutions of higher learning continue to change, so will the debate on shared governance. This study is important because it is the first of its kind to look at shared governance from the perspective of the relationship between organizational governance and faculty governance as it relates to faculty senates. Birnbaum (1988) and Minor (2004) are both scholars in the field of shared governance and have extensively brought to light aspects of the internal workings of institutions of higher learning with regards to leadership as well as models of faculty governance. Other studies have examined both faculty senates and organizational models independently. None have studied the relationship between the two. Little is known about formal and informal internal governance processes (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). This study examines that relationship and determines what patterns exist among schools as they are classified according to the basic Carnegie Classification system. This study further determines if, or to what extent, Birnbaum was correct when he stated that shared governance had come to an end (Birnbaum, 2003). This determination can be generalized nationally for institutions of higher learning. Thus this study addresses the larger scope of higher education: What types of shared governance relationships exist between administration and faculty?
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between four models of higher education organizational governance and four models of faculty governance as perceived by the faculty senates in the United States, in order to understand how shared governance functions on campuses across the United States. The literature has examined governance from the perspective of organizational governance. It has also examined it from the perspective of faculty governance. However, it has not examined the relationship between the two (Jones, 2011).

The review of literature provides an overview of the major works in the field. The literature review is divided into three areas. The first area is organizational governance in the United States; the second is faculty governance; and the third is shared governance.

Organizational Governance

Universities are not simple organizations (Austin & Jones, 2016). Their duties span from the department level to the organizational level to the level of the interaction with the higher education system (Austin & Jones, 2016). The system must be included, as it encompasses the mechanisms that determine funding policies, legal requirements, rules and regulations, and oversight functions of governing bodies (Austin & Jones, 2016). Organizational governance is viewed as a democratic frame and a frame of interaction and process. The complexity of organizational governance is apparent in the multiple ways that scholars have approached the definition of organizational governance. Nadler, Miller, and Modica (2010) use the term institutional leadership when they call for an exploration of institutional leadership as a conduit for democratic practice. This institutional leadership is also described as organizational leadership. Birnbaum (1988) described the decision making interaction in colleges and
universities as the structure and processes through which institutional participants interact with each other and communicate with the larger environment. Whitechurch, et al. (2013) stated organizational governance provided a frame where local management involves a balance between safeguarding the interests of institutions and safeguarding the interests of individual employees. While each of the descriptions of organizational governance alludes to components of college and university governance at the administrative level, their caveats indicate that the concept of organizational governance is open to interpretation.

The history of organizational governance lends itself to these differences in definition and interpretation. What began as a system that existed in a stable environment, evolved into a system that promotes the massification and commodification of higher education (Austin & Jones, 2016). Higher education had become defined as an industry (Weisbrod, Ballou, & Asch, 2010), a marketplace of commercialization (Bok, 2003), an economic driver (Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, 2010), an institution responsible for developing human capital (Adedeji & Campbell, 2013), and an unparalleled entity with regards to diversity, access, and quality (Birnbaum, 1988). The catalyst for these changes were financial in nature. Where universities were once prosperous, they currently operate with strict financial constraints (Thelin, 2004). Some universities that had been state supported are now universities located in those states without support (Thelin, 2004). Society now perceives that higher education administrators must function in a manner that ensures it is run efficiently with the best return on investment; and to individuals, they must ensure that the best opportunities possible are provided for personal growth and future job growth and development (Ward, 2013). These changes in demands on the institution naturally has affected organizational governance.
Some scholars argue that a top down manner of governance is the solution to meeting the demands on higher education. Lambert (2003) argues that a corporate style of governance is most appropriate for universities. Sheets, Crawford, and Soars (2012) purported university governance would be more effective if it conformed to a business model and introduced more value-added commodities like the ones that technology offers in an online environment. This approach suggests that higher education is a commodity and that colleges and universities sell the certification of learning (Miller, 2010).

In response to the complexity of organizational governance, Birnbaum (1988) developed four models of institutional governance based on the diversity of each type of institution of higher education and their need (p. 84). Birnbaum noted that the complexity of higher education does not lend itself to fit every type of institution literally but his models provide a lens through which we can view college and university governance, organization, and leadership (Birnbaum, 1988). He named these institutional models collegial, bureaucratic, political, and anarchical and noted that although each system is not pure, it is reflective of how the institution makes the operational decisions of the institution (Birnbaum, 1988).

Organizational governance is a complicated concept. Nevertheless, it refers to the entire workings of a campus system and the interaction of each of the stakeholders of the institution. Organizational governance is a necessary consideration for the discussion of shared governance. Organizational governance models allude to the function of stakeholders with regards to decision making within the college or university. The models established by Birnbaum (1988) define structures that ranged from centralized governance to shared governance. Using these models assists in determining whether shared governance exists in colleges and universities in the United States.
Faculty Governance

Faculty governance has been a defining feature of American colleges and universities for generations (Heaney, 2010). In 1889, Cornell University established the first faculty senate (Moran, 2012). Many Midwestern Universities followed Almost 100 years later, Dill and Helm (1988) reflected on faculty’s role in institutional governing; they defined three different periods of faculty governance. They called them faculty control, democratic participation, and strategic policy making (Dill & Helm, 1988). Faculty senates continue to be structurally and culturally diverse and influence decisions within the institution (Minor, 2004).

Scholars disagree on the roles that the faculty senate should play. Some believe that too much faculty involvement inhibits the universities’ ability to make quick decisions in the current higher education environment (Association of Governing Boards, 1996). Heaney (2010) refers to the lethargic pace of decision making when faculty are involved; others agree that faculty involvement keeps universities from responding to market demands (Gerber et al., 1997). The University of California uses an Academic Senate to ensure that faculty have a voice in the operations of the University (Simmons, 1995). Standing committees within the senate are given specific duties with regard to university operations; their involvement is included in everything from finance to grievances to admissions (Simmons, 1995). Vassar College includes all stakeholders in the decision making process (Vassar College, 2015). All of their specific roles and responsibilities are recorded in the document referred to as the Governance, which continues to be a living document (Vassar College, 2015). Their practice reflects the importance of faculty participation indicated by Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, and Bradley (2013). Without faculty participation in governance, their power would be lost (Beaky et al., 2013).
Birnbaum (1988) provided a framework to try to explain why senates work and will not go away. In this particular work, he referred to the purposive symbolic or cultural functions that Minor revisited in his 2004 publication *Understanding Faculty Senates: From Mysteries to Models*. Minor’s research reveals themes concerning how faculty senates function within institutional governance. The four models he identified were subverted, ceremonial, influential, and functional (Minor, 2004). Their perception of campus constituents, areas of decision making, and relationship with the administration are what ultimately drove the determination of the senate. By examining this break down of types of senates, it becomes clear why the research has conflicting information regarding effects of the faculty senate and what, if any, role the faculty plays with institutional governance. Within the four models, there is a variance of perceptions of campus constituents that ranges from faculty senates existing to preserve faculty rights to existing as a pastime (Minor, 2004). The relationship with the administration ranges from skeptical to collaborative (Minor, 2004). With so much diversity among institutions, it becomes apparent why the evidence is unclear regarding faculty’s governance role.

Nevertheless, Nichols (n.d.) relates that faculty governance, based on AAUP documents, refers to faculty governance as faculty having primary responsibility for academics, aspects of student development related to the educational process, faculty employment matters, and operations where relevant. This situation creates an environment of shared governance.

It has been stated that 80% of universities believe shared governance is important (Tierney & Minor, 2004). If a university has a subverted senate, then the assumption is that the university is not actively engaging in shared governance. That poses an interesting observation, given that significant research literature demonstrates that university success may be determined by faculty participation in institutional governance (Jones, 2012); faculty involvement affects the
academic quality of an institution (Dickson, & Ruseski, 2013); and academic freedom and trust come in to question with the lack of faculty governance and the lack of power sharing in higher education lead to an institutional uproar (Bucklew, 2012). If faculty involvement is important in higher education, how are senates functioning in higher education? Are they taking active roles in institutional governance? If they are taking active roles, are they satisfied with their level of involvement? Despite the fact that the faculty’s role in shared governance has received ample attention, further research is required to complete the higher education community’s understanding of this complex and multifaceted area (Jones, 2011).

Shared Governance

Jones (2012) calls for more studies to carefully examine shared governance. To examine shared governance, there must be a shared understanding of what constitutes shared governance. Writers and governing bodies across the United States and around the world have attempted to define it. The American Federation of Teachers (2006) describes shared governance as the set of practices under which college and university faculty and administrators participate in decisions regarding the operation of their institution. Flynn (2005) describes shared governance as the shared responsibility between administration and faculty for primary decisions about the general education policy. Moran (2012) further divides shared governance into internal and external functions of governance. External governance refers to the public portion of institutional governance and government involvement in the governing of the institution (Moran, 2012). Internal governance refers to the day to day decisions and operations of an institution, as well as institutional policy (Moran, 2012) and is attributed to shared governance. Bowen and Tobin (2015) refer to this lack of uniformity of definition when they describe the term shared governance as vague.
The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) sought to define shared governance by issuing a prescriptive statement entitled a Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (1966 Statement, n.d.). The section on internal operations of the university indicates that faculty and administration should have a joint decision relationship in channels of communication, physical resources, budgeting, faculty status and selection of a president, dean and other academic officers. This AAUP definition asserts that faculty should have primary responsibility for curriculum, subject matter, methods of instruction, research, and student life as it concerns academics. Thus, both faculty and administrators are to share the responsibility of college and university governance.

