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Faculty participation in university governance is an accepted norm in American higher education. Nurse educators' participation in university governance provides opportunities to exert influence in organizational matters in order to maintain quality programs and serve the needs of society. The purpose of this descriptive study was to identify nurse educators' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance. A Faculty Participation Survey and Personal Data Questionnaire were completed by 401 nurse educators employed as full-time faculty in 13 Category I and 37 Category II institutions offering baccalaureate or higher degree nursing programs located within the Southern Regional Education Board. Data analysis techniques included descriptive statistics, principal components analysis, t-tests, and one way analyses of variance.

Nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance were reduced to eight factors. Respondents held no strong opinions about
the factors underlying their perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance. No statistical differences were found in nurse educators' perceptions according to the factors when institutional category was considered. Statistical significance (p < .05) was found for Factor 2: Participation when age and tenure status were considered; Factor 7: Motivations when age was considered; and Factor 8: Groups when academic rank was considered.

Implications for nursing education and research were generated. Recommendations included further testing of the eight factors identified in this study using different data gathering instruments and methodologies, using national samples of nursing faculty subjects, particularly within one institutional category, and controlling for institutional variables such as organizational structure and administrative leadership styles. Additional recommendations were to investigate differences between nurse educators' and administrations' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance and between nurse educators' perceptions and those of faculty in other disciplines; to compare actual versus perceived levels of participation in university governance; and to identify other factors which enhance or impede nurse educators' participation in university governance.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Faculty participation in university governance has been an accepted norm in American higher education since 1919. However, as a result of changing student demographics, budgetary constraints, increased emphasis on accountability, and an increasingly business-like administrative hierarchy, the role of faculty as a participant in university governance is changing. Furthermore, it has been reported that faculty in some types of institutions are less likely to participate than in some others (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1978; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989; Clark, 1987) and the actual level of involvement has declined since the 1980s (Baldridge, 1982; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Keller, 1983; Strohm, 1981).

In higher education, freedom and autonomy are achieved through shared authority and informal consensual decision-making between administrators and faculty (Kritek, 1985). Participation in governance by faculty is not only desirable from a professional perspective, but participation in decision-making may also have a positive effect on institutional functioning, including faculty
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morale and productivity (Bahrawy, 1984; Floyd, 1985; Powers & Powers, 1983). According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989), "the involvement of faculty in the governance process is essential to the development of an effective learning community" (p. 129).

Faculty participation in university governance is generally accomplished through the institution's governance structures. University governance structures include departments, schools or colleges, standing or ad hoc committees, and academic or faculty senates. A variety of governance structures are found in colleges and universities as an attempt to respond to the institutional needs for better information flow and better coordination (Bess, 1988).

Faculty senates are generally considered to be the normative organizational structure through which faculty exercise their role in governance at the institutional level (Birnbaum, 1989). The senate, focusing on concerns related to the status of faculty in general ways, should "serve as the conscience of the campus community" (Baldridge, 1982, p. 15). It is at the institutional level where wider policies related to tenure, promotion, academic freedom, program termination, financial exigency, resource allocation, and other such matters are formulated. "Paradoxically, issues such as these have an indelible impact on individual faculty members and individual departments, but they are decided elsewhere, often by
faculty senates and their various committees" (Williams, Gore, Broches, & Lostoski, 1987, p. 631).

The academic role requires the integration of multiple job expectations related to the three components of the university mission--research, teaching, and service. Personal factors, such as gender and age, may also influence perceptions and participation in university governance. Given the multiple academic expectations, faculty participation in university governance becomes a matter of choice (Williams et al., 1987).

Between 1975 and 1985, faculty and administrative interest in university governance waned (Birnbaum, 1991). According to Birnbaum, the decline in interest was "... probably less an indication that the questions had been satisfactorily resolved than an indication that other problems had become more pressing. ..." (p. 1). The focus of academe shifted, and little attention was paid to the decision-making process. During this same time period, the faculty role and degree of influence in governance processes were reported to have decreased (Alpert, 1985; Baldridge, 1982; Clark, 1985, 1987). Several authors reported faculty dissatisfaction with overall institutional management and effectiveness, as well as with the quality, quantity, and outcome of faculty involvement in governance processes (Birnbaum; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989; Lee, 1991).

It has been reported that participation in university governance was once more becoming a focus of attention
(Birnbaum, 1991; Gilmour, 1991). Faculty, administrators, and trustees have begun, once again, to examine their roles in academic decision-making and to question the structures and processes through which they interact and influence each other (Birnbaum). Birnbaum related this renewed interest to several factors: (a) the cyclical nature of institutional issues, (b) declining enrollments, (c) diminished financial resources, (d) increased involvement of state offices in institutional affairs, and (e) to "an endemic tension between faculty and administrators that ensures that periodically at least one of the major governance constituencies will articulate dissatisfaction with existing structures or processes" (p. 21).

Schools of nursing are well established in colleges and universities, and because of their academic appointments, the faculty are a part of the university governance structure. As faculty members, nurse educators are entitled, if they so choose, to actively participate in university governance. Active participation by nursing faculty in university governance facilitates broader interaction, acquisition of the traditional values of the community of scholars, and development of political skills needed to serve as a voice for nursing with other disciplines. In addition, active participation in university governance provides opportunities to influence decisions related to financial and academic matters in order to maintain quality programs, control expenditures, and serve the needs of society; and for the expression of
professional autonomy which is essential to the maturation of the discipline within university settings (Fagin, 1990; Kritek, 1985). Participation in university governance is essential if nurse educators are to be fully recognized as academicians in a discipline with a legitimate place in the university (Conway & Glass, 1978; Mullane, 1977).

Despite the many professional and academic benefits of participating in university governance, some authors have indicated that faculty in collegiate schools of nursing are less likely than their non-nursing colleagues to participate in governance activities (Redman & Barley, 1978). Reasons for this are unknown, but may be influenced by the multiple professional role expectations of a practitioner in addition to those of the educator in an academic setting. Nurses must demonstrate competence in a variety of time-consuming and professional-demanding activities in both the community of scholars and the community of practitioners. The fact that most nurse educators are women may affect their participation in university governance. Women tend to be in lower ranks and temporary positions, be paid less, receive tenure at lower rates, and be underrepresented in executive and administrative positions (Maitland, 1990). As women, nurses are often subjected to family constraints, and conflicts may occur among the demands of the professional and personal commitments (Mauksch, 1982). Furthermore, it has been reported that faculty in schools of nursing not only seem to have difficulty internalizing the concepts of
collegiality (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Beyer & Marshall, 1981; Thompson, 1990), but, due to numerous impediments, they also are said to participate at a minimum level in governance or decision-making processes for policy formulation in schools of nursing (Bahrawy, 1984; Redman & Barley, 1978). The bureaucratic model of governance, a typical decision-making pattern found in schools of nursing, is considered to be antagonistic to the concept of shared authority and faculty participation in university governance (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Hegyvary, 1990; Jacox, 1976; Matejski, 1981; Williamson, 1972). Other organizational characteristics that may have influenced perceptions and participation by nursing faculty include increasing size and complexity of schools of nursing and the influence of external agencies such as federal, state, and professional organizations (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Matejski, 1981; Mortimer & McConnell, 1978). Although many situational factors may impede nurse educators' participation in university governance, nurse educators are in a strategic position to participate, if they choose, in the decision-making process at the department/school of nursing or college/university levels where crucial personnel, academic, and financial decisions are made.

Faculty participation in university governance may be related not only to organizational, professional, and personal factors, but to faculty perceptions of university
governance as well (Bahrawy, 1984). Information about nurse educators' perceptions of university governance is needed to determine factors that may influence nurse educators' actual participation in university governance.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to identify nurse educators' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance.

**Organizing Framework**

The research of Williams et al. (1987), which focused on examining the perspectives faculty hold toward governance, served as the organizing framework for this study. A major assumption of their study was that faculty who avoid any involvement over time in governance hold different perspectives toward this activity than those who are actively involved. Williams et al.'s study appeared to be based on the concepts of role expectations, faculty priorities, and faculty participation in governance.

Primary role expectations of faculty members were defined as: teaching and ancillary activities with students; research and scholarship activities; and activities connected with the institutional public service function (Williams et al., 1987). Faculty participation in governance was described as faculty service on administrative and advisory committees. An assumption of the study was that faculty participation in governance was a matter of individual choice. It was inferred that faculty priorities for fulfilling role expectations were
established by faculty based on individual consideration of role expectations and other influencing factors, such as tenure status, teaching schedules, and discipline requirements.

