A Study to Evaluate the Attitude of Faculty Members of Public Universities of Pakistan towards Shared Governance

Shakeela Shah[1][*] Sajid Yousuf Zai[2] Prof. Dr. Parveen Munshi[3] Soaib Asimiran[4]
Prof Zaidatol Akmaliah Lope Pihie[4] Shamsuddin Ahmad[4]

1. Faculty of Education, University of Sindh, Elsa Kazi Campus (old campus) Hyderabad
2. Ph.D Scholar, Educational Statistics and Research Methods, University of Arkansas, Arkansas
3. Faculty of Education, University of Sindh
4. Faculty of Educational Studies, University Putra Malaysia
E-mail of the corresponding author: shakeela.seyed@gmail.com, sayousuf@uark.edu

Abstract

This paper is based on the evaluation of the attitude of faculty members toward shared governance. Four indicators were used for share governance: role of dean, role of faculty, role of board, and role of joint decision making. Five points liker scale questionnaire of Baker-Brown was used in this study. There were 90 samples for this study from all public universities of Pakistan. Two research questions were formulated for this study. A multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) approach was used to answer research questions. SAS 9.3 software used to analyze the data. A one-way MANOVA result indicates that there is a significant difference in the perception of shared governance in all four indicators by the faculty rank group at $\alpha=0.05$ since $F(12, 219.89) = 4.68$, $p < .001$ correspondence to Wilks' $\lambda = .548$, partial eta squared = .182. Power to detect the effect was .99. There is 55% of variance for shared governance perception is accounted by faculty position. The gender group one-way MANOVA result also indicates that there is a significant difference in the perception of shared governance in all four indicators by gender group at $\alpha=0.05$ since $F(4, 85) = 5.97$, $p < .001$, correspondence to Wilks' $\lambda = .781$, partial eta squared = .182. Power to detect the effect was .99. There is 55% of variance for shared governance perception is accounted by faculty position. Follow-up tests indicates that there was a significance difference in the dean role and join decision making role indicators of shared governance according to the faculty position. There was also significance difference found in the overall MANOVA when analyzed by gender group since Wilks' $\lambda = .781$, $F(4, 85) = 5.97$, $p < .001$, partial eta squared = .219. Power to detect the effect was .98. The result shows that there was 22% of variance for shared governance perception is accounted by male and female group.

Keywords: shared governance, faculty role, university, decision making.

1. Introduction

In 2002, University Grant Commission (UGC) was replaced by Higher Education Commission, Pakistan (HEC). The main purpose of HEC is to promote research culture, accreditation, faculty professional development, ensuring quality of teaching and research, ensuring appointment and promotion criteria of vice chancellors and faculty members in the public universities in Pakistan.

In this regard, the task force was established in 2002 to review the university education system. The task force focused primarily on the function of the universities because they are the chief determinants of the quality of higher education. The report expressed serious concerns in respect of university governance. The report found bureaucratic and centralized system which hampered the governance process. The centralization of decision making functions, arising out of the colonial past of the country (Obaid, 2006). Too much of the decision making is centralized on the vice chancellor. The process of governance of the public universities was found inadequate as required for complex institutions like universities happen to be.

All major decisions are taken without significant input and participation from the educational stakeholders, such as faculty (Task force report, 2002). Public universities in Pakistan need to change governance structure to steer the institution towards shared responsibilities. This study evaluates the attitude of faculty members towards shared governance.

1.1 Shared Governance

Shared governance is the term for structures and processes that academic institutions invent to achieve effective balance between legal authority and professional authority. Both are valid for organizational control and influence. Role of professional authority is gaining tempo over time. Shared institutional governance has been a hallmark of American colleges and universities for over a generation (Tierney and Minor, 2003). In 1966 the AAUP's (American Association of University Professors) statement of Government of colleges and universities used the term "shared governance", and the term began to emerge in the literature (Lanning, 2006). The statement promoted the idea that all internal stakeholders in higher education for instance, boards, administrators, faculty, and students should take a shared responsibility and cooperative action for the academic institution. The

concept was for the first time proposed by President Henry P. Tappan of university of Michigan for faculty to enjoy sovereignty because scholars are the only workers who can build universities (Tappan 1961, p519). Because after post world war II, faculty voice became strong in educational matters other than curriculum. Therefore, the joint statement of AAUP, 1966 (American Association of University Professors), ACE (American Council of Education) and AGB (American Governing Boards) laid down two principles one participation of all institutional components and second weight of each voice be determined by reference to responsibility of each component for particular matter at hand. This move came to be known as "shared governance".