In order to gauge shared governance, Nadler, Miller, & Modica (2010) conducted a survey to identify and describe the effectiveness of faculty governance in institutional decision making. The survey participants identified what they believed to be most and least key elements in successful staff governance (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010). The most important factors identified by faculty were the ability to make decisions that impacted the campus, that higher administration was supportive of initiatives that improved the campus environment for the staff, and a campus culture of support from higher administration and staff (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010). The least important factors for faculty governance were identified as close cooperation with both union and state oversight bodies, senator’s tenure, the ability of governance units to have financial autonomy, and direct communication between the faculty governance bodies and faculty. (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010). Further advocating the creation of a culture of shared governance is the recommendation in an article written for the United Kingdom that cites examples of institutional governance from the United States (Taylor, 2013). In the article, Taylor presents a model of shared governance that demonstrated the executive body as a
coordinator of committees that were comprised of council and faculty (Taylor, 2013). This represents another model where the faculty share in the governance. Thus, the common theme in defining shared governance is the mutual agreement about the operation of the institution by both faculty and administration.

Emergence of Shared Governance

The concept of shared governance has been debated since the inception of land grant universities in the 1860s. In those days, institutions were operated primarily by governing boards and institutional presidents (Lucas, 1994). With a desire by faculty for participation in institutional decision making, the lack of faculty involvement sparked discontent within institutions, and discontent with governing bodies escalated. In response to its faculty’s discontent, Harvard University developed a set of statutes that granted the faculty control over the admission of students, student discipline and the conduct of instruction in 1926 (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997).

Over the next few years, higher education began to change. Enrollments increased, faculty began to participate in research, and the national political climate changed (Dill & Helm, 1999). These changes prompted the Joint Statement on Government in Colleges and Universities in 1966 (Birnbaum, 2004). This statement was significant because it not only emerged from a joint effort between the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, it also defined the responsibilities and authority of faculty and administration (Birnbaum, 2004). The recommendation of the joint statement was for sharing authority for endeavors that require joint decisions and segmented authority on endeavors where one party has primary responsibility (Mortimer & McConnell, 1978). The importance of this recommendation was that, unlike
previous models established by land grant institutions and Harvard University, this statement reflected that faculty should have an integral role in institutional decision making. Prior to this, faculty participation was limited or nonexistent as noted by Lucas (1994) and Brubacher and Rudy (1997). In 1994, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges issued a statement concerning the relationship between academic freedom and faculty governance (Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, & Bradley, 2013). In this statement, the Association emphasizes the importance of faculty participation in institutional governance to maintain academic freedom (Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, & Bradley, 2013). Without the participation by faculty in governance, their power would be lost (Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, & Bradley, 2013). The Association addressed shared governance again in 2003 when it recommended that all faculty, including those that were less than full-time be granted responsibilities related to shared governance (Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, & Bradley, 2013).

The practice of shared governance continues to change despite efforts to establish definitive decision making roles. While some universities have a president/chancellor and cabinet making university decisions with faculty making significant contributions (Minor, 2004), others are described as corporatized entities that de-skill and devalue faculty (Schoorman & Acker-Hocevar, 2013). This dichotomy is important, as scholars agree that a participatory decision making should remain an important institutional value (Tinberg, 2009).

Challenges to Shared Governance

Langland (2011) asserts that the concept of shared governance has helped make the system of higher education great. Despite this opinion, the dynamic of faculty and institution changed based on numerous factors, including state, local, and national initiatives. A changing institution has the potential to encourage a changing governance structure and a change in faculty
roles. As universities become more technology and profit driven, the focus shifts toward the
types of activities that promote the most profit (Rhoades, 2005). Activities such as academic
advising and serving in a governance capacity do not produce measurable dollars in the same
way as spending time in class (Rhoades, 2005). This encourages profit driven initiatives, such as
the increase of non-faculty professionals on campus, which increases the number of positions
that are controlled by management instead of peers (Rhoades, 2005).

However, the faculty still must maintain the academic standards of the institution to meet the
accountability measures put in place by state and national governments (Hendrickson, 2013).
This becomes increasingly more difficult as funding decreases and accountability increases
(Hendrickson, 2013).

On the state and national levels, the political environment also impacts the higher
education governance system (McLendon & Ness, 2009). Between 1985 and 2000, more than
100 college and university initiatives that developed around political races were considered at the
state level (McLendon & Ness, 2009). These initiatives focused on accountability, the
decentralization of governance and deregulation, in an effort to improve institutional quality and
efficiency (McLendon & Ness, 2009). These areas of focus drive institutions to address
graduation rates, increased enrollment, and alternative means of educational delivery, such as
distance learning (Leach, 2008). They also force university administration to include additional
stakeholders, such as business firms and legislators, in the governance process (Leach, 2008).

All of these factors challenge institutional governance and the concept of shared governance.

Legal Aspects

Shared governance is valued by the stakeholders in higher education, but the privileges
that come with shared governance are not guaranteed by the law (Backer, 2013). While the first
and fourteenth amendments provide limited protections, these protections apply to general
matters and not to matters of governance (Backer, 2013). Furthermore, these amendments to the
United States Constitution apply only to public colleges and universities (Babbitt, Franke, & Lee,
2015), not to private colleges or universities. Also, the Constitution does not mention academic
freedom (Babbitt, Franke, & Lee, 2015).

However, two recent court rulings have challenged even these traditionally constitutional
rights. *Garcetti v Cabellos* and *Pickering v Board of Education* are cited in numerous
publications regarding the freedom of speech and academic freedom. In *Garcetti v Cabellos* the
courts ruled that the employees do not have freedom of speech rights if the speech is related to
their job responsibilities (Babbitt, Franke, & Lee, 2015). When an assistant district attorney
revealed misconduct in the district attorney’s office, he spoke out as a citizen. However, the
court ruled that because of his relationship to the job, his speech was not protected under the
freedom of speech clause of the First Amendment; he was speaking as an employee. This ruling
disquiets faculty at colleges and universities. For example, not only are faculty at public
institutions afforded the protections of the First Amendment, they most often have protections
under academic freedom clauses in faculty handbooks. Given the 2006 *Garcetti* ruling, faculty
speech may become restricted, even censured. The concern is the continued blurring of the lines
between what constitutes employee speech and academic speech and employee as a citizen
speech. As a result, the AAUP drafted a new version of its statement on academic freedom,
which no doubt will be tested in the courts. As reported by the AAUP (2009):

> Academic freedom is the freedom to teach, both in and outside the classroom, to conduct
research and to publish the results of those investigations, and to address any matter of
institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional
governance. Professors should also have the freedom to address the larger community with regard to any matter of social, political, economic, or other interest, without institutional discipline or restraint, save in response to fundamental violations of professional ethics or statements that suggest disciplinary incompetence (p. 88).

The revised statement is an attempt to mitigate the precedent set by *Garcetti*. This is accomplished by making academic freedom more extensive in scope by strengthening shared governance, providing faculty the right to address matters of institutional policy.

In *Pickering v Board of Education*, the courts had ruled that speech would be protected if it were a matter of public concern. The revised AAUP academic freedom would protect this ruling, in that professors should have freedom to address concerns of social, political, or other interests as part of their role in the larger community. The implications of such court rulings was that professors cannot act with certainty that their speech will be protected, because it is open to interpretation in the courts. This potentially affects the role that faculty can play in governance.

Division of power, stakeholders, the governance model of the institution, and politics are all contributing factors to the contentious nature of shared governance. Fish (2007) claims that litigation can be attributed to the fact that the stakeholders vary from institution to institution. No two institutions have the same students, faculty, culture, or climate. He also asserts that it matters whether the institution operates under a business model or a democratic one (Fish, 2007).

The definition of roles within the university is a topic of consideration in the literature as well. The Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities attempted to define the roles of the faculty and governing body, but no consensus has been reached about the definition of the concept of shared governance (Euben & AAUP, 2003). Forty seven percent of four-year universities define shared governance as fully collaborative, while 27% and 26% define shared
governance as consultative and distributed respectively (Euben & AAUP, 2003). One federal court defined university governance as a shared authority but continued to describe this authority as theoretical (Euben & AAUP, 2003). Failure to concretely define the concept of shared governance allows for multiple interpretations and disagreements. To remedy this, California includes a statement on shared governance in its Education Code; this statement requires community colleges to consult with stakeholders before decisions affecting them are made (Fitzgerald, 1998).