For the purposes of this study, concepts chosen for the organizing framework were faculty governance role expectations and perceptions. Using these two concepts, the organizing framework for this study was diagrammed as:

\[
\text{FACULTY GOVERNANCE} \quad + \quad \text{FACULTY EXPECTATIONS} \quad = \quad \text{IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE PERCEPTIONS}
\]

**Organizing Concepts Defined**

**Role expectations.** Biddle and Thomas (1966) defined role as a set of prescriptions that described what the behaviors of a position member should be. Hardy and Conway (1988) defined role expectations more specifically as the "position-specific norms that identify the attitudes, behaviors, and cognitions required and anticipated for a role occupant" (p. 165).

The role of a faculty member is a complex one composed of numerous components. Historically, the triad of goals of higher education linked to teaching, research, and service have provided the basis for expected role performance of a faculty member.

Given the expectation that nursing faculty are also practitioners, nursing faculty have additional role expectations. Mauksch (1982) described the components of
the role of nursing faculty member as being divided into three categories:

1. Principal or primary roles: teaching, researcher, clinician, mentor-counselor, consultant.
2. Peripheral role components: campus citizen, community person, member of the profession.
3. Personal-competitive role components: member of a family, guardian or personal health and perceiver of personal needs, pursuer of personal career goals. (p. 8)

In this study, role expectations referred to teaching, research, and scholarly activities, institutional service, and service to the community and to the profession.

Perception. Helson’s (1964) conceptual framework of an individual’s general adaptation level stated that the general adaptation level was a geometric mean of all situations within a person’s experience or all stimuli influencing a person. According to Helson, the concept of perception played a role in the individual’s adaptation level. Perception has been traditionally regarded as consisting of sensory components, aroused directly by energies that stimulate receptors, and nonsensory components supplied by past experience or imagination. Helson also stated that perception was affected by needs, values, and attitudes; by activities such as taking account or not taking account of cues; and by special analytic processes. Perception was differentiated from thinking by:

1. a reaction to "what is" as opposed to thinking which dealt with contingencies and possibilities;
2. a concern with here-now presentations whereas thinking was concerned with past, present, or future and was symbolic;
3. a concern with the "real" as opposed to thinking which may be concerned with "real" or "imaginary"; and
4. being supplemented by cognition whereas thinking returned to perception for validation. (Helson, p. 459)

In this study, perceptions referred to the subject’s level of agreement or disagreement with statements regarding university governance.

**Research Questions**

The following questions directed this investigation:

1. What are the personal characteristics of nurse educators in Category I and Category II institutions?

2. What are the perceptions of nurse educators regarding faculty participation in university governance?

3. What factors underlie nurse educators’ perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance?

4. Is there a difference between nurse educators’ perceptions according to the factors regarding faculty participation in university governance when institutional category is considered?

**Hypothesis**

The statistical hypothesis which related to research question four was: There is no statistically significant difference between perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors of nurse educators employed in Category I institutions and perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors of nurse educators employed in Category II institutions.
Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definition of terms were used:

University Governance - the institutional decision-making structures and processes applied by university constituent groups to issues related to educational and administrative policy, long-range planning, allocation of resources, and determination of faculty status (American Association of University Professors, 1966; Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973; Council of Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs, 1989b).

Faculty Participation - involvement of a faculty member in the institutional decision-making structures and processes applied to issues related to educational and administrative policy, long-range planning, allocation of resources, and determination of faculty status. Faculty involvement could have been either formally through membership on standing or ad hoc committees/councils/task forces at the department/school of nursing or college/university level; or informally through department/school of nursing faculty meetings. For the purposes of this study, quantitative measurement of faculty participation in university governance was based on self-reports of standing committee involvement either as a member or chair, within the school of nursing and/or college or university within the past 2 years.
Perceptions - scores on the Faculty Participation Survey, indicating degree of agreement or disagreement with individual statements about university governance.

Factors - empirically generated categories of shared cognition determined by applying principal components analysis to the nurse educators' perceptions about faculty participation in university governance.

Nurse Educator - a registered nurse employed prior to the beginning of the 1990-91 academic year as a full-time faculty member in the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, exclusive of deans, department chairs, and/or program directors, in a National League for Nursing accredited baccalaureate or master's nursing program, and/or doctoral degree nursing program located in an institution of higher education in the south.

Personal Characteristics - nurse educators' responses on the Personal Data Questionnaire.

Institutional Category - one of two categories of educational institutions based on the degrees offered and the comprehensiveness of the institutions' missions (modification of the 1987 Carnegie Classification System, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987). Category definitions were as follows:

A. Category I - included Research Universities I and II, and Doctorate-Granting Universities I and II. This category included institutions which offered a full range of baccalaureate programs and were committed to graduate education through the
doctorate degree. A high priority was given to research, particularly in the Research Universities I and II. The institutions annually awarded 20 or more doctorate degrees in at least one discipline or 10 or more doctorate degrees in three or more disciplines.

B. Category II - included Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I and II, as well as Liberal Arts Colleges I and II. This category included institutions which primarily offered baccalaureate programs. Institutions with enrollments of at least 2,500 students also offered graduate education through the master’s degree. Institutions which awarded more than half of their baccalaureate degrees in two or more occupational or professional disciplines as well as undergraduate colleges which awarded degrees primarily in the art and science fields or more than half their degrees in the liberal arts fields were included in this category.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for the purposes of this study:

1. Nurse educators have a right and a responsibility to participate in university governance.

2. Nurse educators have the expertise and knowledge necessary for participation in institutional decision-making.
3. Faculty participation in university governance enhances the quality of institutional decisions.

4. The Faculty Participation Survey measures perceptions of faculty participation in university governance.

**Significance**

While university governance, faculty participation, and related concepts have been frequently studied phenomena in other disciplines, very few studies have investigated nurse educators' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance. The significance of this study is its contribution to the knowledge base about nurse educators' perceptions of nursing faculty participation in university governance. Knowledge about nurse educators' perceptions has significant implications for the nursing profession, the role of nursing faculty in colleges and universities, and the future of schools of nursing in institutions of higher education.

**Summary**

Faculty participation in university governance has been an accepted norm in American higher education for the past 25 years. As a result of changing student demographics, budgetary constraints, increased emphasis on accountability, and an increasingly business-like administrative hierarchy, the role of faculty as a participant in university governance is changing.

Support for nurse educators' participation in university governance is well documented (Council of
Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs, 1989a; Fagin, 1990; Hegyvary, 1990; Kritek, 1985). However, multiple factors may influence the nurse educators’ perceptions and participation in university governance. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, the faculty role and degree of influence in governance processes were reported to have decreased (Alpert, 1985; Baldridge, 1982; Clark, 1985, 1987). It has been reported that faculty participation in university governance is facilitated by the perceptions one holds of university governance (Bahrawy, 1984; Williams et al., 1987). There is a scarcity of research related to nurse educators’ perceptions related to faculty participation in university governance. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to measure nurse educators’ perceptions of faculty participation in university governance.

In this chapter, the organizing framework was discussed and the four research questions related to nurse educators’ perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance were proposed. Concepts and terms relevant to the study were defined and assumptions of the study were identified.

In Chapter II the pertinent literature and research on governance of colleges and universities is reviewed. The chapter also includes a discussion of factors which may impede nurse educators’ participation in university governance and a review of research of variables related to nurse educators’ participation in university governance.
The methodology is discussed in Chapter III. Chapter IV presents the analysis of data and discussion of the findings. Chapter V presents a summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations related to the research findings.
CHAPTER II
Review of Related Literature and Research

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature related to faculty participation in university governance. The review of literature is reported in two main sections: (a) university governance, and (b) nursing faculty governance. Under university governance, discussions about faculty participation in university governance and research related to university governance are reported. A review of factors impeding nurse educators' participation in university governance and a review of research related to nurse educators' participation in university governance are presented in the section on nursing faculty governance.

University Governance

Governance in colleges and universities has been a well known and widely used form of participative decision-making that has been used in many sectors of the business world (Bess, 1988). Millett (1980) defined governance as the act of deciding what to do and how to do it within an organization. Professional organizations have defined university governance as the institutional decision-making structures and processes applied by academic constituent groups to issues related to educational and administrative
policy, long-range planning, allocation of resources, and determination of faculty status (American Association of University Professors, 1966; Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973; Council of Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs, 1989b).

