DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Participation by faculty members in policy development and decision making is bound to have some impact on the governance structures and processes of an educational institution. It is not immediately clear, however, to what direction and up to what extent changes will have to be made to accomodate greater faculty participation in institutional governance.

A study of attitudes can be considered as a logical first step in understanding the various forces influencing the governance system of an educational institution. Such a study will pave the way for a deliberate intervention to develop structures and processes attuned to the desires, capabilities and limitations of the participants of governance of an educational institution, namely; administrators, faculty members, non-teaching employees and students.

The study pursued the following objectives:

1. to determine, analyze and compare the attitudes of faculty mambers and administrators toward certain aspects of university governance particularly on faculty participation in university governance, the role of faculty organizations in governance, on collective bargaining, and on the participation by students in university governance;

2. to determine the factors which imnfluence the attitudes of faculty members and administrators toward certain aspects of governance;

3. to compare the attitudes of faculty members and administrators in the two institutions selected for the study;

4. to determine the attitudes of faculty members and administrators toward each other in relation to university governance within the framework and as determined from the collegial-adversarial scale; and,

5. to offer meaningful recommendations which may be adopted by administrators, faculty members, and leaders of faculty organizations for a more participative and effective governance of private universities.

The study was mainly concerned with the problem of describing, analysing, and comparing attitudes of faculty members and administrators toward certain aspects of governance. All in all, there were twenty three operational research questions raised in the study distributed in seven research areas as follows:

1. on attitudes of faculty members toward participation by them in university governance;

2. on attitudes of administrators toward participation by faculty members in university governance;

3. on the congruence of attitudes of faculty members and attitudes of administrators toward participation by faculty members in university governance;

4. on the role of faculty organizations in university governance as perceived by faculty members and by administrators;

2

5. on the collegial-adversarial attitudes of faculty members and administrators;

6. on attitudes of faculty members and administrators toward collective bargaining;

7. on attitudes of faculty members and administrators toward participation by students in university governance.

As part of the theoretical framework, the study reviewed various gavernance models as presented by organizational theorists in their attempts to understand and explain governance processes and structures within educational institutions. Likewise, the study presented some discussions on collective bargaining as experienced in educational institutions in the United States.

The study covered faculty members and administrators of two selected catholic universities. The two universities were selected on the basis of their experiences in faculty unionism as well as parallels in the size of student population and similarities in course offerings.

In gathering data for the study, sampling surveys were conducted among the faculty members and administrators using structured questionnaires. Data were analyzed mostly with the use of parametric statistical tests particularly the analysis of variance.

In summary, the following findings came up for each of the research areas of concern:

1. **On Attitudes of Faculty Members Toward Participation by them in University Governance.**

In general, faculty respondents tended to consider faculty participation in university governance as necessary. However, variations in attitudes were observed depending upon the governance area. The areas in which faculty members desired high participation were those concerned with teaching functions and faculty rights and working conditions. On the other hand, such areas as financial affairs, and general administration received lower priority concern among the faculty members. Regarding student affairs, faculty members appeared to be more concerned with participating in the determination of policies on student discipline than with policies regulating the activities of student organizations.

Of the eleven faculty variables included in the study, the variables of academic department, educational achievement, years of service, sex, and age of faculty members appeared to have some significant relationship with attitudes of faculty members toward participation in certain governance areas.

2. **On Attitudes of Administrators Toward Participation by Faculty Members in University Governance.**

In general, administrator respondents considered faculty participation in university governance to be necessary. However, significant variations were seen in the degree of participation desired for faculty members,

depending upon the governance area being considered. Administrators tended to allow greater leeway for faculty participation in such areas as the formulation of guidelines for the development of course syllabi, defining faculty rights and duties, determination of the grading system, and policies for faculty evaluation and promotion. Less priority was given by adiministrators to faculty participation in such areas as determination of tuition fee increases, defining policies affecting working conditions of non-teaching personnel, preparing the university budget, and defining rights and duties of administrators.

Of the eight administrator variables included in the study, the variables of present position, academic achievement, teaching status, length of teaching service and age, appeared to be significant factors related to attitudes of administrators toward faculty participation in university governance.