Faculty senates are also called in to question, not only their definition but also their functionality within the system. In Gonzalez v Irazarry, the court ruled that the faculty senate was a legislative body constituted by law (Euben 2003). Amadieh v University of Southern California determined that the senate was a legislative body but it did not have authority over curriculum (Euben & AAUP, 2003). The faculty handbook has even been used to determine the functionality of the system. In Faculty for Responsible Change v Visitors of James Madison University, a group of faculty sued the university for closing programs without involving the faculty, namely the faculty senate (Euben & AAUP, 2003). The court ruled that the faculty’s participation in curriculum decisions was not mandatory (Euben & AAUP, 2003). This indicates a continued eroding power based of faculty senates. According to Simmons and Floyd (2009), legislatures are passing laws to restrict the faculty role in governance that are rarely, if ever, challenged during the legislative process. They state that the political pressures on higher education give faculty concern about the erosion of faculty governance. Only time will tell whether faculty governance violations will be challenged in court by a governing body, such as a faculty senate, or if they will continue at the individual level under the freedom of speech protections.
Summary

The concept of governance in higher education is complex. The issues can range from a system of universities with several institutions connected to a central organizing unit, to faculty roles in decision making, to how, or whether, a particular program in a college or university operates. In principle, organizational governance refers to how administrators make decisions on their campuses (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010). Faculty governance primarily refers to the role faculty senates play in the decision making process across their campuses (Jones, 2012). And, shared governance refers to the interaction between administrators and faculty represented by faculty senates, as the two groups make decisions for campus operations (American Federation of Teachers, 2006). The literature is clear pertaining to two aspects of governance. First, it has shown different perspectives of how organizations are governed. organizational governance. Second, it has also examined the role of faculty in governance. However, it has not examined the relationship between the two (Jones, 2011). This study examined the relationship between the two.
CHAPTER 3
METHOD
Introduction

Governance remains a central point of controversy in higher education. Over the years, colleges and universities in the United States have tried to reform their approaches to governance by changing the structure or adjusting the powers and authorities afforded those governing bodies (Tandberg, 2013). Birnbaum (2003) purported that shared governance had ended. Yet, 90% of the four year institutions have a faculty governing body that participates in campus governance (Association of Governing Boards, 2009; Gilmour, 1991; Hubbell, 2010; Schachter, 2011). So the question becomes, “Has shared governance ended or does it need to become more efficient to preserve the nature of academic institutions?” (Birnbaum, 2003, p. 26). One way to examine the issue is to see how models of faculty senates (Minor, 2004) relate to models of college and university governance (Birnbaum, 1988). The purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between four models of higher education organizational governance and four models of faculty governance (faculty senates) as perceived by the faculty senate leaders.

The following questions guide this study:

1. What are the models of organizational governance among institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications?
2. What are the models of faculty governance among institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications?
3. What is the relationship between organizational governance and faculty governance in institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications?
3.1 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.2 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.3 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.4 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

3.5 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.6 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.7 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.8 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

3.9 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.10 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.11 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?
3.12 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

3.13 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.14 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.15 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.16 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

Research Design

This study employs a descriptive design (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007) to gather the data needed to answer the research questions. The human mind cannot organize a large mass of raw data so descriptive statistics are used to reduce data into a manageable form (Borg & Gall, 1989). Descriptive studies report summary data such as measures of central tendency including the mean, median, mode, deviance from the mean, variation, percentage, and correlations between variables (AECT, 2001). Survey research often includes this type of measurement (AECT, 2001). Due to the non-experimental nature of the study, no causal inferences are drawn.

Subject Selection

The participants were faculty senate leaders of colleges and universities identified in the Carnegie Classification System. Stratified random sampling was used to select one third of the institutions included in Basic Carnegie Classifications (Classification Description, n.d.). This included baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral-granting institutions. Contact information for
Instrumentation

This study uses a new instrument, developed for this study, which will be referred to as the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument (HESGI). The instrument was developed by the researcher in conjunction with faculty experts in the subject area, using descriptors of organizational governance models (collegial, bureaucratic, anarchical, and political) as established by Birnbaum (1988) and the types of faculty senate models (subverted, ceremonial, functional, and influential) as determined by Minor (2004). The survey includes 44 items that measure alignment with the four models of organizational functioning and the four models of faculty senates. A 6-point Likert-type scaling (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = somewhat disagree; 4 = somewhat agree; 5 = agree; 6 = strongly agree) is utilized. One additional item is descriptive so as to identify the basic Carnegie Classification of the institution (baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral/research granting institutions).

The HESGI has two sections. The first section has 44 statements related to the four models organizational governance (Birnbaum, 1988) and the four models of faculty senates (Minor, 2004). Each model from Birnbaum and Minor is described as having specific characteristics. Those characteristics were developed into statements that could be measured on a Likert-type scale. The items were randomized so respondents would not know which items
pertain to which models. The following represents the order of statements for each model occur in the HESGI.

Organizational Governance

- Collegial: 1, 3, 9, 13, & 19
- Bureaucratic: 2, 6, 8, 14, & 18
- Political: 4, 7, 10, 15, & 17
- Anarchical: 5, 11, 12, 16, & 20

Faculty Senates

- Functional: 21, 30, 31, 33, 36, & 43
- Influential: 24, 25, 32, 38, 40, & 44
- Ceremonial: 22, 27, 28, 37, 39 & 42
- Subverted: 23, 26, 29, 34, 35, & 41

The second section of the HESGI only has two categories: (a) type of institution as public or private; and (b) classification as baccalaureate, masters, or doctoral/research.

Data Collection

Data collection from all institutions took place concurrently. The instrument was sent to 200 baccalaureate, 208 masters, and 207 doctoral-granting institution senate leaders. An email was sent to all selected faculty senate leaders to inform them of the study and its purpose of the study. It included a link to an online version of the HESGI, in Qualtrics software for data collection. A second e-mail was sent one week later to reiterate the purpose of the study and encourage faculty senate leaders to participate. This e-mail also included a link to the survey. A third e-mail was sent two weeks after that to provide the link again and to inform the participants of the survey cut-off date. A final e-mail was sent at the cut-off date to thank the participants.
Assumptions

There were several assumptions associated with data analyses, to examine issues that must be addressed in order to help ensure the accuracy of results (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). The first assumption was independence of observations; the study assumed participants did not confer with each other when they completed the survey. Each participant was to complete the survey independently. The second assumption was related to normality. Evaluations of histograms, skewness, and kurtosis indicate whether data fall within normal distributions (parametric). The expectation was that responses would be normally distributed. If no variable responses were considered skewed, the data were considered appropriate for further statistical analyses. Vogt (2007) suggested that parametric measures of association, such as Pearson’s $r$ and ordinary regression, may have to be abandoned if the data are not normally distributed; the dependent variable is categorical; sample sizes of comparison groups are unequal; or samples are quite small.

Data Analysis

The data were exported from Qualtrics into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics were employed to summarize and organize the data. Correlational analysis and analysis of variance were conducted to examine the relationship between organizational governance and faculty governance. Research questions one and two were examined with descriptive and frequency statistics. Descriptive statistics summarize the results so information can be relayed in meaningful ways (Coladarci et al., 2011). Frequency distributions are part of descriptive statistics, which provide results according to how data are associated by assigned values (Coladarci et al., 2011). Descriptive statistics also includes analyzing reliability according to Cronbach’s alpha. Reliability analysis is used to measure the
consistency of the survey instrument and should be run for each subscale of survey instruments. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ indicates reliability of the sub-category; values of 0.8 and above are good (Field, 2009).

Research question three was analyzed by using two statistical processes. First, Pearson’s product moment correlation was used to examine the relationship between organizational governance models and faculty governance models according to each Carnegie classification. Effect size was also calculated. Pearson’s correlation coefficient $r$ and Cohen’s $d$ are very common measures of relationships and effect size, respectively (Field, 2009). Effect size, in essence, relates to the strength of a phenomenon without making a statement about the relationship in the population. Although Vogt (2007) argued that there are no useful statistical rules for deciding about large or small correlation coefficients, Frankfort-Nachmias (1999) considered correlation coefficients to be (a) weak ($r = .22$), (b) moderate ($r = .52$), and (c) strong ($r = .82$). Field (2009) reported that the widely used effect sizes are (a) small ($r = .10$), (b) medium ($r = .30$), and (c) large ($r = .50$). Vogt (2007) noted that in educational research, Cohen’s $d$ is referred to as the measure of effect size. Cohen’s $d$, calculated as the mean difference divided by the standard deviation of all participants, provides an evaluation of effect size in terms of standard deviations. Evaluations of the magnitude of effect size with Cohen’s $d$ are (a) small ($d = 0.2$), (b) medium ($d = 0.5$), and large ($d = 0.8$) (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2008).