Faculty Participation in University Governance

Collegial theories of university governance emphasized autonomy, decision-making, and the desire for self-direction in one's work. As faculty, individuals are members of an academic profession. Historically, faculty have been virtually autonomous and independent in academic work which included basic control of curriculum, internal governance of the university, and requirements for academic degrees, as well as establishing and maintaining standards of excellence and evaluating peers (Altbach, 1979; Altbach & Berdahl, 1981; Dill, 1982; Hegyvary, 1990; Platt & Parsons, 1970). More specifically, professional autonomy meant the ability of the individual to decide work patterns, to actively participate in major academic decisions, to have work evaluated by professional peers, and to be relatively free of bureaucratic regulations and restrictions (Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1973; Grandjean, Bonjean, & Aiken, 1982). In higher education, freedom and autonomy have been achieved through shared authority in informal consensual decision-making between administrators and faculty (Kritek, 1985; Millet, 1980; Mortimer & McConnell, 1978).
Participation in governance by faculty has not only been desirable from a professional perspective, but it has also been suggested that participation in decision-making had a positive effect on institutional functioning (Floyd, 1985; Powers & Powers, 1983). According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989), "the involvement of faculty in the governance process is essential to the development of an effective learning community" (p. 129). Rationale for faculty participation in decision-making rested on reasoning drawn from organizational theory which related employees' participation in certain types of decision-making with job satisfaction and job satisfaction with work productivity. Participation in decision-making improved motivation, performance, and satisfaction, while it reduced resistance to change (Powers & Powers; Strauss, 1978; Yukl, 1981). A sense of participation in decision-making by the individual professional was an aspect of satisfaction which contributed to the success of an organization (Heilman & Hornstein, 1982).

Faculty participation in university governance has generally been accomplished through the institution's governance structures. University governance structures included departments, schools or colleges, standing or ad hoc committees, and academic or faculty senates. The variety of governance structures in colleges and universities are attempts to respond to the institutional
needs for better information flow and better coordination (Bess, 1988).

Academic departments served as the primary mechanism for faculty participation in university governance and as key structural links in governance processes, especially in large complex institutions (Baldrige, 1982; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989; Clark, 1987; Epstein, 1974; Floyd, 1985; Kritek, 1985; Platt & Parsons, 1970). Although constrained by higher-level decisions and directives, a great deal of educational decision-making has taken place in academic departments. Critical issues including curriculum; student relations; and faculty hiring, firing, and promoting have been handled by department faculty (Baldrige & Kemerer, 1976).

At the academic department level, participation in governance activity assured professional autonomy (Epstein, 1974; Kritek, 1985), and provided opportunities for faculty to function together as professional peers to achieve mutual purposes. Decision-making activities required knowledge of such political and managerial skills of negotiation, bargaining, and influence. Faculty with such skills have been better equipped to become an integral part of the higher-level governance structure, where they could represent the department’s interests in the institutional political processes.

Faculty senates are generally considered to have been the normative organizational structure through which faculty exercise their role in governance at the
institutional level (Birnbaum, 1989). The senate, focusing on concerns related to the status of faculty in general ways, should "serve as the conscience of the campus community" (Baldridge, 1982, p. 15). It has been at the institutional level where wider policies related to tenure, promotion, academic freedom, program termination, financial exigency, resource allocation, and other such matters are formulated. "Paradoxically, issues such as these have an indelible impact on individual faculty members and individual departments, but they are decided elsewhere, often by faculty senates and their various committees" (Williams et al., 1987, p. 632).

Pervasive environmental changes have confronted higher education in the past decade. The 1980s was a period dominated by declining enrollments, periods of financial stress, changing student demographics, and increased control and demands for accountability by external agencies. Projections for the 1990s included a continuation of budget deficits, along with a diminishing pool of graduating high school seniors to support new and existing university programs (Koerner & LaRochelle, 1989). Thus, there has also been a threat of faculty lay-offs due to financial exigency.

To maintain and improve academic programs under conditions of declining enrollment, spiraling cost, and continued economic uncertainty, difficult and severe decisions must be made. University administrators often found it difficult to exercise shared authority and have
reacted to these forces by centralizing decision-making authority (Kemerer & Baldridge, 1981). However, Kemerer and Baldridge stated that broad consultation is essential to adjust the institution to the changing environment.

The university's organizational structure appears to becoming more and more like a corporation with high level managers in a typical bureaucratic-type hierarchy, replacing self-direction and self-governance (Baldridge, 1982; Fuhrman, 1987; Hegyvary, 1990; McDonald, 1987; Rehder, 1979). To maintain their role in governance, faculty on many campuses have responded to the increased centralization by engaging in collective bargaining, which in itself has a centralizing effect (Baldridge; Rehder).

The faculty role and degree of influence in governance processes were reported to have decreased since the late 1970s (Alpert, 1985; Baldridge, 1982; Clark, 1985, 1987). In addition, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989), reported a great diversity in the extent of faculty participation in decision-making with the size of the institution largely determining the nature and extent of faculty involvement.

University Governance Research

In the past 2 decades, research on governance has been subjected to a multiplicity of designs, models, and treatments. Research designs have been characterized by diversity in the variables studied, data collection methods, and subject selection. Much of the research on decision-making in higher education appeared to have been
guided primarily by experiences that occurred at specific colleges and universities. From the empirical perspective, descriptive case studies and surveys have predominated. Theoretical treatments include typological treatments, social-psychological analysis, organizational theory, sociology, and political science (Mortimer, Gunne, & Leslie, 1976).

A major investigation of faculty participation in governance was reported by Dykes in 1968. Dykes interviewed 106 faculty (20%) of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at a large midwestern university. The investigation dealt with faculty's conception of its proper role in academic decision-making, the degree to which faculty were satisfied with its actual role, the reasons for faculty participation in academic decision-making, the impediments to faculty participation, and the means by which participation took place.

Findings showed that faculty claimed a determining role in decisions about academic affairs and personnel affairs, but little involvement in other matters (Dykes, 1968). The most significant finding was the ambivalence in faculty attitude toward participation. Faculty indicated that they should have an active and influential role in decisions, but at the same time they were reluctant to assume the burden of participation. A discrepancy was found between what the faculty perceived its role in decision-making to be and what its role was in reality. The discrepancy was attributed to the desire for a larger,
more active and influential role in the decision-making process. Serious misconceptions seemed to exist between the processes through which decisions were made and the role of the faculty in them.

The majority of the faculty were dissatisfied with their role in participation (Dykes, 1968). Lack of information and decisions made without faculty consultation were the most important sources of dissatisfaction.

Motivation for participation was related to a sense of duty and self-interest (Dykes, 1968). Major impediments to participation were thought to be related to increased emphasis on research, professionalism, and the growth in size and complexity of the institution (Dykes).

Dykes (1968) reported that departmental meetings were rated highest in usefulness in providing for faculty participation in the decision-making processes. Examination of the committee system related the presence of faculty oligarchies and constraints imposed on junior faculty.

The study demonstrated that tension between administrators and faculty seemed to be determined by the faculty belief that any increase in administrative influence must result in a reduction of faculty influence (Dykes, 1968). Dykes stated that faculty seemed to believe that administrators had more power and influence than they actually possessed and faculty were not aware of the pressures exercised by external constraints.
In 1973, Baldridge et al. reported results of research designed to determine if size, complexity, and bureaucratization of institutions would enhance or undermine academic autonomy. Data were gathered from a random sample of 241 academic institutions in the United States. Sources of data included commercially prepared compilation of statistics on higher education, college catalogs, an institutional questionnaire completed by central administration, and individual questionnaires completed by a sample of faculty members and administrators at each institution.

Baldridge et al. (1973) defined professional autonomy as the ability of professionals to decide work patterns, to actively participate in major academic decision-making, to have work evaluated by professional peers, and to be relatively free of bureaucratic regulations and restrictions. Four distinct patterns of professional autonomy and faculty power were examined: (a) peer evaluation, (b) departmental autonomy, (c) freedom from administrative work regulations, and (d) overall decision decentralization.

Research findings strongly indicated that small colleges did not necessarily promote academic freedom (Baldridge et al., 1973). The results also indicated that large, complex institutions may have more professional autonomy, fewer bureaucratic constraints, more individual influence for the academic professional, and greater freedom for disciplinary departments. Baldridge et al.
noted that increased size of an institution was almost always related to more complex tasks which, in turn, required more highly trained experts who demanded and received more autonomy. The investigators concluded that increased differentiation into subunits seen in larger institutions provided some explanation for the positive effect on autonomy (Baldridge et al.). The authors noted that the larger college or university may provide members with more opportunities to participate in academic decision-making and to preserve a high degree of specialized autonomy.

Baldridge and Kemerer (1976) reported the results of a project to ascertain if collective bargaining would increase the effectiveness of campus governance. Questionnaires were sent to a random sample of college presidents, to every college president with a faculty union, and to every faculty member who was a chairperson of a union in the United States. Case studies and interviews supplemented the survey data.

Survey results indicated that in the institutions studied, unions and senates existed under a dual-track model with each having a separate area of influence (Baldridge & Kemerer, 1976). Both presidents and chairpersons responded that senates had their greatest influence in academic areas, while economic matters were the province of unions. In addition, an overwhelming majority of the presidents at both unionized and nonunionized colleges were in agreement with a statement
reflecting that faculty collective bargaining would undermine the influence of faculty senates.