3. On the Congruence of Attitudes of Faculty Members and Administrators toward Participation by Faculty Members in University Governance.

Statistical tests revealed that there was no significant difference between the attitude mean scores of faculty members and administrators with regard to their attitudes concerning participation by faculty members in university governance. A high correlation was also observed, indicating that faculty members and administrators had similar attitudes in terms of what governance items

5

should be given priority in allowing faculty participation in governance.

4. **On the Role of Faculty Organizations in University Governance as Perceived by Faculty Members and by Administrators.**

Of the twenty assorted faculty organization objectives presented, the respondent faculty members would like to have their faculty organizations to give priority to such items as professional development of teachers, improvement of instructional skills, and improvement of academic standards. On the other hand, they gave lower priority to the organizational objective of becoming a 'critic' of policies and actions of administration. They also gave lower priority to politically oriented objectives and to those items which belong to administrative functions.

Results of the survey also revealed that faculty members were too optimistic on the capabilities of their respective faculty organizations in university governance. In particular, faculty members of School B (non-unionized) had higher mean scores than faculty members from School A.

Administrators tended to expect faculty organizations to give importance to academic and developmental concerns. Such items as improvement of academic standards, upliftment of professional developmewnt of teachers, improvement of instructional skills, attainment of the goals and objectives of the university and

improvement of academic image were among the items administrators wished faculty organizations should give importance to.

Administrators, however, appeared to be not as enthusiastic in having faculty organizations give importance to such items as promoting rights of students, promoting rights of non-teaching personnel, improvement of work efficiency in various administrative offices, and taking up socio-political issues affecting faculty members.

There was significant positive correlation between the priority ranking given the organization obectives as perceived by administrators and faculty members. Though the computed Spearman rho was relatively high, there were significant differences if detailed comparison of mean scores were made using the t-test.

Administrators gave higher importance to such objectives as working for the attainment of goals and objectives of the university, help in coming up with institutional development plans or assisting the administration in improving financial viability and stability. On the other hand, faculty members gave significantly higher importance to such concerns as protecting teachers from administrative harassment and unjust accusations by students, and representing faculty members in the policy making bodies of the university. From the viewpoints of both faculty and administrators, academic matters and economic matters should be given higher

priority by the faculty organization.

There was some measure of agreement that administrative matters and political matters should have lower priority in the ranking of faculty organization objectives.

5. On the Collegial-Adversarial Attitudes of Faculty Members and Administrators

The overall mean score computed for the faculty indicated that faculty members had the tendency to be more adversarial than collegial toward the administrators.

Classified by school, faculty members from School A appeared to be more adversarial than faculty members from School B. This could be explained by the fact that School A had longer history of unionism than School B.

The computed mean scores of administrators revealed that administrators, as a group, were generally centrists in their attitudes toward faculty members. On the average, they could not be categorically labelled as adversarial nor collegial.

There were indications, however, that administrators may swing either to the adversarial side or to the collegial side depending upon the institution. Administrators from School B turned out to be more collegial than administrators from School A, the school with longer experience of unionism.

Inspite of less than collegial tendencies, faculty members had attitudes which may be cause for some degree of

optimism for those who adhere to the collegial model of governance. On the whole, however, faculty members considered administrators as their colleagues who share with them the same interests. They also accepted that administrators can be expected to take care of the interests of faculty members and recognize the importance of administrative supervision in improving their overall teaching performance.

On the part of administrators, they tended to accept the statement that administration will be better if faculty members were involved in the formulation of policies. They also acknowledged the professionalism of teachers in the sense that they expected faculty members to perform their functions well even with minimum supervision.

6. **On Attitudes of Faculty Members and Administrators toward Collective Bargaining**

As a whole, faculty members were highly optimistic in regard to possible effects of collective bargaining. They seemed to be more optimistic on the effects of CBA on such items as improvement in salaries, better clarification of the role of the faculty in relation to administrators, improvement of the influence of the average faculty on policy making, and improvement of communication between teachers and administrators. On the other hand, they seemed to be less optimistic that CBA can help administrators do a better job, that CBA can result in less conflict in the

governance process, or that CBA can bring about improvement in the academic image of the university.