Second, in addition to correlations, ANOVA and MANOVA were used to analyze research question three. The ANOVA analyses examined the differences between the Carnegie classifications according to organizational governance models and then faculty governance models. These analyses revealed whether there were statistical differences in organizational governance models and then faculty governance models among baccalaureate, masters, and
doctoral/research institutions. Levene’s test for equality of variance was examined. If it was violated \( (p < .10) \), unequal groups were used for interpretation. If there was statistical significance, follow up analyses were completed using Tukey post hoc tests. The Tukey post hoc test analyzes patterns of significance among subgroups (Glass & Hopkins, 2008). MANOVA is a multivariate analysis of variances among two or more dependent variables; it measure the differences of mean scores in ordinal data among one or more categories of nominal data (Cronk, 2008), analyzing the main effects, interactions, and importance of the dependent variables. Multivariate analysis of variance (Cronk, 2008) is used to test group differences; and the Tukey post hoc tests determine where differences occur in specific groups.

Summary

In this study, research was conducted using a survey instrument developed by the researcher. The instrument, the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument (HESGI), was distributed to institutions of higher education in the United States. These institutions were selected based on their Carnegie Classification and having a faculty senate. The data were collected and analyzed using SPSS and an effect size calculator.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS/RESULTS

Introduction

This study examines the relationship between four models of higher educational governance and four models of faculty governance as perceived by faculty senate leaders and university administration. A survey instrument, the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument (HESGI), was developed to measure descriptors of organizational governance models and descriptors of faculty senate models. These organizational governance models used to determine the descriptors (collegial, bureaucratic, anarchical, and political) were those established by Birnbaum (1988) and the faculty senate models (subverted, ceremonial, functional, and influential) were those established by Minor (2004). The instrument was divided into two sections. The first section contained 44 descriptive statements. The second section contained categories to determine whether the institutions were public or private, the Carnegie classification of the institution, student enrollment, number of faculty, and number of senators.

Stratified random sampling was utilized to select recipients for the study. To identify recipients for the HESGI, the Carnegie classifications were filtered for Doctoral/Research Universities, Master’s Colleges and Universities, Baccalaureate Colleges, Baccalaureate/Associate’s Colleges and Associate’s Colleges. This list was cross referenced with the Faculty Senates on the Web () to obtain senate and university leader’s e-mail addresses. A minimum of two e-mail addresses were located for each university included. The instrument was sent via e-mail to 207 Doctoral/Research University faculty senate leaders, 208 Master’s Colleges and University faculty senate leaders, and 200 Baccalaureate/ Associate’s College faculty senate leaders. The consent form containing the criterion for participation was included.
as well as the link to the survey in Qualtrics. Eleven participants replied to the e-mail and indicated they did not meet the criterion and chose not to respond. Therefore, responses were considered representative. No Associate’s Colleges responded to the instrument. Therefore, no findings representing that group were analyzed or reported. Seventy-one faculty senate leaders responded which was an 11.5% response rate.

The research questions that guided the data collection were:

Question one: What are the models of organizational governance among institutions of higher learning in the United States according to the Carnegie classifications?

Question two: What are the models of faculty governance among institutions of higher learning in the United States according to the Carnegie classifications?

Question three: What is the relationship between organizational governance and faculty governance in institutions of higher learning in the United States according to the Carnegie classifications?

3.1 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.2 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.3 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.4 What is the relationship between organizational collegial governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

3.5 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate functional governance?
3.6 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.7 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.8 What is the relationship between organizational bureaucratic governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

3.9 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.10 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.11 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.12 What is the relationship between organizational political governance and faculty senate subverted governance?

3.13 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate functional governance?

3.14 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate influential governance?

3.15 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate ceremonial governance?

3.16 What is the relationship between organizational anarchical governance and faculty senate subverted governance?
After the data were collected, the responses were downloaded from the Qualtrics system into the SPSS software for data analysis. Descriptive statistics, Cronbach’s alpha, *t*-tests, and MANOVAs were performed.

**Statistical Assumptions**

There were several assumptions associated with data analyses. Assumptions examine issues that must be addressed in order to help ensure the accuracy of results (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). The first assumption was independence of observations. The study assumed participants did not confer with each other when they completed the survey. Each participant was to complete the survey independently. The second assumption was related to normality. Evaluations of histograms, skewness, and kurtosis indicate whether data fall within normal distributions (parametric). The expectation was that responses would be normally distributed. If there were no variable responses considered skewed, then data are considered appropriate for further statistical analyses. Vogt (2007) suggested that parametric measures of association, such as Pearson’s *r* and ordinary regression, may have to be abandoned if the data are not normally distributed; the dependent variable is categorical; sample sizes of comparison groups are unequal; or samples are quite small.

**Statistical Analysis**

Data were collected from institutions of higher education to determine which model of organizational governance and which model of faculty governance existed in each institution. Respondents indicated whether they completely disagreed, strongly disagreed, disagreed, agreed, strongly agreed, or completely agreed with descriptive statements. Those numbers were coded numerically one to six with one representing completely disagree to six representing completely
agree. The results begin with providing overviews of descriptive information from the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument (HESGI) then address the research questions.

Table 1

*HESGI Response Results, N = 71, 1 = completely disagree to 6 = completely agree*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Governance</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegial</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchical</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*HESGI Response Results, N = 71, 1 = completely disagree to 6 = completely agree*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Senate Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subverted</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although no clear organizational governance or faculty senate model emerged from the results, the preferred models are political organizational governance and influential faculty senates. Political governance is described as autonomous and interdependent (Birnbaum, 1988). Influential senate is described as legitimate governing authority within the institution (Minor, 2004).
Data were collected from universities regarding their public or private status.

Table 3

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE, N = 71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were collected from universities to determine their Carnegie classification. The Associate’s classification was omitted due to no response from this category.

Table 4

Carnegie Classification, N = 71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were collected to determine student enrollment. Responses were numerical in nature and not categorical. Therefore, they are summarized in numerical ranges. The ranges vary due to a variance in reporting by respondents. The high number of student population reported may be due to a respondent reporting error.
Table 5

Summary of Student Enrollment, \( N = 71 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200-3800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000-5000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5200-6000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000-10000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10200-12500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14000-16500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17000-20855</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21000-25000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26000-28000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30000-35000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40000-80000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were collected regarding the number of faculty in the university. Table 5 represents a summary of this data.
Table 6

*Summary of the Number of Faculty, N = 71*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-300</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330-457</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-690</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-850</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930-1000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1650</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000-3300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were collected according to the number of senators in the university. The following table represents a summary of the data collected.
Table 7

Summary of the Number of Senators, $N = 71$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-134</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-230</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s $\alpha$ determined the internal consistency of survey items and provided an estimate of reliability. Table 8 provides a summary of the statistical analyses before and after items were removed.
Research Questions One and Two

The following data were collected based on research questions one and two: (a) What are the models of organizational governance among institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications?; and (b) What are the models of faculty governance among institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications? Survey questions were collapsed categorically into the model that they represented.
Table 10 provides a summary of the frequency of distribution, means, and standard errors of the responses to the HESGI.

Table 10

*Frequency of Distribution, Means, and Standard Errors for HESGI, 1 = Completely Disagree to 6 = Completely Agree*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subverted</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchy</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that colleges and universities operate by the political model of organizational governance (M = 3.82) and have an influential faculty senate (M = 3.92) for shared governance.

Research Question Three

The following data were analyzed based on research question number three: What is the relationship between organizational governance and faculty governance in institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications? Classifications were collapsed into two categories based on a lack of data in the baccalaureate classification.
$T$-tests

$T$-tests were run for the senate models: bureaucratic, ceremonial, subverted, and influential. Levene’s test of equality of variance was not violated for the bureaucratic subscale, $p = 0.57$; therefore equality of variance data were used for results. Results of the $t$-test for the bureaucratic subscale showed no statistical difference between masters and doctoral institutions: $t(69) = 0.87, p = 0.39$. Levene’s test of equality of variance was not violated for the ceremonial subscale, $p = 0.62$, therefore equality of variance data were used for results. Results for the ceremonial subscale showed no statistical difference between master’s and doctoral institutions: $t(69) = -0.37, p = 0.71$. Levene’s test of equality of variance was violated for the subverted subscale, $p = 0.05$, therefore equality of variance for unequal data were used for results. Results for the subverted subscale showed no statistical difference between master’s and doctoral institutions: $t(69) = -1.37, p = 0.18$. Levene’s test of equality of variance was not violated for the influential subscale, $p = 0.32$, therefore equality of variance data were used for results. Results for the influential subscale showed no statistical difference between master’s and doctoral institutions: $t(69) = 1.11, p = 0.27$. Table 11 provides a summary of results.
Table 11

*T-tests for Faculty Senate Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subverted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T-tests were also performed for the models of organizational functioning: collegial; political; anarchical; and functional subscales. Levene’s test of equality of variance was not violated for the collegial subscale, \( p = .61 \), therefore equality of variance data were used for results. Results of the \( t \)-test for the collegial subscale showed no statistical difference between master’s and doctoral institutions, \( t(69) = .67, p = .53 \). Levene’s test of equality of variance was not violated for the political subscale, \( p = .83 \), therefore equality of variance data were used for results. Results for the political subscale showed no statistical difference between master’s and doctoral institutions, \( t(69) = 1.06, p = .29 \). Levene’s test of equality of variance was not violated for the anarchical subscale, \( p = .32 \), therefore equality of variance data were used for results. Results for the anarchical subscale showed no statistical difference between master’s and doctoral institutions, \( t(69) = -1.14, p = .26 \). Levene’s test of equality of variance was not violated for the functional subscale, \( p = .61 \), therefore equality of variance data were used for results.*
results. Results for the functional subscale showed no statistical difference between master’s and doctoral institutions, $t(69) = -.68, p = .50$.