In the treatise "shared governance: a fable about the lost Kingdom," Baldridge (1982) traces out the origin of shared governance in ancient "Academy Land" where king was named First-Amount-Equals", who listened carefully to the speakers in great senate when education was worshipped and truth was watch word. With passage of time king turned monarch and bureaucratization replaced shared governance." In recent times "Community Colleges are dominated by bureaucracies and heavy-duty administrators. However, he finds that shared governance is practiced in some institutions in different forms, like constant flow of faculty members in administrative positions, departments' key link in shared governance, academic senates and students' element added to shared governance in 60s and 70s dramatically situation altered with students representation shut and faculty influence lost in governance process.

In shared governance system participation of all the constituencies is needed as requirement. They have certain shared norms, values and briefs. As such, broad based decision making produces ideas to prevail ethos, identity and mission. This way consensus is promoted for particular idea a strategy to generate plurality for multiple constituencies who work to advance the idea and ensures it success. Kezar and Eckel (2002) explore the characteristics of shared governance as the institutions operate with many unclear, competing and inconsistent goals, which can be accommodated in shared governance. Again, organization accomplishes its task through unclear processes that govern technologies. Through shared governance system they can understand those activities and produce their output. Then participation is fluid actor flow in and out of decision making opportunities, and out of the decision making opportunities.

1.2 Salient features

 a. Collaboration

Lanning (2006) finds common themes that emerge in most definitions; for example, words like collaboration, mutuality, participation, responsibility and advisory can be found as a theme in almost all the definitions. He further, says shared governance as participation by constituencies; constituencies can include the governance board, administrators, classified staff, faculty, students, employee group councils/senates, and unions.

 b. Participatory decision making

Lanning's (2006) research participants used various terms to describe their expectations and experiences for the implementation of the governance system. They define it "shared governance", participatory decision-making", "college governance", or hybrid- shared governance." In 1999, AGB (American Governing Board) issued report on shared governance, seeking include more stakeholders in governance process. Tierney, Minor, & James (2003) support faculty's role in shared governance. They argue defenders of the faculty's role in shared governance contend that faculty involvement in decision-making has positive effects on academic freedom and educational quality.

 c. Faculty involvement in decision making associated with low level of institutional performance

Brown (2000) says McCormick, and Meiners find the increased faculty control in decision-making is associated with lower levels of institutional performance. Brown further, argues that employees have at least a partial residual claimancy status in the firm and therefore have the incentive and right to participate in organizational decision-making. He supports greater faculty control over decisions concerning academic performance is associated with increased university performance; greater faculty over decisions concerning organizational management is associated with lower levels of university performance. McCormick, and Meiners (1989) also acknowledge that faculty members provide valuable assistance and advice to administrators.

 d. Sharing responsibility

According to Birnbaum (1992) shared governance is the process by which the university community respectfully shares responsibility for reaching collective decisions on matters of policy and procedure. It is as mutual recognition of the interdependence and mutual responsibilities among trustees, administration, staff, faculty and students for major institutional decision making relating to mission, budget, teaching, and research (Gayle, Tewarie, et al, 2003). It 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 institution charter (Garrison, 2010). Lanning's (2006) study finds community college administration characterizing shared governance as an ideal model of governance for college/universities, and some faculty unions, board members, and administrators have concurred.

e.   Joint participation

Onwunli and Agho (2004) state making decisions without the high degree of academic staff participation may have deleterious effects on institutional moral and on overall effectiveness. Administrative decisions are made by administrator with very limited input from academic staff members, are generally dissatisfied with the general working conditions and the university governance process. According to AAUP (1966) the notion of participatory and inclusive governance has been a desire for the academy since 1961. Shattock (2002) also considers joint consultation and joint formulation of strategy will bridge gap between lay governor's and academic community.

Looking from different angles researchers have expressed supporting views regarding shared governance Tierney and Minor's (2003) study for four year colleges and universities found shared governance strong institutional value among all campus constituencies. Brinbaum (2000) supports the system that since this system is generally accepted, any attempt to reduce role of faculty would result in negative consequences. The end of governance must support the aims and objective designed to create an institution. Aim of academic institutions is a mission not profit. It is that justified to look back ward far their mission and governance system.