Among the eleven selected faculty variables included in the study, the variables of sex, academic department, and length of service as teacher came out to be significant influencing factors to faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining.

School origin also turned out to be a significant variable in determining faculty attitudes toward CBA. Faculty members from School A had significantly higher mean scores than faculty members from School B.

Administrators tended to agree that CBA will bring about improvement in salaries, that it can clarify better the role of the faculty in relation to administrators and that it can improve faculty morale. They also tended to be optimistic of the possibility that CBA would promote better institutional planning and improve administrative efficiency and effectiveness. However, they were pessimistic that faculty rights can be protected better with a CBA.

Likewise, administrators seemed to be less optimistic about the effects of CBA on the academic image of the university or that they can do their work better with the adoption of a CBA. Lower optimism was also observed regarding the effects of CBA in improving teaching services or that CBA can result in less conflict in the governance process.

Of the eight administrator variables included in the survey, only the variables of present position and length of service as teacher can be considered to be important factors in influencing the attitudes of administrators toward CBA. Administrators belonging to the upper administration level were less optimitic about CBA than those representing the middle or the lower administration levels. Likewise, administrators with shorter length of service as teacher were more optimitic than those with longer years of service as teacher.

School origin turned out to be an important factor, with School A having significantly higher mean scores than faculty membvers from School B.

In general, faculty members appeared to be more optimistic on the effects of CBA on the university than the administrators.

Significant differences in attitudes were observed in the following concerns: protection of rights of teachers, maintenance/promotion of the academic image of the university, improvement of communication between faculty members and administratrors, improvement of teaching services, and building up of community spirit among the faculty, administrators and non-teaching personnel. In all the areas, administrators were less optimistic about the effects of CBA.

7. On Attitudes of Faculty Members and Administrators toward the Role of Students in University

Governance

Faculty members had positive attitudes toward student participation in governance. They tended to agree to the statement that students should have representatives in policy making bodies of the university and that administration should allow students to participate in decision making.

Overall, it was mainly on matters that affect student welfare or concerns that faculty members were willing to accept student participation to some extent. On the other hand, faculty members were less willing to recognize student influence in the control of teaching services.

Of the eleven faculty variables considered in the study, the variables of age, length of teaching service and year when last degree was earned came out to have some influence on the attitudes of faculty members toward student role in governance.

As to the variable of school origin, the statistical tests revealed that there was no significant difference in the atitudes of faculty members toward student participation in governance.

As a whole administrators showed liberal tendencies in such matters as student evaluation being given high weight in the promotion of teachers, in allowing student representatives in policy making bodies of the university,

12

in allowing students to participate in decision making, and in students having a say on the contents of the courses they enroll in. On the other hand, they showed conservative tendencies in such matters as dismissing teachers on the basis of students' complaints of incompetence, or in allowing students to have the right to know who their teacher will be before enrolling in a certain subject. They were also less inclined to allow the student government to run their affairs independent of faculty and administration or in students running their own newspaper without faculty or administration advisers.

Of the variables included in the study, only the variable of age proved to be a significant influencing factor in the attitudes of administrators toward the role of students in university governance. The results of the F-test showed that younger faculty members tended to have a more liberal outlook than older faculty members. Such variables as sex, educational attainment, present administrative position and school origin appeared not to have made any significant difference on the attitudes of administrators on student role in governance.

In general, faculty members tended to have a more liberal attitude toward student role in university governance than their administrators. A scrutiny of data revealed certain interesting variations. In those matters where the role/functions of teachers are affected, administrators seemed to be more liberal. Conversely, in

those areas where the role/functions of administrators are concerned, faculty members showed relatively more liberal tendencies.

The following recommendations were proposed with a view to maximize the potential of faculty members and their organizations in participating in university governance efficiently and affectively with due consideration to the possible emergence of a dual governance structure:

1. **System Participation Review.** This type of review involves looking into goals and objectives, a re-examination of organizational structures and governance processes, and identification of areas where faculty members/faculty organization may effectively participate including a definition of the form of participation they can effectively assume in each policy or governance area, in partnership with administrators. The process to be followed is not unlike an organizational needs assessment exercise, but with the difference that effective governance cum faculty participation will be the end result, rather than mere clarity of objectives. In other words, the review goes beyond mere identification of priority needs and objectives, but tries to identify how the faculty may participate in the governance process for the attainment of identified needs and objectives.