Table 12 provides a summary of results.

Table 12

*T-tests for Models of Organizational Governance Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson’s correlation coefficient $r$ and Cohen’s $d$ are very common measures of relationships and effect size, respectively (Field, 2009). Effect size, in essence, relates to the strength of a phenomenon without making a statement about the relationship in the population. Although Vogt (2007) argued that there are no useful statistical rules for deciding about large or small correlations coefficients, Frankfort-Nachmias (1999) considered correlation coefficients to be (a) weak ($r = .22$), (b) moderate ($r = .52$), and (c) strong ($r = .82$). Field (2009) reported that the widely used effect sizes are (a) small ($r = .10$), (b) medium ($r = .30$), and (c) large ($r = .50$). Vogt (2007) noted that in educational research, Cohen’s $d$ is referred to as the measure of effect size. Cohen’s $d$, calculated as the mean difference divided by the standard deviation of all
participants, provides an evaluation of effect size in terms of standard deviations. Evaluations of the magnitude of effect size with Cohen’s $d$ are (a) small ($d = 0.2$), (b) medium ($d = 0.5$), and large ($d = 0.8$) (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2008).

While the data indicated a significant statistical correlation between groups, most of the effect sizes were small. There is a moderate correlation that is statistically significant with a strong effect size with the correlation between influential senates and collegial organizational governance models, $r = .52, p < .01, d = 1.0$. This would be expected, because both models offer open styles of communication. The following table presents a summary of the correlations and effect size.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Collegial</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Bureaucratic</th>
<th>Anarchical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subverted</td>
<td>-0.53**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

ANOVA could not be utilized. The Carnegie classifications had to be collapsed into master’s and doctoral institutions because there were too few cases in the baccalaureate category. MANOVAs were run for type of organizational governance. Wilks' Lambda was not statistically significant, $p = .812$, (Wilks’ $\Lambda = .98$, F(4, 66), $p = .39$). Therefore, there was no statistically
significant difference in organizational governance based on Carnegie Classifications. Post hoc
tests were not performed because there were fewer than three Carnegie Classifications.

Table 14

*MANOVA Results for Carnegie Classifications*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Wilks’ Λ</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANOVAs were also run for type of faculty senate. Wilks' Lambda was not statistically
significant, \( p = .643 \), (Wilks’ Λ=.96, F(4, 66), \( p = .629 \)). Therefore, there was no statistically
significant difference in faculty senates based on Carnegie Classifications. No post hoc tests
were performed because there were fewer than three Carnegie Classifications.
Table 15

**MANOVA Results for Senate Models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Wilks’ Λ</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subverted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Chapter four presents the statistical analysis of data gathered by the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument, examining the relationship between four models of higher education organizational governance and four models of faculty governance as perceived by the faculty senates in the United States. The descriptive data indicated too few responses to include all Carnegie classifications as variables for analysis. Private institutions were omitted as well.

The study used SPSS software and effect size calculators for the analysis, using $t$-tests and correlations to examine relationships. The first question determined which models of organizational governance exist in the institutions that responded to the HESGI. The second question determined which models of faculty senates existed in the institutions that responded to
the HESGI. The third question examined the relationship between the models of organizational governance and faculty senate models. *T*-tests and MONVAs were run. Statistical significances were found between some models of organizational functioning and faculty senate models. However, for the most part there were small effect sizes.
CHAPTER V
OVERVIEW, SUMMARY, AND PURPOSE

Introduction

Shared governance and its effectiveness continues to be a topic debated among scholars. The literature has examined governance from the perspective of organizational governance. It has also examined it from the perspective of faculty governance. However, it has not examined the relationship between the two (Jones, 2011). This chapter provides an overview of the study, a discussion of the data analysis of the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument (HESGI), implications of the study based on current literature, and implications for further studies.

Summary of the Problem

The concept of shared governance in higher education has long been debated. Clarification of the role of faculty has been attempted by institutions, law makers and organizations. Harvard university attempted to determine the role of faculty in institutional decision making as early as 1826 (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010). The Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities was issued years later to articulate the faculty’s role in shared governance (Birnbaum, 2003). The relationship has often become so contentious that it has been fought over in the courts, mostly under first amendment rights. The Supreme Court has addressed freedom of speech and the academic relationship (Levinson, 2011). The root of it all is the controversy over shared governance.

Over time, institutions have become less focused on academics and more focused on education as an industry (e.g., Birnbaum, 2003; Weisbrod, Ballou, & Asch, 2010), often described as a commodity to be traded (e.g., Miller, 2010; Naidoo, 2003; Shumar, 2014). This
change has caused some to question the lethargic pace of decision making when faculty was involved (Heaney, 2010). Stensaker (2013) posited that higher education was changing rapidly and may require institutions to operate in a more optimal way than possible in shared governance. This would mean the end to shared governance (Birnbaum, 2003).

The literature reflected that the concept of shared governance has been studied from the perspective of faculty governance and organizational governance sharing responsibilities. However, there has been no study to examine the actual types of shared governance present among colleges and universities. Although the topic of shared governance in the literature ranges from the demise of faculty involvement in shared governance to state legislators taking more control, no actual data have been found to show how faculty and administrators actually govern institutions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between four models of higher education organizational governance and four models of faculty governance (faculty senates) as perceived by the faculty senate leaders. The senate models were drawn from work by Minor (2004) and the organizational governance models were drawn from Birnbaum (1988). Using key words in these models, the researcher developed 44 statements for a survey instrument entitled the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument. The campus size, faculty size, senate size, public or private institution were also included in the HESGI, but since they were not included in research questions, specific analyses were not completed. The campus type was indicated by Carnegie Classification. The Carnegie Classification System has been used since 1971 (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). The classification provided the manner in which the institutions were grouped.
Governance involves three major elements. First, there is organizational governance, which focuses on administrative oversight of all college and university operations. Birnbaum (1988) described organizational governance as a term that involves decision making interaction in colleges and universities. Second, there is faculty governance, which relates to the extent faculty have decision making power over college and university operations. Faculty governance is a defining feature of American colleges and universities that is characterized by organized, independent, deliberate bodies, mainly found through faculty senates (Heaney, 2010). Third, there is shared governance, which is the relationship between organizational governance and faculty governance. The American Federation of Teachers (2006) described shared governance as the set of practices under which college and university faculty and administrators participate in decisions regarding the operation of their institution. The focus of this study was on shared governance.

Conclusions

This section will begin by conveying two general observations, relate the finding from the study. In general two interesting observations were discovered that help define the role of governance on campuses: (a) presence of shared governance; and (b) extent of shared governance.

General Observations

First, when the contact information for the participating institutions was being obtained and colleges and universities were cross-referenced with the list of established faculty senates, each type of institution was represented. Doctoral, Master’s, Associates, and Baccalaureate institutions all had a form of faculty governance present. This was an interesting observation but the most interesting observation was the variance of types of faculty representation, particularly
in the associate’s degree institutions. These institutions either had a senate comprised of all faculty, representative committees in colleges that fell under the senate umbrella, or they had a senate composed of both faculty and administration. These are not the typical types of shared governance models found in four-year institutions. Their level of involvement in governance varied but the fact that they existed indicated the presence of shared governance. While it may be ambiguous who is in control at a campus, there is a structure in place for some type of shared governance.

A second general observation is that Birnbaum (1988) challenged the notion of shared governance even to the extent that shared governance has ended. In an era where governance is forced to be more efficient, faculty roles are being diminished (Birnbaum, 1988). Although governing structures are being challenged, senates appear to be more than symbolic. On each of the websites of the faculty senates of the universities included in the study, there were numerous indications that faculty are interacting with organizational governance and shared decision making exists in institutions of higher learning. Often, the provost or president of the institution and other members of the administration are represented in faculty senates, but the majority of members are faculty. Faculty appear to be involved in issues ranging from tenure to curriculum to budgetary considerations of the institution. These findings indicated that shared governance had, in fact, not ended. The data ultimately showed shared governance to exist.

Conclusions Based on Results

Several key findings from data include: (a) the preferred model of organizational governance is political; (b) the preferred model of faculty governance is influential; (c) faculty senate members amongst doctoral and master’s institutions ranked the four faculty senate models almost identically; (d) faculty senate members among doctoral and masters institutions ranked
their organizational governance almost identically; and (e) no statistical difference was found in the relationship between the faculty governance and organizational governance models with regard to their Carnegie classification.