Baldridge and Kemerer (1976) concluded that evidence did not support the view that senates would collapse with the arrival of collective bargaining, but serious problems did exist. Although the weaknesses of existing campus governance mechanisms were considered a strong influence in the establishment of collective bargaining units on campuses, Baldridge and Kemerer stated that unions alone could not be held responsible for the problems of senates. Survey results supported links between senate ineffectiveness and a lack of active participation by faculty, administrative interference, or system-level power plays (Baldridge & Kemerer). Baldridge and Kemerer stated:

If faculty do not become involved in both senate and union affairs, the ominous predictions about the demise of faculty governance may come true . . . . Faculty involvement, determination to preserve the best of traditional practices, and an insistence on responsible union leadership may be the factors that tip the scales toward a genuine dual-track system - with strong unions and strong senates each doing what they can do best. (p. 346)

In 1981, Kemerer and Baldridge completed a second research project designed to re-evaluate the consequences of faculty unionization in higher education. Five groups of individuals were surveyed: a sample of presidents from a cross-section of nonunionized campuses, presidents at all unionized campuses in the country, faculty union chairpersons at the same campuses, system-level administrators, and central office union officials. Kemerer and Baldridge reported a return rate averaging 52%
of the nearly 1,400 questionnaires sent out. Union contract analysis was used for data collection in conjunction with the questionnaires.

Results indicated that senates or an equivalent body and unions were existing simultaneously on college campuses with clearer lines of demarcation separating spheres of influence than in the 1976 study (Kemerer & Baldridge, 1981). According to the investigators, in the 5 years since the initial study, an increase in senate influence had been evident in such academic areas as degree requirements, admissions, and curriculum, while unions were viewed as having increased influence over such economic matters as faculty salaries and working conditions. Results also indicated that administrators were less fearful of faculty collective bargaining than reported in 1976.

In interpreting the results, Kemerer and Baldridge (1981) identified several factors contributing to dual-track stability. First, the legal framework which confined bargaining to traditional economic matters also accounted for the limited negotiation on governance topics at many campuses. Second, even when faculty joined unions, professional commitments were often strong enough to prevent the union from encroaching on senate and department territory. In addition, collective bargaining agreements provided a degree of security on campuses where faculty governance influence was dependent on administrative willingness to share authority. Third, administrative
support for faculty governance bodies was an essential factor to maintain functioning of these bodies. Kemerer and Baldridge stated that most administrators recognized that it was in their best interest to solicit faculty input without the potential adversarial influence of the collective bargaining unit. Kemerer and Baldridge concluded that, although dual-track governance was viable, trends in higher education related to higher costs and fewer students may effect the future of dual-track governance.

Mortimer et al. (1976) attempted to ascertain whether identified patterns of governance were associated with higher or lower faculty perceptions of legitimacy. The authors stated that those subject to a government’s authority grant it legitimacy when they believe it is correct, proper, or "right" to comply with the orders or commands. Two separate but related studies using the same six institutions as the sample for each study were conducted. The purpose of the first study was to examine governance patterns. The second study was designed to examine perceived legitimacy of governance. Three public state colleges and three public community colleges in Pennsylvania were chosen and studied at the same time.

The goal of the field study of governance patterns was to classify authority relations according to a five-zone continuum, ranging from faculty dominance to faculty primacy through a middle zone of shared authority to administrative primacy and administrative dominance.
(Mortimer et al., 1976). Decision-making processes were examined to determine the levels of participation of faculty and administration. Decision processes were also examined for each of five issue areas on each campus: appointment of faculty, promotion of faculty, tenure, merit raises, and curriculum. Separate analyses were completed for each issue. The analyses resulted in a characterization of the distribution of authority for each issue-specific decision process and a composite description for each institution.

A mailed survey questionnaire to random samples of 50 faculty on each campus was used for the study of perceived legitimacy. The following decision areas were explored: (a) new courses, (b) merit raises, (c) financial decisions, and (d) educational goals. At the same time, administrators from the sampled institutions were requested to rate faculty governability for each of the four decision areas. Findings of the study of governance patterns were presented separately from the study of perceived legitimacy of governance. Mortimer et al. (1976) noted that some especially important implications were uncovered where the two sets of findings overlapped.

Issue areas for decision-making emerged from both studies as a powerful variable. In the governance patterns study, separate issue areas were classified into differing zones on the authority continuum (Mortimer et al., 1976). In the study of legitimacy patterns, issue areas were
reported to have a major effect on the perceived legitimacy of governance at a majority of the institutions.

Both studies focused on curriculum decisions and merit raises, and the researchers noted striking parallels from a comparison of the findings on these two issue areas (Mortimer et al., 1976). In every institution, there was more faculty involvement on curriculum decisions than on merit raise decisions. Curriculum decisions were accorded higher legitimacy than decisions on merit raises.

Mortimer et al. (1976) reported that variability in governance patterns and legitimacy was marked among institutions and types of institutions. The authors stated that the findings suggested that there are discrete organizational types within higher education. It was recommended that research about decision-making behavior should probably be done within institution types rather than across them.

In 1976, Mortimer et al. concluded that decisions were often made in drastically different ways from issue to issue within the same institution, and faculty were discriminating enough to assign widely varying levels of legitimacy to different issue decision patterns within the same institution. This conclusion tended to further emphasize the importance of local campus political cultures of governance (Mortimer et al.).

In 1979, Lee examined the effect of unionized faculty upon the governance of 4-year colleges and universities. The study placed particular emphasis on structural changes.
in an institution's governance system subsequent to unionization in terms of the levels at which decisions were made and the composition of the groups making these decisions. Attention was also given to the power of various individuals and groups within the governance structure and to the effect of unionization upon power distribution. Using a case study methodology, six institutions from two east coast states, which were unionized as of July 1974, were studied.

A structured interview instrument was used to collect data from the academic vice-president, one dean, two department chairpersons, faculty members active in the senate, faculty union leaders, and tenured and untenured faculty members not active in governance at each institution. A total of 60 individuals were interviewed. Interviews were supplemented with study of printed materials.

Upon analyzing the data to determine the effect of unionization upon governance structures, Lee (1979) reported several conclusions which confirmed results of prior studies. Lee noted that faculty as a whole gained formal governance power through the union contract. Even on campuses where faculty had enjoyed considerable decision-making power, the contract legitimated and often broadened the scope of the faculty's governance role. Administrators at the vice-presidential and presidential levels acquired greater authority over formal decisions, particularly in personnel matters. Deans appeared to have
lost much of their autonomy over personnel and workload decisions. The single most significant effect of unionization at the six institutions was the development of a formal grievance procedure (Lee).

At institutions where senates were relatively new or had minimal faculty support, senates were abolished and replaced with union-dominated faculty committees (Lee, 1979). At institutions with a traditionally strong faculty senate, unions respected senate prerogatives and focused on economic issues. On campuses that had a tradition of faculty participation in governance, union influence appeared minimal. Unionization tended to formalize relationships between faculty and administration which reduced the ability of an individual to influence decision-making by informal means.

An additional finding at each of the six institutions and one that Lee (1979) had difficulty measuring and documenting related to the attitude of the president and other high-level administrators toward the faculty’s governance role and subsequently toward faculty unionization. This attitude appeared to be a major factor in the faculty’s decision to unionize and in the quality of post-unionization governance relationships. Lee concluded that faculty and administration have the capacity to build a governance system which would be mutually satisfactory as a mechanism for addressing the problems of governing institutions.
In 1982, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching conducted a survey of decision-making in higher education for the purpose of describing the current state of academic governance. The central issue that the Foundation was concerned with was how institutions of higher education maintained their tradition of self-control, while being accountable to the various constituencies that they served.

The survey instrument contained 39 decision areas representative of one of the following key policy matters: (a) academic, (b) personnel, and (c) administrative (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982). Respondents were asked to identify which of the 12 locations had the authority for decision-making for each of the 39 decision areas. The survey was sent to four respondents in each of the 50 states: (a) chief executive officer of the state’s flagship university or university system, (b) chief executive officer of a public 4-year institution, (c) chief executive officer of a public 2-year institution, and (d) head of the state’s higher education system. A response rate of 76% was reported.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1982) concluded that the most serious problem encountered by higher education was the cumulative impact of government intervention. "As public officials ask colleges and universities to defend endlessly their decisions, they inadvertently reshape the institution in fundamental ways. Priorities are shifted as faculty and
administrators spend more time on paperwork than on academic planning" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, pp. 65-66). The Carnegie Foundation report took the position that governance initiatives must be returned to the academic institution and higher education must reaffirm and strengthen self-regulation.

The report also concluded that if higher education was to regulate itself more effectively, campus decision-making structures needed to be improved (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching indicated that decreased faculty participation and a curious mismatch between the agendas of the faculty councils and the crisis confronting many institutions were present.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s (1982) report stated that inadequate governance should not be attributed to faculty alone. It was suggested that administrators still appear to be too authoritarian or too bureaucratic to consult openly and honestly with colleagues. The breakdown in campus governance could also be a reaction to the hard times colleges and universities were facing (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching).