2. Theoretical framework

In this paper, I have analyzed faculty members' attitude about shared governance. I have employed Ramo's (1997) four modified indicators of shared governance as theoretical framework of the study. Ramo (1997) says universities and colleges can modify basic indicators according to their institutional culture.

Ramo (1997) in his monograph identified and summarized the references in the AAUP policy documents and reports to the faculty's role in the governance and assessing shared governance at a particular institution. The ideal governance model is one in which collaboration among the various governance components is the rule. Specially faculty participation thus, college and university governance policies and structures that do not include scrupulous protections of academic are unacceptable, and must not be supported (Ramo, 1997).

2.1 Ramo's (1997) Shared governance indicators

This framework is supported by AAUP 1966 and Statements on Governance of Colleges and Universities 1978. This statement is widely used in the United States universities and colleges and is one the most reliable predicators of shared governance in academia (Ramo, 1997). These indicators are: (i) institutional communication (ii) role of governing board (iii) role of chief administrator (iv) role of faculty (v) joint responsibility/ joint decision making.

2.1.1 Institutional Communication

Reciprocal communication among the various actors in the governance of an institution is one of the most critical components of good governance (Ramo, 1997). He further states mechanisms of communication are necessary for effective sharing of decision making. For example, according to the Statement on Government, the interdependence of the governing board, faculty, administration, students, and others requires adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort. For this to be accomplished, a system of communication channels among university components should be jointly established and maintained, while the distinction between the system for communication and the system for decision making is preserved.

2.1.2 Role of Governing Board

The governing board has ultimate responsibility and authority for the management and effectiveness of the institution. Ramo (1997) says according to the Statement on Government there should be mechanism to appoint the members of the board to assure that they are properly qualified. Boards of private, as well as public institution are often criticized for their management of their institutions (Baker-Brown, 2012). Referring Henderson, Ramo (1997) says some have complained that board members don't understand higher education, and may not even be well educated themselves. The AAUP's 1966 Statement on Governance strongly suggested that board members should be highly qualified before they are allowed to serve on college or university board (Baker-Brown, 2011). While the board is the only body that can legally speak for the institution. However, board members should realize that support of the president, faculty, or students should take place with consideration of the vested interest of society in the institution. Some suggest faculty members from other institutions and young alumni should be considered for board memberships (Ramo, 1997).

2.1.3 Role of Chief Administrator

The president's chief role is leadership (Ramo, 1997). One of the main functions of the leader of any institution is to shape the culture of that institution (Baldridge, Kemerer 1976). He or she shares the responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, administrative action, and communication; and is obligated to innovate and initiate and bring about new life in the institution. Thus presidential activities are to plan, organize, direct, and represent. In these activities the president should be supported by the delegated authority of both the board the faculty (Ramo, 1997).

2.1.4 Role of Faculty
The faculty role is found most complicated in governance process. The faculty has primary responsibilities for fundamental areas such as curriculum, research, faculty status, etc. The areas in that faculty has primacy, for example, faculty responsibilities regarding faculty status include decisions related to appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, and dismissal. In those areas, faculty must be able to both adverse and favorable judgments (Ramo, 1997).

2.1.5 Joint Responsibility/ Joint Decision Making
AAUP's (1966) statement of Government of Colleges and Universities promoted the idea that all internal stakeholders in higher education for instance, boards, administrators, faculty, and students should take a shared responsibility and cooperative action for the academic institution. However, institutional decisions should be made in a way that all stakeholders get greater proportion of responsibility to participate, primarily the faculty participation in decision making is required. The framing and execution of long range plans should also be a concern of the entire academic community. Thus, institutions must create governance structures that both reflect the culture of the setting and protect the proper governance roles in the sharing of power and authority (Ramo, 1997).

3. Statement of Problem:
The current study evaluated the attitude of faculty members towards share governance. I have borrowed the instruments. I have granted permission to use them. Baker-Brown has used this instrument to evaluate the attitude of faculty towards shared governance in the Jamaican Community college system, USA. Her study shows that faculty has positive attitude about shared governance. I used some part of her instrument in Pakistan's university context to evaluate Pakistani universities' system and see what faculty perception about shared governance is.

4. Research question
1. Is there any difference in the perception of four indicators of shared governance in faculty ranks?
2. Is there any difference in the perception of four indicators of shared governance in gender?