The current literature on the theoretical framework for describing types of organizational governance and faculty senate models does not appear to be as accurate as the literature portrays. No previous study had tested the models, even though the field has widely accepted them as the standard governance structures in institutions of higher education. Therefore, the results of this study bring into question the scope to which the current models represent organizational and faculty governance. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ results show that questions had to be omitted to improve reliability. Initially, the alpha range for the models of organizational governance was -.051 to .715. The bureaucratic model began at an alpha level of .715, so it was not altered. However, all three of the other categories had one, two, and three questions omitted to improve their alpha results to moderate levels. This does not say the designations are incorrect, but how faculty senate leaders understood them may not be representative of the descriptions provided in the literature. However, it could also mean that faculty senate leaders did not have a very good understanding of how their institutions were governed. Or, they actually may not be representative of the models.

The faculty governance models performed better with alpha levels ranging from .682 to .799. The items for the final instrument had only one model with four items and the other three had six. This could mean that the designations were correct or that the faculty senate members have a clear understanding of the inner working of their faculty senate and they understand its function.
Research Question One

Research question one examined which models of organizational governance represent the institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications. The organizational governance model with the highest mean score was political (M = 3.82). This rating represents that faculty senate leaders strongly agree their organizations are political. According to Birnbaum (1988), a political institution is defined as a construct by groups that operate autonomously but work interdependently. The major indicator of the political institutions is that groups acquire, develop, and use power to obtain outcomes when groups disagree (Birnbaum, 1988). This models differs from the anarchical institution that had unclear interdependence and the bureaucratic and collegial institutions that are both hierarchical in nature.

Research Question Two

Research question two examined which models of faculty governance represent the institutions of higher learning in the United States according to the Carnegie classifications. The faculty senate model with the highest mean score was influential (M = 3.92). This rating represents that faculty senate leaders strongly agree their faculty senates are influential. According to Minor (2004), an influential senate is a legitimate governing authority within the institution (Minor, 2004). The major role of an influential faculty senate is to provide direction on a wide array of issues across campus (Minor, 2004).

Research Question Three

Research question three examined the relationship between organizational governance and faculty governance in institutions of higher learning in the United States according to Carnegie classifications. Due to the lack of responses in the baccalaureate category, the
responses were collapsed into the master’s category, which gave two Carnegie classification categories to compare: masters with doctoral. With the revised designation, no statistical differences were measured in either organizational governance or faculty senate governance. For the senate models, doctoral institutions ranked influential, subverted, bureaucratic, and ceremonial senates highest to lowest, respectively. Masters institutions ranked influential, bureaucratic, subverted, and ceremonial senates highest to lowest, respectively. While the middle two rankings are transposed between doctoral and masters’ institutions, their top and bottom ranked faculty senate models were the same. For organizational models, doctoral institutions ranked the political model first then the anarchical, collegial, and functional models, respectively. Masters institutions ranked the political model first followed by the collegial, anarchical and functional models respectively. Like the senate models, the organizational models had the same model ranked first and fourth with the middle two transposed.

Faculty senate leaders revealed they mostly operated by an influential senate model in a political organizational governance environment. Correlation statistics looked at the relationship more closely. Results showed a statistically significant relationship, however it was moderate. A slightly stronger relationship was influential and collegial. It is interesting to note that a negative, moderate, statistically significant relationship was found between an influential senate and anarchical operational governance model. Although it was two-directional, it appears that as anarchy decreases, so does the need for influence. Nevertheless, the influential model was the only one that was statistically significant across all organizational governance models.

Finally, Carnegie classifications according to organizational governance models and faculty senate models were examined for differences in the models. There were no statistical differences in Carnegie classifications among organizational models or faculty senate models.
Although no one model was statistically significant, both the influential and political models had the highest mean scores in both master’s and doctoral institutions. Between the two institutions, master’s level scored higher for both influential and political models.

Discussion

How universities should be governed is a recurring issue in higher education (Austin & Jones, 2016). The role of the faculty and administration changes in response to the institution’s environment. These factors led to the declaration that shared governance no longer existed in higher education (Birnbaum, 2004) and that it was in tatters (Flaherty, 2013). Jones (2012) called for more studies and a closer look at shared governance, and the literature indicated no data were available concerning the interaction between organizational governance and faculty governance in the role of shared governance in higher education.

This study was initiated with the purpose of examining the relationship between four models of higher education organizational governance and four models of faculty governance (faculty senates) as perceived by the faculty senate leaders. The models of organizational governance: collegial; bureaucratic; political; and anarchical were defined by Birnbaum (1988) based on their defining characteristics. A collegial institution is primarily democratic, whereas a bureaucratic institution relies more on its bureaucracy. A political institution is more about power and autonomous groups, whereas an anarchical institution does not have a defined organization, and the manner in which decisions are made is unclear. The results of this study indicate that the majority of the faculty senate leaders believed their institutions best fit the political framework. This means they did not feel the institution was either democratic or bureaucratic or that it was loosely coupled with regards to decision making. A political model of organizational governance indicates that faculty senate leaders felt groups were interdependent,
which infers shared governance by according to the American Federation of Teachers (2006)
definition. The American Federation of Teachers (2006) describes shared governance as the set
of practices under which college and university faculty and administrators participate in
decisions regarding the operation of their institution.

The majority of responses came from public institutions of higher learning. The fact that
public institutions chose the political model of organizational governance could be reflective of
the response to the political climate in higher education as indicated in the literature. A political
institution is a system of coalitions and interest groups where major decisions are based on
whichever group is in power according to the timing and type of issues (Birnbaum, 1988). Leach
(2008) stated that changes in higher education forces the administration to include additional
stakeholders in the decision making process. Floyd (2009) related that political pressure on
higher education give the faculty concerns about the erosion of faculty governance. This
concern would encourage the faculty to build political alliances to gain strength within the
institution. Fish (2007) conveyed that the division of power, stakeholders, the governance model
of the institution, and politics are all contributing factors to the contentious nature of shared
governance. Whether it is change as a response to political pressure, a change of stakeholders, or
a policy change, a system of coalitions would be encouraged to preserve the faculty’s role in
shared governance. Further impacting the public institution and perhaps explaining the response
by the public institutions is the fact that the amendments in the United States constitution apply
only to public colleges and universities (Babbitt, Franke, & Lee, 2015).

Minor (2004) described four models of faculty governance: subverted; ceremonial;
influential; and functional. A subverted senate was characterized as having an informal decision
making process. A ceremonial senate exhibits low levels activity and disorganization. The other
two models, influential and functional, demonstrate more decision making by the faculty, with the influential senate characterized as a legitimate decision making authority and the functional senate being a lateral partner in decision making. The results in this study reveal that the faculty senate leaders perceive they are influential in both masters and doctoral institutions. This indicates that senate leaders believe they have a role in institutional decision making. Had they been ceremonial or subverted, it would have indicated minimal interactions between the faculty senate and the administration. The influential senate as a faculty governance model coupled with the political model of organizational governance indicated the presence of shared governance.

Scholars disagree on the roles that the faculty senate should play. Some believe that too much faculty involvement inhibits the university’s ability to make quick decisions in the current higher education environment (Association of Governing Boards, 1996). Some of these believe that faculty involvement keeps universities from responding to market demands (Gerber et al., 1997). Those statements may have been true 20 years ago and to some degree may currently apply in today’s world. More recently, Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, and Bradley (2013) emphasize the importance of faculty participation in institutional governance to maintain academic freedom; and, without the participation by faculty in governance, their power would be lost. This study reveals how faculty approach decision making and institutional responses to market demands. The fact that senate leaders identified with the political model of governance and the influential model of the faculty senate demonstrates their belief that they have a role in institutional governance. The political model of governance requires coalitions and engagement with the stakeholders. Faculty, being major stakeholders in the institutions, would be an important component in that political realm. The fact that the majority of senate leaders of the institutions in this study felt they were participating in an influential senate indicates a perception
that faculty are a part of institutional decision making. Through political governance, the institution can respond to market demands and through an influential senate, these demand can be met while preserving the power of the faculty.

Shared governance appears to be thriving, in contrast to Birnbaum’s (2004) claim that shared governance is dead, or at least is suffering due to greater control by stakeholders other than faculty. According to this study, shared governance has been adapting to the changing environment. Gayle, Tewarie, and White, Jr. (2011) say that colleges and universities have been influenced by technology, demographic changes, globalization, and funding, but governance has changed little. Faculty governance has been a defining feature of American colleges and universities for generations (Heaney, 2010). Together with organizational governance, it becomes shared governance. Although the concept of governance has changed little, there is little evidence from the literature to describe what type of shared governance has been in place.