In response to the survey findings, it was recommended that a clear distinction be drawn between corporate authority of trustees and campus governance structures (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982). The report also recommended that faculty, with
trustee-delegated authority, should support a campus-wide senate to oversee all matters relating to the institution's academic core. In addition, it was suggested that special consultative bodies, which included faculty, should monitor campus performance in response to external accountability mandates (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching).

The purpose of a field study conducted by Clark (1987) between 1983 and 1985 was to describe the condition of the professorate and academic life. "Conceived as an intensive and largely qualitative exercise . . ." (Clark, p. xxiv), the researcher drew mainly upon recorded interviews with approximately 170 faculty members from six disciplines in six major types of institutions. Institutional types were determined by the Carnegie Classification Index of Universities and Colleges. A total of 16 institutions was used. The disciplines represented by the sample were physics, biology, political science, English, business, and medicine. In addition to faculty, supplementary discussions were held with presidents, deans, and union representatives.

Clark (1987) stated that the open-ended field interviewing was deficient in its ability to demonstrate representation and its loose control of bias in deciding what would be reported. Clark further stated that "by giving voice to professors' own accounts of their academic doings and thoughts, the interviews flesh out meanings that
often remain ambiguous or hidden in statistical results of surveys . . ." (p. xxvi).

The dimensions of the academic profession studied included: (a) definitions of academic work, (b) the culture of the profession, (c) academic authority, (d) the academic career, and (e) patterns of association (Clark, 1987). According to Clark, professional authority in higher education began with the fact that academic subjects served not only as areas of work and sources of dignity, but also as a basis of control. Faculty influence began at the lowest level, inside the basic operating units.

In reporting the study results, Clark (1987) stated that it was difficult to grasp how the control of academic services operated.

No one is in charge. . . . Within the profession itself, there are no particular chiefs, nor can we find an interlocking directorate of professors or administrators or trustees, or the three combined, who might exercise a commanding sway. (Clark, p. 183)

Clark (1987) reported academic control being localized in autonomy-seeking subsets which often were in competition with one another. The academic department was reported as essential to the work, culture, and authority of American academics. Clark concluded that the academic department served as "the building block of faculty hegemony, even as it serves as the main operating component of a bureaucratic structure" (p. 154). The author stated that the academic department was growing stronger with each passing decade (Clark).
Different disciplines were reported to display different combinations of personal, collegial, and managerial controls (Clark, 1987). The humanities tended to remain closest to collegiality. In other disciplines, particularly the professional fields which are heavily invested in clinical application, the practices of bureaucracy became more evident (Clark).

Clark (1987) noted that the most important variation in professional authority was produced by the differentiation of types of institutions. In complex research institutions, the academic professional had decisive roles. Clark's results indicated that faculty in complex research institutions controlled much decision-making at divisional and all-campus levels by means of committees. Faculty at top research institutions reported that the influence they possessed was acceptable.

In contrast, Clark (1987) reported that at the opposite end of the institutional hierarchy, in community colleges, collegial control was substantially diminished and a bureaucratic framework was much more prominent. Interviews in institutions between the extremes of the complex research institution and community colleges demonstrated that as one moved up the status hierarchy, one encountered more professional control, and as one moved down, one observed more administrative dominance and autocracy.

Faculty interviews revealed that as authority environments stiffened, faculty found it more difficult to
reconcile the contradictions of professional and organizational controls (Clark, 1987). Clark noted that faculty members in institutions with greater organizational controls felt more uncomfortable with the lack of self-determination and felt a greater sense of powerlessness.

An additional source of authority reported by Clark (1987) was the extent to which the profession was special. Clark stated that professional expertise seemingly brought moral as well as technical authority. It was also noted that as specialness decreased, authority declined (Clark). The author concluded that the discipline remained the ultimate base for professional autonomy. "The more arcane the materials, the more powerful the claim to self-determination" (Clark, p. 185).

In analyzing the faculty response to unions in colleges and universities, Clark (1987) concluded that powerfully positioned professors sensed they did not need unions. In roles that were professional in nature, "self-control stands at the very heart of professionalism" (p. 174). Clark reported that weakly positioned professors, feeling overpowered by administrators, felt the need for unions.

In 1987, Williams et al. conducted a study designed to examine the perspectives faculty members held toward governance. Presuming that those faculty who avoided any involvement in governance over time held different perspectives toward this activity than those who were actively involved, the authors set out to develop profiles
of faculty who held these contrasting perspectives (Williams et al.).

Using the Q sort methodology, a Concerns Deck consisting of pertinent items reflective of aspects of institutional governance found in the literature and proposed by knowledgeable individuals was developed. Each of 102 participants was asked to sort the cards into five piles, indicating the extent to which he/she agreed, was neutral to, or disagreed with the statements. In addition, participants completed a demographic questionnaire which dealt with career history, professional and scholarly activity, instructional duties, and an inventory of participation in governance and other general campus affairs (Williams et al., 1987).

Analysis of response patterns showed a high level of agreement around a certain discrete set of items (Williams et al., 1987). This same set of items was also identified by a majority of participants as being particularly salient in their conception of governance. The items were:

1. A faculty that fails to exercise its responsibility to govern itself runs the risk of forfeiting to the administration those policy-making prerogatives that it does have.
2. Faculty and administration should share in developing the broad outlines of institutional policy.
3. The ultimate function of faculty governance is to enhance the quality of the institution. (Williams et al., p. 637)

The authors concluded that because faculty shared these convictions, many faculty members would not yield primacy of governance to the administration.
Findings demonstrated ambiguities (Williams et al., 1987). If the faculty were to play a central role in governance, respondents indicated that too few rewards currently existed for individuals to make a sustained contribution. Respondents also agreed that a modest level of involvement was all that should be expected of faculty members, who were otherwise highly committed to their own disciplines (Williams et al.).

In addition to analysis of the response patterns, Williams et al. (1987) performed cluster analysis followed by secondary analysis. The secondary analysis, called object typing, identified faculty members whose responses followed statistically similar patterns. This step generated a series of profiles which the authors concluded indicated contrasting perspectives toward governance. The perspectives were: (a) administrator-dominant perspectives which were characterized by a bureaucratic orientation toward governance; (b) individualistic/anarchistic perspectives which were characterized by a lack of interest or involvement in faculty governance; and (c) collegial/shared governance perspectives which were characterized by a strong faculty role and rejection of a dominant role for administration (Williams et al.).

Williams et al. (1987) concluded that a great deal of diversity existed among faculty members studied. Findings did not support that the majority of faculty held idealized perspectives of governance. The researchers identified that middle-range perceptions were held by a majority of
the respondents. Subjects having middle-range perceptions responded positively to a strong administrative role, collective bargaining, and collegial governance mechanisms. These respondents tended to be less heavily involved in teaching and more involved in research activity that would lead to promotion to the next rank. Williams et al. concluded that this middle-range perspective may explain the coming and going of many of those individuals who participate in the decision-making process but only as time and interests permit.

The purpose of a study by Williams and Zirkel (1988) was to determine the extent to which unions have expanded their scope to include academic issues. The study hypothesized that there were significant differences between faculty collective bargaining agreements at institutions of higher education in 1975 and 1985 with regard to 18 academic items. The investigators analyzed available faculty collective bargaining agreements from 124 institutions that had a 10-year history of collective bargaining from 1975 to 1985.

Results revealed that faculty maintained their prerogative in both sets of contracts over the following academic items: termination for cause, number of preparations, course load, office hours, outside remunerated employment, and textbook selection (Williams & Zirkel, 1988). Administration prerogative was retained in both sets of contracts for appointment, promotion, tenure, entrenchment, registration duties, and academic freedom.
The authors stated that it appeared that the 1985 contracts contained higher levels of faculty control for each academic item, as revealed by higher means in the 1985 contracts.

Williams and Zirkel (1988) posited that faculty turned to unions to achieve influence over academic issues, especially at those institutions where a strong tradition of faculty participation in academic decision-making had been absent. Williams and Zirkel concluded that the search for increased input and control over these selected academic items may have induced faculty at institutions of higher education to replace informal and tacit agreements with more structured and explicit contractual agreements that not only maintained existing provisions but also granted increased control and decision-making authority to themselves.

In 1989, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching conducted a survey of more than 5,000 faculty members at all types of higher learning institutions. The purpose of the survey was to describe the status of the professorate. Findings from the survey were organized into eight areas, which included participation in decision-making and faculty satisfaction with certain aspects of the institution.

Results revealed a great diversity in the extent of faculty participation in decision-making (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989). The size of the institution largely determined the nature and
extent of faculty involvement. More participation in institutional policy making was reported by a greater proportion of the faculty at smaller institutions. Faculty over the age of 40 years reported a greater level of participation than faculty less than 40 years. Gender was not significant for the extent of involvement reported.