5. Methodology
5.1 Instrument
A five points likert scale questionnaire was used to collect data from faculty members (lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor). There were 42 items mainly categorized by formal communication, information communication, board role, dean role, faculty role, and join decision making.

5.2 Procedure
The questionnaire was revised according to the need of this research paper. The questionnaire was distributed to faculty members of 35 universities in Pakistan. Data was collected through email and personal meeting. Once the filled questionnaire received the researcher sorted out the forms. The data was analyzed using SAS 9.3.

5.3 Population
Teaching staff of all public universities are the population of this study.

5.4 Sample
Questionnaire was filled by 120 teachers of 35 public universities.

5.5 Variables:
5.5.1 Dependent variables: 4 dependent variable, attitude scale value of board role, dean role, faculty role, and join decision making.

5.5.2 Independent variables:
1. designation groups (4 levels: lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor)
2. experience groups (5 levels: levels lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor)
3. Gender group (2 levels: male and female)

5.6 Data analyses technique
Data was analyzed by univariant and multivariate (k group MANOVA) approaches. Two difference MANOVA test were used to answer the research questions. The data was analyzed by rank order to find the significance difference among the perceptions of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and lecturer in share governance. The data was also analyzed by gender to find the significance difference between the male and female perception in share governance.

6. Results
The descriptive statistics of four domains of shared governance according to faculty rank is reported in Table 1. A one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect at $\alpha=0.05$ by the faculty rank group since

Wilks' λ = .548, F (12, 219.89) = 4.68, p <. 001, partial eta squared = .182. Power to detect the effect was .99. There is 55% of variance for shared governance perception is accounted by rank group.

Given the significance of the overall test at 0.05 level, the univariate main effects were examined according to the faculty rank at alpha level 0.0125. There was a significance main effect in dean role by the perception of all four faculty ranks, F (3, 86) = 17.07, p <001, partial eta square =.373 power = 1.00; there was also difference in the perception of joint decision domain of shared governance found according to the faculty ranks F (3, 86) = 4.52, p <.005, partial eta square =.136 power = 0.87. There was no significance difference found in the perception of shared governance in board and faculty role.

The Dunnett T3 statistical procedure was used for pairwise comparison. Significant mean differences in shared governance of board role were obtained at alpha 0.006 between professor (N=13, M=3, SD=1.15) and lecturer (N=41, M=4.41, SD=0.50) and between associate professor (N=16, M=3.25, SD=1.00) and lecturer (N=41, M=4.41, SD=0.50).

Another one-way MANOVA approach was used for gender group to find the significance difference between the perception of male and female faculty staff about the four domains of shared governance.

The descriptive statistics of four domains of shared governance according to the gender groups is reported in Table 2. There was significance difference found in the overall MANOVA test by gender group since Wilks' λ = .781, F (4, 85) = 5.97, p <. 001, partial eta squared = .219. Power to detect the effect was .98. There was 22% of variance for shared governance perception is accounted by male and female group.

Follow-up test were assessed by univariate approach at alpha 0.012. There was a significant main effect found in the share governance perception about dean role between male and female groups, F (1, 88) = 17.83, p <.001, partial eta square =.17; there was also difference in the perception of joint decision domain of shared governance found according to the gender group, F (1, 88) = 8.37, p <.005, partial eta square =.09. There was no significance difference found in the perception of shared governance in board and faculty role by gender group.

7. Discussion

These findings are similar to Baker Brown (2012)' research that there is significance difference in attitude about shared governance by faculty ranks. The current study also revealed that there is significance difference in the attitude towards shared governance by faculty position. Pakistani public universities have mainly four ranks for faculty position: lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Another factor were used in this study to analyze the attitude of faculty towards share governance by gender group and It was found that male and female faculty members have difference attitude towards share governance. This study further showed that there is significance difference in the perception of professor and lecturer rank. It is true because in most of the decision making process in university the lecturers are not taken on board even within faculty and departments higher rank officers ignore the recommendations of lecturers.

There is a need of coordination among faculty members within department and intra departments. The administration collaboration is necessary which would enhance the productivity of the educational institution. Educational institute works effective when higher authority governs institution through systematic model. All members of faculty should be on board before making any policy or strategy. Without taking academic fellows in decision, the satisfactory implementation cannot be ensured.

References

Baldridge, J.V., & Kemerer, F. (1976). Academic senates and faculty collective bargaining. *Journal of Higher Education, 47*(4).