This study shows that the prominent shared governance model is a political/influential combination. The literature states that full participation by all stakeholders is demanded by shared governance (Heaney, 2010). Both political and influential models are grounded in cooperative decision making. People who are accountable for decisions must have the authority to make them (Heaney, 2010). Shared governance honors varied responsibilities and acknowledges the complex interweaving roles of faculty, administration, staff, and students in fulfilling the mission of an institution (Heaney, 2010). The political model of governance involves acquiring, developing, and using power to obtain preferred outcomes when groups disagree (Birnbaum, 1988). Influential senates are responsive to the administration, and the administration responds to them as a recognizable governing body on the campus (Minor, 2003). These two models are natural complements to one another and they support the literature that
suggests a faculty voice in shared governance is desired. People who are accountable for decisions must have the authority to make them (Heaney, 2010). The political model of governance ensures equality in decision making as it acknowledges that some groups are more powerful than others; but it does not allow for one group to dominate all the time (Birnbaum, 1988). The influential senate shifts power between constituencies as contextual circumstances shift (Minor, 2004). The AAUP (1966 Statement, n. d.) extends the role of faculty in shared governance, as faculty and administration should have a joint decision relationship in channels of communication, physical resources, budgeting, faculty status, and the selection of a president, dean, and other academic officers. The combination of the political/influential models indicated that the roles set forth by the AAUP nearly 50 years ago are being honored.

This study reveals no significant difference between how masters and doctoral institutions perceive their organizational governance or their faculty governance, to the extent that they even rank their models almost identically. This finding supports what Nadler, Miller, and Modica (2010) suggested were important factors in shared governance: important components of shared governance are the ability of faculty to make impactful decisions and a culture of support from the higher administration and staff (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010). Faculty senate leaders of both masters and doctoral institutions chose influential and their first choice and ceremonial senates as their last choice. Likewise, they both chose political as the top ranked model and functional organizational governance as their last choice. Had they chosen ceremonial senates, it would have indicated that they felt like they had no voice or power in decision making. The fact that they chose influential indicates that senate leaders believe they have a role in university governance that is not insignificant. The fact that those same senate leaders perceived that their administration fit the political model of organization indicates that
the senate leaders feel that their governance operates in such a manner that they include others, including faculty. Had they chosen functional as their organizational model, it would have indicated that the governance was more top down; less shared governance is demonstrated in that model.

Implications

The study reveals interesting implications for higher education. Higher education is described as an industry (Weisbrod, Ballou, & Asch, 2008) with a diverse organizational structure Cohen and Kisker (2010). It is suggested that its diversity functions as a foundation to serve the diverse regions, students, and states’ objectives (Thelin, 2004). However, given the political environment surrounding higher education in the past 20 years (Floyd, 2009), a less diverse shared governance structure has emerged.

Three major implications emerge based on the results of this study:

First, at least at public institutions, there is little diversification of shared governance. The politics of education may extend benefits to diverse regions and populations, but it restricts governance (Spring, 2011). The results of this study show that the politics of education are driving governance structures. This is not to presume that faculty and administrators do not have a say in decision making (i.e., shared governance); it simply means that decision making is more confined to the political context in which colleges and universities reside. This should not come as a surprise. Clark (2000) was prophetic when he stated campuses are moving away from collegial or bureaucratic models: they will become professionalized as governmental agencies. The importance of this is found in the results of this study.

The literature, based on Birnbaum (1988) and Minor (2004), has suggested there is diversity in governance models, because no data had been collected and analyzed to indicate
otherwise. Thus, the expectation became accepted that colleges and universities operate by
diverse shared governance models. The opposite appears to dominate governance structures. It
was expected that institutional type, such as baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral, would use
different models (Birnbaum, 1998 & Minor, 2004). However, the political/influential model
shows no difference among institutional types. This is an indicator that political pressures are so
strong; they dictate shared governance relations regardless of Carnegie classifications
(Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 2010). Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (2010) further
asserted that when external pressures are strong, it forces governance to operate in particular
fashion. In particular, decisions are made by groups of political elites who persist. This is
consistent with the characteristic of the political model where people build coalitions to establish
a power base for decisions. It is also consistent with the characteristic of the influential model
dealing with policy and policy change. Thus, contrary to the literature, this study shows a lack of
diverse models among institutions in their shared governance. The implication is that the
political environment is a primary driver of how colleges and universities share governance.

Additionally, Birnbaum (2003) related the death of shared governance or at minimum, its
suffering. Bowen and Tobin (2015) echoed those sentiments but for a different reason. They
considered the term to be vague, with a lack of agreement as to what it is, used a slogan for all
kinds of organizational efforts. However, shared governance is pervasive across the academy
(Faculty Senates on the Web, 2014) and the term is here to stay even with all its connotations
and interpretations (Bowen & Tobin, 2015). The idea of shared governance, in the past, may
have suffered from a lack of clear identity, but this is due to a lack of empirical data to help
explain it. This research provides clarity. Although additional work must be undertaken, the
implication is shared governance has specific characteristics according to political/influential model.

Second, Marginson (2010) stated institutions are more politically grounded than ever. He surmised that, consequently, shared governance would deteriorate. However, the results of this research show the political environment to have galvanized a particular type of shared governance. The implication is that faculty groups are too strong and too outspoken with too many representative forces (e.g., AAUP) to fade quietly into a political abyss (Hendrickson, 2015). Compartmentalizing governance is not effective in managing the complexity of higher education today (Bowen, 2015). Political environments create a natural diversification within institutions. Individuals belong to more than one group in an effort to participate in the political process (Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 2010), consistent with a political/influential model. This is contrary to the concept of declining or the elimination of shared governance. The very nature of the political environment encourages the involvement of campus stakeholders.

The third implication is that the lack of resources (funding) drives people to band together to build a power base for accessing resources. Over time, universities that were once considered prosperous found themselves in a position of financial constraint (Thelin, 2004). Some universities that were once state supported have become merely state located (Thelin, 2004). Between 1985 and 2000, more than 100 initiatives developed around political races were considered at the state level (McLendon & Ness, 2009). These initiatives focused on accountability, the decentralization of governance, and deregulation in an effort to improve institutional quality and efficiency (McLendon & Ness, 2009). These areas of focus drive institutions to address graduation rates, increased enrollment, and alternative means of educational delivery such as distance learning (Leach, 2008). They also forced university
administration to include additional stakeholders, such as business firms and legislators, in the governance process (Leach, 2008). This encouraged the emergence of the corporate or top-down type of governance that is prominent in business models (Sheets, Crawford, & Soars, 2012). This study shows that, instead resorting to a business model of governance, stakeholders within institutions have adopted a political/influential approach to shared governance. Perhaps a contributing factor to this finding is the dynamic between the loss of financial support from the state and increased accountability required by state legislatures and enforced through varying types of coordinating board structures. As finances have diminished, faculty accountability measures have risen (Hendrickson, 2013). Faculty must maintain the academic standards of the institution while also meeting the accountability measures put in place by the state and national governments (Hendrickson, 2013). Rather than wilt under this pressure, the results indicated that the faculty and administration have engaged in shared governance to meet these new challenges, by evolving into a more political/influential form of governance.

Based on the results of the study, a substantial difference exists between the theoretical shared governance model and the model being practiced most widely. The original model of shared governance was founded on the question: Who’s in control?
However, theory does not always match particular phenomena. In this case, the answer to the question of who is in control? has been answered. Evidence of shared governance is found in the data of the sheer number of faculty senates found by examining the Faculty Senates on the Web (2014) and the type of responses provided by this study (see figure 2). Based on the results and supporting literature, a new model is suggested, though. The question that drives how shared governance operates is framed by the question: How are limited resources distributed? The following model represents the shared governance structure of colleges and universities.

Figure 2: Political/Influential Model of Shared Governance

Shared governance is complex. The question of who is in control? has been answered. The answer is clear: faculty and administration according to shared governance primarily based on a political/influential model. Currently, the question is: How are limited resources distributed? This suggests faculty and administrators band together to build power bases to
compete for limited resources. The shared governance that emerges is a political/influential one. However, the extent of the shared governance remains unknown.

Future Research

The literature conveys a consistent theme pertaining to “shared governance”: what it means is unclear. Bowen and Tobin (2013) portray shared governance, the relationship between administration and faculty for campus decision making, as a vague concept. They further assert little agreement as to what it is. However, this may be misleading; shared governance is the relationship between organizational governance and faculty governance on campus issues. Thus, the issue is not a discrepancy as to what it is, but to what extent do faculty and administration interact to govern an institution. Jones (2011) further relates the need for greater understanding, because shared governance is complex and multifaceted. Jones calls for additional research to bring better understanding. This study sheds some light on the subject, but it has also raised several recommendations for future research.

The first area of research, although not directly tied to this study, reflects the changing environment of higher education. Higher education exists in a politically charged environment. In combination with the complexity of shared governance, the potential for future legal challenges exists. Future research should look at how the legal environment will influence shared governance.

Second, although the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument (HESGI) performed fairly well, it needs revision. The results from Cronbach’s alpha concerning faculty governance items are strong. The organizational governance items are less strong. Although this could be due to a lack of understanding by faculty senate leaders, future research should consider two directions. Initially, the HESGI can draw from a broader scope of the literature to define the
four areas of organizational governance: collegial; bureaucratic; political; and anarchical. Then, a pilot study should be conducted to help determine its utility from this broader scope. The study should be conducted among various Carnegie classifications and institutional sizes to indicate the performance of the instrument and potential differences among institutions.