Faculty participation at the department level approached 90% and was relatively unchanged by academic rank, age, or gender (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989). A third of the faculty reported participation in campus-wide faculty committee meetings. The degree of influence at this level was necessarily more restricted. One is either appointed to or selected to these campus-wide faculty committees and membership is a small percentage of eligible faculty.

Faculty, both in the data and in written comments, expressed ambivalence about the ability to influence decision-making. Opportunity to influence policies at the department level was reported as "a lot" by 73% of the faculty and as "some" opportunity by 96% of the faculty (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989). Twenty percent of the faculty reported "a lot" of opportunity to influence policies at the institutional level with 69% reporting "some" opportunity. The inability to affect policy was reflected in one reported comment:
Communication from the upper administration downward is seriously inadequate; similarly, there is no system for assuring faculty input into decisions - and no visible way in the future for the faculty to become meaningfully involved in our own destiny. (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, p. 129)

Opposing views were also presented:

Faculty members here are not helpless in changing policies; and correcting deficiencies. There is much room for improvement here, but too many faculty members are totally passive. Faculty members who "care" can bring about great positive change - energy and enthusiasm are not met with disapproval here. (p. 129)

The Carnegie Foundation concluded that, in general, faculty believed that they had at least some control over professional decisions that affected their lives.

Faculty respondents evaluated their institutions rather negatively. Only half of the faculty surveyed believed their institutions were managed effectively (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989). Results revealed that a majority of faculty (64%) rated the administration at their campus as either "fair" or "poor." Two-thirds of the respondents reported administrators as autocratic (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching concluded that "faculty have . . . always had mixed feelings about their administrations, and surely there is ambivalence today" (p. 93).

In 1991, Gilmour reported on a national survey of participative governance which addressed the following questions:
1. How are participative governance bodies organized, how do they operate, and what support do they receive?
2. What is the relation of these governance bodies to the collective bargaining unit at their institution?
3. How are these bodies perceived by their chairs and institution presidents?
4. What important issues have these bodies addressed in the past three years, and what issues do they plan to undertake over the next three?
5. How could these bodies be strengthened? (p. 28)

The study utilized a questionnaire survey sent to a stratified sample of 800 institutions. The survey was constructed for institutional presidents and governance body chairs. Gilmour reported a response rate of 50.2% with institutions from nine Carnegie categories being represented.

Ninety-one percent of the 402 institutions responding to the survey had a participative governance body (Gilmour, 1991). Overall perceptions of governance bodies held by presidents and chairs were good with 79% agreeing or strongly agreeing with positive performance statements about their governance body. Gilmour concluded that the presidents and chairs believed that the governance body played an important governance role with relative effectiveness.

According to the results, collective bargaining did not appear to be a threat to participative governance bodies (Gilmour, 1991). Gilmour concluded that governance bodies and collective bargaining units can coexist on campuses. It was further noted that coexistence is more
likely to occur at larger institutions with enrollments of 10,000 to 20,000 students (Gilmour).

Gilmour (1991) reported that respondents indicated that members were not sufficiently rewarded for service to the governance body. Operating budgets of governance bodies were inadequate with a median level of $5,000 annually. Results also indicated that the most able faculty were not attracted to serve on governance bodies or committees, and the governance body did not operate efficiently. Also, the study revealed that a key variable differentiating participative governance body structure was institutional size. A curvilinear relationship was found between enrollments and the size of the governing body. Colleges with enrollments of less than 2,000 students were less likely to have an executive committee or an operating budget for their governance body. Conversely, in institutions enrolling more than 20,000 students, the executive committee of the governance body was likely to have a larger and more powerful role, and the chair was likely to be better supported by the institution.

Gilmour (1991) reported that the level of faculty participation in policy making had increased from a level of consultation common in the 1970s, to formal recommendation for most issues. In addition, the work of the governance bodies had expanded beyond the traditional academic issues to include economic and management issues.

Gilmour's (1991) study also elicited comments on how governance bodies could be strengthened. The three needs
that were ranked highest by the majority of respondents were: enhancement of governance body organization and operation, greater member participation, and increased financial and secretarial support (Gilmour, 1991).

Case studies of the dynamics of campus governance were completed by Lee (1991). Data on the interplay between leadership and governance and on how leadership both affected governance and was affected by it were collected from eight institutions. Respondents included presidents, provosts, vice presidents, deans, department chairs, faculty senate leaders, union leaders, and faculty not formally involved in the senate. Results indicated that the effectiveness of academic senates depended on structure, culture, and administrative posture toward faculty involvement in institutional decision-making (Lee).

According to Lee (1991), the single most important structural issue in the governance system's perceived effectiveness was its composition, including the identity of its chair. Senates that included large numbers of nonfaculty were viewed by both faculty and administrators as less effective than faculty-dominated or all-faculty bodies. In addition, results indicated that greater senate size and complexity caused a perception of inefficiency which lead to a perception of the senate's ineffectiveness. The composition and role of the executive committee was an additional structural element affecting a senate's perceived effectiveness. The way issues were framed for the senate and by whom was also reported as an important
element in perceived effectiveness. Unilateral framing by either faculty or administrators was viewed as counterproductive. Interaction between faculty and administrators, either through executive committees or a more informal mechanism, was perceived to produce better quality decisions with less lengthy deliberation. The boundaries of the senate role, particularly on campuses where faculty were unionized, were less important than expected. Little evidence of role conflict between the senate and union was found. Lee concluded that structural elements were important, primarily because they influenced the way that the senate functioned and its ability to deal with complex issues.

Cultural and contextual factors were reported to have important effects on senates' functioning (Lee, 1991). One of the most obvious cultural elements was the governance history of the institution. Old disputes between faculty and administrators shaped the governance system in ways even the passage of 20 years could not change. Another contextual factor that influenced governance was the faculty's attitude toward the senate. According to Lee, the faculty's attitude toward the senate was shaped not only by the characteristics of its leaders but by the way the administration responded to it. Quality of faculty who chose to participate was another cultural element critical to governance effectiveness. Respondents reported that the quality of senate leadership varied with the intensity of faculty emotions about certain issues, with the better
leaders being energized by anger over an issue. Views of administrators toward the senate were often influenced by their attitudes toward the senate leaders (Lee).

The third dimension that Lee (1991) reported to be critical to perceived effectiveness of governance systems was the posture of the president and/or provost toward the system.

The degree to which the administration permitted the system to operate, the amount of interaction between faculty governance leaders and top administrators, and the responsiveness of top administration to recommendations from the governance group shaped faculty and administrative attitudes toward legitimacy and effectiveness of the system. (Lee, p. 46)

A final finding reported by Lee (1991) related to ways to make senates more effective. Results indicated that governance leaders were rarely respected or rewarded. "Even on campuses where the system appeared to function reasonably well, both faculty and administrators criticized the quality of faculty governance leaders" (Lee, p. 58).

In addition, it was reported by a majority of respondents that too few faculty were active in the governance system and that the same ones held office almost all of the time. Lee concluded that one reason for the difficulty in attracting good governance leaders was that there were too few or no rewards for such service. Lee further stated that many institutions have shifted reward systems to emphasize research and publication, and many others have never rewarded service to the institution that is accomplished through governance or other activities. Therefore, there is little incentive for faculty to
participate if they are unrewarded or if they are criticized for inadequate research because they spent the time on governance instead (Lee).

**Nursing Faculty Governance**

There is a limited number of research studies on governance in schools of nursing. It has been reported that nurse educators participate at a minimum level in the decision-making processes for policy formulation in schools of nursing (Bahrawy, 1984; Redman & Barley, 1978). Factors impeding nurse education participation in university governance are discussed, followed by a review of research related to nurse educators' participation in university governance.

**Background**

A primary concern for Florence Nightingale was the need for nursing to maintain autonomy and control over its own destiny as a discipline distinct and separate from that of medicine (Torres, 1981). Early hospital nursing schools in the United States, although not always successful, were established with the intent of remaining autonomous educational programs.

Nursing leaders recognized early the need to move the preparation of nurses into institutions of higher education in order to raise the quality of the educational programs to a level more nearly equal to other professions (Jacox, 1976). The increasing shift of nursing education into academic settings was influenced by this drive for academic maturity of the discipline as well as by a desire for
educational autonomy (Brown, 1948; Kritek, 1985). Bridgewater (1979) supported Brown’s position by stating that a:

Nursing unit which lacks autonomy is stifled in its contribution of meaningful input to the total university. Such a unit also fails to attract well-qualified, innovative faculty who are challenged to find employment in autonomous, professionally progressive programs. (p. 6)

The last 2 decades have been the period of greatest growth for university-based nursing education. Schools of nursing in universities have become a part of the traditional academic community with all the rights and privileges as well as the high expectations. As a relatively new discipline in higher education, nursing has been continuing to develop academic traditions and credentials. At the same time, nursing has been under pressure to demonstrate that its faculty are performing at a level comparable to faculty in other disciplines.