Baldridge, J. V. (1982). Shared governance: A fable about the lost magic kingdom. Academe, 68(1), 12-15.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). How Academic Leadership Works: Understanding Success and Failure in the College Presidency: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, W. O. (2000). Faculty participation in university governance and the effects on university performance. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 44*(2), 129-143.

Clover, B. Brown (2012). An analysis of the shared governance practices in the Jamaican community college system: Faculty perspectives. NY: BiblioLabsII, 2012. Print.

Garrison, M.S. (2010). Models of academic governance and institutional power in Southern Baptist related liberal arts colleges and universities. Ph.D. Unpublished dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, United States -- Kentucky.

Gayle, D. J., Tewarie, B., & White Jr, A. Q. (2003). Governance in the Twenty-First-Century University: Approaches to Effective Leadership and Strategic Management. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series: Wiley Subscription Services, Inc., A Wiley Company, Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education:

Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *The Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(4), 435-460.

Lanning, Patrick M. (2006). The implementation year of shared governance at a Vanguard community college. Ed.D. Unpublished dissertation, Oregon State University, United States -- Oregon.

McCormick, R. E., & Meiners, R. E. (1989). University governance: A property rights perspective. *JL & Econ., 31*, 423.

Obaiz, Z. (2006). Reforming political universities: An organizational analysis of university of Peshawar. (Master's thesis).

Onwunli, A. U., & Agho, A. O. (2004). Faculty opinion on shared authority: A Nigerian national survey. Higher Education, 48(4), 397-418.

Ramo, K. J. (1997). Reforming shared governance: Do the arguments hold up? Academe, 83(5), 38–43.

Ramo, K.J. (1998). Assessing the faculty's role in shared governance: Implications of AAUP standards. Washington, DC: AAUP (American Association of University Professors).

Shattock, M. (2002). "Re–Balancing Modern Concepts of University Governance." Higher Education Quarterly 56(3): 235-244.

Tierney, W. G., & Minor, J. T. (2003). *Challenges for governance: A national report* (ERIC Report ED482060). Retrieved March 10, 2008, from http://www.usc.edu/dept/chepa/documents/publications/gov_monograph03.pdf

Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (1). (1966). Retrieved from Standing Committee and Subcommittee Reports website: http://www.aaup.org/report/1966-statement-government-colleges-and-universities.

Task Force on Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan. (2002). www.hec.gov.pk/mediapublication/HECpublication/documents

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of four dependent variables by faculty rank groups

Faculty Rank		Dean role	Board role	Faculty role	Joint decision
Professor	Mean	3.00	3.31	4.54	4.08
	N	13	13	13	13
	SD	1.15	1.03	.52	1.04
Associate Professor	Mean	3.25	3.25	4.06	4.44
	N	16	16	16	16
	SD	1.00	1.13	.93	.5125
Assistant Professor	Mean	4.25	2.95	4.30	4.65
	N	20	20	20	20
	SD	.71	1.32	.92	.49
Lecturer	Mean	4.42	3.32	4.12	4.73
	N	41	41	41	41
	SD	.50	1.25	.90	.45
Total	Mean	3.97	3.22	4.21	4.57
	N	90	90	90	90
	SD	.95	1.21	.87	.62

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of four dependent variables by gender groups

Gender		Dean role	Board role	Faculty role	Joint decision
Male	Mean	3.64	3.09	4.23	4.42
	N	53	53	53	53
	SD	1.06	1.24	.89	.69
Female	Mean	4.43	3.40	4.19	4.78
	N	37	37	37	37
	SD	.50	1.14	.85	.417
Total	Mean	3.97	3.22	4.21	4.57
	N	90	90	90	90
	SD	.95	1.21	.87	.619

Table 3

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) table for faculty rank groups

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Rank	Pillai's Trace	.498	4.227	12.000	255.000	.000	.166	1.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.548	4.675	12.000	219.889	.000	.182	.999
	Hotelling's Trace	.742	5.048	12.000	245.000	.000	.198	1.000
	Roy's Largest Root	.612	13.007[c]	4.000	85.000	.000	.380	1.000

Table 4

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) table for gender groups

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Gender	Pillai's Trace	.219	5.970	4.000	85.000	.000	.219	.981
	Wilks' Lambda	.781	5.970	4.000	85.000	.000	.219	.981
	Hotelling's Trace	.281	5.970	4.000	85.000	.000	.219	.981
	Roy's Largest Root	.281	5.970	4.000	85.000	.000	.219	.981