A third area of research should examine shared governance differently than in this study. This study examines how faculty senate leaders view organizational governance and faculty governance. It is recommended that data be collected from campus administrative leaders as to their perspective of organizational governance. Then faculty senate leaders should provide data on faculty governance issues. A number of combinations for data collection and analyses are possible. For example:

- Administrative leaders’ views of organizational governance related to faculty senate leaders’ views of faculty governance
- Administrative leaders’ views of organizational governance and faculty governance related to faculty senate leaders’ views of faculty governance and organizational governance.

It is unknown how administration perceives both organizational governance and faculty governance. The current research provides some insights into how faculty senate leaders perceive organizational governance and faculty governance, but it should be expanded to have greater participation across the country, across stakeholders and across several organizational characteristics, such as Carnegie classifications, campus size, union and non-union campuses, and public and private institutions.

A fourth area of future research concerns the extent to which administrators and faculty share responsibilities of decision making in the political/influential model of shared governance.
The Political/Influential Model of Shared Governance above was developed based on the results of this study and the strength of literature. A critical feature of the model is that people band together in different groups (faculty and administrators) at different times to build a power base for obtaining limited resources. Moreover, across the spectrum of decision making for operations and academics, research should examine the extent to which faculty are involved in decisions pertaining to academics and operations, as well as the extent administrators are involved in decisions pertaining to operations and academics. In essence, how much shared governance is there? Hendrickson (2013) related that as finances have diminished, faculty accountability measures have risen. But, do these accountability measures relate to shared governance issues or to other politically mandated responsibilities?

Summary

Shared governance and its effectiveness continues to be a topic debated among scholars. The literature has examined governance from the perspective of organizational governance. It has also examined it from the perspective of faculty governance. However, it has not examined the relationship between the two (Jones, 2011). For the past 30 years, the literature has sustained a perception that a division of power exists between organizational governance and faculty governance. In reality, there has been a silent but powerful movement toward shared governance and the literature has been absent in revealing it. This study reveals it. This study examined the relationship between four models of organizational governance established by Birnbaum (1988) and four models of faculty senates established by Minor (2004). Data were gathered from the dissemination of the Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument. This survey instrument was developed by the researcher using descriptors from the models established by Birnbaum (1988) and Minor (2004). The data were analyzed using SPSS, the results were interpreted, and
conclusions were drawn. The research findings indicate that the majority of the institutions’ faculty senate leaders identify with a political model of organizational governance and an influential senate model. This indicates that shared governance does exist in institutions of higher education in the United States. Further research indications include restructuring the survey instrument, the inclusion of the administrative perspective, and the exploration of the extent that shared governance exists.
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Appendix A

ONLINE SURVEY CONSENT FORM

_The relationship between higher education organizational functioning and faculty senate_

You have been asked to participate in a research project studying organizational leadership and faculty governance. Please read the following. If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Michelle Williams, miwilliams@tmisd.us, 361-947-4868.

Description: The purpose of this study is to examine shared government in higher education. You were selected to be a possible participant because of your role within the faculty senate. If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey regarding organizational function and the role of the faculty senate. This study will take approximately 30 minutes.

Confidentiality: This study is confidential. The records will be kept private and the no identifiers linking you to this study will be included in any sort of report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely and only the principle investigator and the faculty advisor will have access to the records.

Risks and Benefits: The risks associated in this study are minimal, and are not greater than risks ordinarily encountered in daily life. You will receive no direct benefit for this study; however, the results of the study could be useful to institutions of higher learning, policy makers, and other educational stakeholders.
Right to Withdraw: Your participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate or to withdraw at any time without your current or future relations with Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi.

Voluntary Consent: You agree to participate in the study by completing the following survey. Participants must be 18 years of age or older. Please do not complete the survey if you do not wish to participate in this study.

This research study has been reviewed by the Research Compliance Office and/or the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. For research-related problems or questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you can contact Erin Sherman, Research Compliance Officer, at (361) 825-2497 or erin.sherman@tamucc.edu
You are being asked to participate in a national survey regarding shared governance. Your participation is crucial to the understanding of the changing nature of faculty involvement in campus governance. Your responses are confidential and are used for research purposes only. All information will be reported in aggregate form and no individual identifiers are used as part of data collection. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

The survey asks you to respond to various campus governance and faculty senate statements. Considering your role on Faculty Senate, you are asked to indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the statements on the survey. Please use the following scale in answering each item.

1 Completely Disagree (CD)
2 Strongly Disagree (SD)
3 Disagree (D)
4 Agree (A)
5 Strongly Agree (SA)
6 Completely Agree (CA)

You would respond with ‘CD’ for an item of which you Completely Disagree, ‘SD’ for one of which you Somewhat Disagree, ‘D’ for one of which you Disagree, and so on.
Please be discriminating. Your results will be more helpful if you consider each item carefully and respond thoughtfully.

Thank you for your participation

1. Faculty and administration share a relatively balance of power.
   CD  SD  D  A  SA  CA

2. The levels of governance are strictly adhered to according to an organizational chart.
   CD  SD  D  A  SA  CA

3. The president is considered to be a “first among equals.”
   CD  SD  D  A  SA  CA

4. Faculty and administrative groups operate autonomously but are interdependent.
   CD  SD  D  A  SA  CA

5. The institution is driven by autonomous actions of many individuals/subgroups according to their interests or market pressures.
   CD  SD  D  A  SA  CA

6. The relationship between superiors and subordinates relies on directives from a clear reporting structure.
7. Decisions involve a reliance on compromises or trade-offs to achieve desired results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Written job descriptions are highly important to define roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. There is an emphasis on consensus building that stresses collective responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Governance relies heavily on actions, such as coalitions building and negotiations, to achieve desired outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Processes on campus appear chaotic, but there is an underlying, guiding structure to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. An outside observer might characterize decision making as “shooting from the hip.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
13. The range of academic departments considers each other more as a community of colleagues than separate disciplines.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

14. There is a strong, systematic division of work, such as labor, rights, and responsibilities.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

15. Faculty power is related more to their expertise than other items, such as connections or relationships.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

16. Faculty subcultures are strong as faculty are likely to associate with colleagues who share disciplinary or research interests.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

17. Groups with the highest prestige have more power over internal budgets than personnel on campus.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

18. Responsibilities are directly related to specific roles.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

19. The institution is governed through egalitarian and democratic principles.
20. The institution could be described as organized anarchy.

21. The work of the faculty senate is completed through committees with specific responsibilities.

22. The faculty senate primarily exists in name only.

23. The faculty senate’s decisions are habitually influenced by small groups of trusted faculty.

24. The faculty senate promotes policy change across the institution.

25. It is nearly impossible to get things done across campus without the involvement of the faculty senate.
26. The academic community on campus challenges the authority of the faculty senate.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

27. The faculty senate usually does not meet regularly.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

28. The faculty senate has modest communication with faculty and administration across campus.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

29. There is often confrontation between the faculty senate and administration.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

30. The faculty senate serves primarily in an advisory capacity.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

31. The agenda for the faculty senate meetings are more of a product of the environment and/or in response to administration rather than faculty concerns.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

32. The faculty senate works in true collaboration with administration.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐
33. Decision making authority over academic issues frequently rests with individual colleges/schools/departments rather than with the faculty senate.

CD ☐ SD ☐ D ☐ A ☐ SA ☐ CA ☐

34. Administration often views the faculty senate as an obstacle to institutional improvement.

CD ☐ SD ☐ D ☐ A ☐ SA ☐ CA ☐

35. The faculty senate functions as an association that represents primarily faculty interests rather than a lateral partner in campus decision making.

CD ☐ SD ☐ D ☐ A ☐ SA ☐ CA ☐

36. The major role of the faculty senate is to maintain formal procedures but key decisions are usually made through select faculty in cooperation with administration.

CD ☐ SD ☐ D ☐ A ☐ SA ☐ CA ☐

37. The major role of the faculty senate is to perform latent functions that are not necessarily related to university governance.

CD ☐ SD ☐ D ☐ A ☐ SA ☐ CA ☐

38. Administration views the faculty senate as a prominent governing body.

CD ☐ SD ☐ D ☐ A ☐ SA ☐ CA ☐
39. The relationship between the faculty senate and administration is best described as cooperative but passive.

40. The major role of the faculty senate is to provide direction on a wide array of issues across campus.

41. The relationship between the faculty senate and administration is best described as skeptical or confrontational.

42. The major role of the faculty senate is to maintain the campus status quo.

43. The relationship between the faculty senate and administration is best described as cooperative.
44. The relationship between the faculty senate and administration is best described as collaborative or collegial.

CD ☐  SD ☐  D ☐  A ☐  SA ☐  CA ☐

45. Our college or university is:

☐ ☐ Private

☐ ☐ Public

46. What one academic classification best describes your college or university? *Only choose one category.*

☐ ☐ Associates

☐ ☐ Baccalaureate

☐ ☐ Master’s

☐ ☐ Doctoral/Research