Several authors have indicated there are differences in the levels of faculty participation in decision-making among the various disciplines within colleges and universities (Baldridge et al., 1978; Clark, 1987). In particular, faculty of schools of nursing not only seemed to have difficulty internalizing the concept of collegiality (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Beyer & Marshall, 1981; Thompson, 1990), but, due to numerous impediments, they also are said to participate at a minimum level in governance or decision-making processes for policy formulation in schools of nursing (Bahrawy, 1984; Redman &
Faculty participation may be related not only to organizational, professional, and personal factors, but to faculty perceptions of university governance as well (Bahrawy). According to Bahrawy:

Participation in governance was facilitated by faculty members' belief in participation and in collegiality, their belief that participation increases morale and productivity, support of faculty participation in governance by nursing education administrators, and a strong influence of tenured faculty on decision-making processes. (p. iii)

In considering the organizational factors, aspects of organizational structure characteristic of schools of nursing often made faculty participation in university governance more difficult. Based on the decision-making pattern typical of schools of nursing, the bureaucratic model of governance frequently prevailed in schools of nursing. Williamson (1972) described the situation as the deans being the prime decision makers. "Instead of internal control and faculty autonomy, faculty has become dominated by the central nurse authority figure" (Williamson, p. 363).

Bauder (1982a) described a prevailing organizational model of schools of nursing as a traditional family model. Based on the assumption that administration knew what was best for all parties—the entire university and the faculty—faculty did not need to organize in their self-interest. According to Bauder, the consequences of the family model were: (a) administrators had more power than faculty and frequently made decisions without faculty input, and (b) faculty must trust administrators to make
decisions that are responsive to faculty needs as well as to the needs of the organization.

These patterns are reflective of nursing's heritage of obedience and deference to superiors which has been a consequence of the origins of nursing in the religious orders. The latter emphasized service and obedience which were later reinforced by nurses' involvement in the military. Consistent with this heritage, nursing faculty often have been expected to follow policy and procedures established by administrators and to respect orders of the administrators. The tendency of some deans to run the school of nursing in an autocratic way was reflective of nursing's long association with the hospital bureaucracy and was antagonistic to a collegial community of scholars and to shared authority (Hegyvary, 1990; Jacox, 1976).

Nurse educators who have been quite accustomed to working in a bureaucratic environment may be slower to question the rights and responsibilities of faculty for self-governance. Therefore, not only may differing perceptions exist, but faculty may be less likely to participate in university governance activities.

Several authors have noted potential conflict between professionals' desire for autonomy and bureaucratic administrative practices in organizations (Argyris, 1973; Donohue, 1986; Grandjean, Aiken, & Bonjean, 1976; Grandjean et al., 1982; Juhl, 1989; Kennerly, 1989; Marriner & Craigie, 1977; Scott, 1966; Sorensen & Sorensen, 1974; Spector, 1986). As nurse educators continue to develop in
their maturity toward participation as a true community of scholars, the discomfort with a bureaucratic administration will increase (Hegyvary, 1990).

The growth in size and complexity of some schools of nursing located in larger universities has made it hard for nursing faculty to participate in governance activities. As the size of the school of nursing increased, it may become segmented into areas of nursing specializations or levels of educational programs for administrative purposes, and the environment becomes more complex (Hegyvary, 1990). Each nursing specialty or program deals with its own portion of the total environment. Conflict may arise when collaboration and participation are necessary to identify priorities and share already scarce resources.

Another difficulty limiting nursing faculty participation was the increase of control over schools of nursing by external agencies, including federal and state funding agencies (Bahrawy, 1984). Involvement with accrediting agencies increased the faculty potential for decision-making, but financial exigencies, external pressures for accountability, and differences in professional values have lead to a loss of professional autonomy, greater centralization, and placed a constraint on nursing faculty members' attempts at participation (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Dykes, 1968; Matejski, 1981; Mortimer & McConnell, 1978).
Professional factors have also affected actual levels of faculty participation in university governance. Faculty participation seemed to be hindered by the demands of the academic role (Williams et al., 1987). Nurse educators acquisition of a faculty role required integration of multiple job expectations related to the three components of the university mission—teaching, research, and service.

Teaching of nursing involved a vast range of activities. Nursing instruction has been physically and mentally exhausting because of the simultaneous responsibility and accountability to the students and the patients, and the need to satisfy nursing service as well as medical, legal, and institutional requirements while meeting educational objectives. In addition to activities on campus, nurse educators spend a large amount of time off campus in clinical activities, in traveling to clinical facilities, and in providing service to professional nursing agencies and professional nursing organizations (Bahrawy, 1984; Solomons, Jordison, & Powell, 1980). Integrated curricula, team teaching, and continuous curriculum revision to reflect current issues and trends in nursing and health care are time consuming. The amount of time needed for classroom and clinical teaching activities may be a hindrance to participation in university governance by nurse educators.

With the present financial constraints and public demand for greater accountability, colleges and
universities have been setting rigorous work expectations (Bauder, 1982a, 1982b; Koerner & LaRochelle, 1989; Williams, 1989). Many nursing faculty workloads have increased. As more time has become needed to meet their teaching obligations, less time and energy are left to fulfill other requirements of the faculty role (Mauksch, 1982; Williams et al., 1987).

Nurse educators have recognized the importance of research and scholarly activities as the discipline moved into the university structure and became socialized into the norms of the institution (Jacox, 1976; Megel, Langston, & Ceswell, 1988; Messmer, 1989; Solomons et al., 1980; Wakefield-Fisher, 1987). In contemporary universities, nurse educators have been required to meet the same evaluation criteria as other faculty which included an increased emphasis on research activities (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989; Clark, 1985, 1987; Epstein, 1974; Trow & Fulton, 1975). Demands placed on nurse educators for research and scholarly activity may further limit nursing faculty's participation in university governance.

Nursing faculty use their expertise in a variety of ways to meet the needs of the institution and its larger community. The institutional service component of the nurse educator role has been directly linked to the governance of the institution (Davis & Williams, 1985; Kritek, 1985). Not only has faculty membership on various department and university committees been a faculty role
expectation, but membership has also provided a mechanism for participation in university governance. In terms of the time requirements to attend meetings, write reports, and make recommendations, the cost of faculty participation has been high (Floyd, 1985; Howell, 1982; Mason, 1982; Williams et al., 1987). Junior, nontenured faculty have been frequently advised to avoid participatory activities since the rewards of promotion and tenure have depended on research productivity and teaching effectiveness. Tenured faculty have often found more satisfaction with professional activities than involvement in campus politics (Baldridge & Kemerer, 1976). Therefore, the number of faculty that has been eligible and willing to participate in university governance has become overwhelmed with work, and since there was little or no reward for such activity, interest and participation in university governance declined (Bahrawy, 1984; Lee, 1991; Williams et al.).

A large number of today's faculty of schools of nursing have not been socialized into the academic role and their involvement in university governance has thereby been impaired (Bahrawy, 1984; Conway & Glass, 1978; Dill, 1982; Mauksch, 1982; Thompson, 1990). Frequently, nurse educators have been unaware of their academic responsibility for participation in university governance activities. In addition, Torres (1981) noted a relative lack of sophistication on the part of nurse educators in dealing with the academic and political requirements of the university. When nurse educators have been inadequately
prepared or lack the desire to participate in university governance, the system of influence in institutional decision-making becomes unbalanced (Redman & Barley, 1978).

The nurse educator has carried an additional burden of having to mesh academic life with that of a practicing professional and of having to establish credibility in the two domains (Bahrawy, 1984; Williams et al., 1987). Nurse educators must demonstrate superior competence in both the community of scholars and the community of practitioners for nursing to be recognized as a legitimate profession (Conway & Glass, 1978). Often, loyalty to the profession of nursing has taken precedence over the role in the academic community. Conflict may arise between professional commitments and obligations, and those stemming from the institution. Nurse educators who have identified more closely with the community of scholars may express more resistance toward arbitrary or adverse administrative decisions as well as greater variance with the expectations from the professional community outside the university (Hegyvary, 1990).

Personal factors may have also impeded the actual level of nurse faculty participation in university governance. The fact that most nurse educators are women may affect their participation in university governance. The university has been a traditionally male club, established and run by men. Rules pertaining to appointment, retention, promotion, and tenure have been male-driven (Bahrawy, 1984; Maitland, 1990). Women have
made gains in higher education in the last 2 decades, but there are still serious equity problems. According to Maitland, women tend to be grouped in lower ranks and temporary positions, and are working at least prestigious colleges rather than major research institutions. Maitland noted that women are paid less, receive tenure at lower rates, rise through the academic ranks at a slower pace, and are underrepresented in executive and administrative positions. Research findings on women faculty’s involvement in decision-making show that women have been less likely than men to participate in policy decision-making activities, including committees in their own department or school (Baldridge et al., 1978). In addition, as women, nurse educators are often subjected to family constraints. Participation in university governance required an extensive amount of time, and conflicts occurred among the demands of the profession, professional, and personal commitments (Mauksch, 1982).