For the purpose of facilitating the System Participation Review, and after conducting a needs

14

assessment, a simple two-dimentional matrix is recommended. On the vertical axis shall be enumerated the policy areas or governance areas, and on the horizontal axis shall be indicated the form of participation faculty members or faculty organizations shall best assume. To be subsumed under each governance area or policy area are the results of the needs assessment exercise. For each matrix cell, effort shall be made to identify the 'structure' upon which policy development shall be carried out, taking into consideration the possible emergence of a dual structure of governance.

2.**Strengthening of the Administrative Sructure**. The emergence of a dual structure of governance notwithstanding, it is recommended that the 'administration structure' be strengthened and made more effective and efficient. This is to avoid undue ballooning of the 'bargaining structure' and to provide stability in the organization in the face of disturbances, externally or internally generated.

The 'bargaining structure' should be looked upon as a complementary, and not as a substitute structure to the 'administration' structure. Inspite of the seeming influence of faculty organizations, most of the substantive activities in the development and implementation of policies and decisions will still remain within the 'administration' structure.

3. **Development and Maintenance of a Systems-Wide Information Scheme**. Effective participation in governance is partly dependent on the quantity and quality of information

15

that participants have in their hands. Furthermore, adversarial tendencies, may be due to misinformation or to information manipulation by unscrupulous individuals. To minimize such tendencies and to encourage intelligent participation in governance, a system wide information system (SIS) can be developed, which is broader concept than management information system (MIS). The latter has for its main clientele, the managers or administrators of the institution. Its development is based on the assumption that governance is mainly a function of managers or administrators. On the other hand, the SIS has for it target users the members of the entire organization including student customers. Its development is based on the idea that governance is not only a function of administrators but participated in also by other members of the academic community.

As the study has shown, faculty members desired greater participation in a variety of policy areas. This desire should be complemented by availability of information about all aspects of university operations including fiscal matters.

4. **Review of Faculty Organization Objectives.** The study has shown that faculty members and administrators have high expectations in faculty organizations. Since these organizations have limited resources, it is advisable to review their objectives and to devote more resources to

those considered as priority concerns. It may be helpful to point out that in the study faculty members gave higher priority to development of instructional skills, to professional development and to improvement of academic standards over other objectives.

5. **Strengthening of Faculty Organizations.** The dual governance structure requires faculty organizations to be strong and be responsive to policy issues brought to its attention. A weak faculty organization will not be able to contribute maximally to the governance process. In this regard, the faculty organization is recommended to adopt an organizational structure parallel to the 'administration' structure. Should the administration opt to decentralize the organization as recommended above, then the faculty organization should make efforts to do the same. Failure to do so will put heavy pressure on the time and resources of the centrally structured faculty organization since demands for participation at the department level or college level will increase.

6. **Continual Dialogues and Joint Orientation Seminars Between Faculty Organization Officers and Adminstrators.** The study revealed that administrators of the two universities were liberal in their attitudes toward faculty participation in governance. They were not also anti-union in their sentiments. Continual dialogues and joint seminars may go a long way in developing mutual respect and understanding of each other's role in the

17

governance process, paving the way to more constructive rather than confrontational interactions.

7. **For future studies the following subjects pertinent to this work on governance are recommended:**

7.1 Parallel studies should be conducted on other types of higher education institutions, i.e. private non-sectarian schools, foundation schools, stock corporations, non-stock corporations, and government universities and colleges.

7.2 Investigate further the influence of environmental factors, leadership styles, school characteristics on attitudes of teachers and administrators toward governance.

7.3 Follow-up study on the actual decision making activities of the two universities included in this study and find out the actual roles faculty members and their representatives have assumed in such decisions.

7.4 A comprehensive comparative analysis of Collective Bargaining Agreements of representative institutions of higher learning with the main intention of finding out the effects of such agreements on the governance processes within the institutions.