Age also may have impacted faculty participation in university governance. A large number of senior faculty of schools of nursing have been institutionally oriented. They have had difficulty accepting the motivation of the younger faculty, who have been breaking out of the traditional mold and claiming their rights and responsibilities to participate in university governance as professionals (Williamson, 1972). Conversely, the younger nurse educators may not have claimed their role in participating in university governance. Instead younger,
nontenured faculty may have concentrated their efforts on teaching and research activities and left the decision-making about faculty matters to the senior or tenured faculty (Williams et al., 1987; Williamson, 1972).

**Nursing Faculty Governance Research**

Literature on governance of schools of nursing and nursing faculty participation in university governance was scarce. Selected variables indirectly related to faculty participation such as job satisfaction, organizational climate, and centralization of decision-making have been major variables for study in nursing research (Donohue, 1986; Grandjean et al., 1976; Grandjean et al., 1982; Johnson, 1973; Juhl, 1989; Kennerly, 1989; Marriner & Craigie, 1977).

Johnson (1973) examined selected characteristics of collegiate schools of nursing to determine whether relationships existed between and among the degree of agreement on the responsibility for decision-making, degree of faculty satisfaction, extent of the autonomy of the school of nursing, and the dean, and the place of the school of nursing in the university community. Four hundred and sixty-four full-time faculty members and administrative officers from 12 university schools of nursing in the Midwest participated in the study.

The author concluded that the greater the autonomy of the school of nursing in the university, the lesser the autonomy of the dean in the school of nursing and the greater the base of decision-making responsibilities within
the school of nursing (Johnson, 1973). However, no relationships between faculty satisfaction and decision-making agreement were found. Johnson concluded that the decision-making structure in schools of nursing was unclear to faculty members. It was predicted that faculty understanding of this decision-making structure would have facilitated their participation in decision-making.

In a survey of 154 female faculty employed at school of nursing in four state universities, Grandjean et al. (1976) examined the importance and satisfaction of 21 job characteristics. Particular attention was paid to aspects of a nurse faculty position related to professional autonomy. Data analysis suggested that items of most importance to nurse educators were: (a) the opportunity to be a good teacher, (b) the opportunity to work with supportive colleagues, (c) a dean who allowed faculty to define individual responsibilities and permitted faculty to fulfill them in his/her own way, and (d) the opportunity for a voice in determining school of nursing policy (Grandjean et al.). Grandjean et al. found no major variations in rankings of items of most importance to nurse educators in relationship to either academic rank or length of employment.

When examining faculty satisfaction, Grandjean et al. (1976) found low satisfaction with both faculty participation in policy decisions and with deans letting the respondents define their own responsibilities. Grandjean et al. noted that this dissatisfaction with two
crucial components of faculty autonomy was evident at all four universities. The authors concluded that "a lack of faculty participation in decision making [was] a particularly noteworthy source of dissatisfaction" (Grandjean et al., p. 216).

In 1982, Grandjean et al. re-examined the data collected in the 1976 survey. Survey data were supplemented by interviews with deans from the four universities. In the 1982 study, the following hypotheses were examined: (a) Centralization of decision-making is associated negatively with overall satisfaction, and (b) the effect of centralization is most negative for faculty members with the strongest desires for autonomy.

Data analysis indicated support for the first hypothesis, while the second hypothesis received little support. Grandjean et al. (1982) concluded that faculty satisfaction is not based only on the individual's perception of the school's organization but could be traced to objectively observable differences in organizational decision-making. Interviews with the deans in two of the four schools of nursing revealed decision-making patterns typical of schools of nursing reflecting hospital bureaucracy with the dean as the central authority figure and primary decision maker. The investigators further noted that the influence of centralization of decision-making on faculty satisfaction did not seem to depend on individual variations in the desire for autonomy (Grandjean et al.). The results showed the importance of centralized
decision-making as a determinant of faculty satisfaction. Grandjean et al. concluded that improving faculty satisfaction is related to changing the decision-making process and increasing professional autonomy.

Marriner and Craigie (1977) carried out a study to determine nurse educators' perceptions of the general importance of job characteristics to job satisfaction. Responses from 477 nurse educators from 13 western states, ranked intrinsic factors such as responsibility, achievement, academic freedom, and autonomy as more important than extrinsic factors such as salary.

An open organizational climate was correlated with faculty satisfaction of numerous job characteristics (Marriner & Craigie, 1977). Marriner and Craigie concluded that a perception of the organizational climate as open and participation as highly likely would result in a feeling of satisfaction with the governance and policies of the institution as well as with fellow faculty and salary scale.

Marriner and Craigie's (1977) results showed that nurse educators tended to be dissatisfied with what they felt was important, and satisfied with what they did not feel was important. The authors concluded that the more self-actualizing nurse educator would probably be concerned about such matters as responsibility, achievement, variety in work, autonomy, and academic freedom. The less self-actualized nurse educator might be more preoccupied with
recognition, reputation of the school, congeniality of colleagues, security, or other extrinsic factors.

Donohue (1986) conducted a study of nurse educators to determine the relationship of their perceptions of the organizational climate of the environment in which they were employed to their job satisfaction. Two hundred and ten full-time faculty who were employed in 15 NLN-accredited baccalaureate programs in a three-state area in the mid-Atlantic region participated in the study.

Study results showed that as the size of the school increased, subjects perceived that more faculty felt detached, unnecessarily burdened by the dean with bureaucratic detail, and they were treated in an impersonal manner by the dean (Donohue, 1986). Conversely, as the size of the schools decreased, respondents perceived that the faculty had a higher morale, three were more positive socio-emotional relationships among colleagues, and the dean treated them in a humane way. The respondents also perceived the dean as providing close, direct supervision of faculty and as being task oriented.

Donohue (1986) reported that longer length of employment in the same environment resulted in faculty feeling more detached and more burdened by the dean with unnecessary bureaucratic detail, feeling less like the dean was using role modeling to move the organization, and feeling less like their socio-emotional needs were met. The investigator found no differences in job satisfaction among subjects in private versus public institutions.
Donohue reported that the primary predictors of job satisfaction were faculty morale and enjoyment of a sense of accomplishment. A dean who was perceived to move the organization through role modeling was the primary predictor of satisfaction with supervision on the job.

The investigator concluded that persons seeking employment in nursing education need to inquire into the administrative structures, kinds of supervision offered, and channels of communication within the school (Donohue, 1986).

An open environment in which faculty feel that what they have to contribute is meaningful should increase overall commitment to the goals of the school and general job satisfaction. (Donohue, p. 378)

In 1989, Juhl conducted a study to identify relationships between and among organizational control, formalization, and work satisfaction. For the purposes of the study, organizational control was defined as a course of action which influenced the behavior of others. Formalization was defined as the rules used in an organization (Juhl). Participants were 208 faculty in 18 schools of nursing in a southern state which offered programs leading to the baccalaureate degree in nursing.

Analysis of data revealed a weak, negative relationship between formalization and total perceived control in schools of nursing (Juhl, 1989). The correlation between formalization and general satisfaction was weak and negative for individual subjects. However, administrators showed a strong, negative correlation
between formalization and general satisfaction. Correlations between perceived control and general satisfaction were positive and moderately strong for both faculty and administrators. The total perceived control by administrators was less than the mean control score perceived by faculty. On the other hand, administrator's total preferred control score was higher than that of faculty (Juhl).

Juhl (1989) reported doctorally prepared individuals preferred more control than did master's prepared faculty. Individuals who taught at two or more program levels had a higher control mean score compared to those who taught at either the graduate or baccalaureate level. The author reported that nontenure track participants believed they had more influence in decision-making than did the tenured or tenure track participants.

Based on the study results, Juhl (1989) concluded that nurse educators seemed to be striving for higher job autonomy with less monitoring of their role and greater participation in organizational governance. The author stated that the presence of extensive rules tended to restrict activities, initiative, and thinking of organizational members while encouraging conformity, preservation of the status quo, and concentration of power in the upper levels of the organization.

According to Juhl (1989), results were consistent with previous control studies and supported the idea that individuals prefer more control in organizational
decision-making, but not at the expense of middle-hierarchial levels. The investigator concluded that nurse educators appeared to have greater work satisfaction when formalization was low and influence in decision-making was high.

The purpose of Kennerly's (1989) study was to examine the relationship among: (a) leadership behaviors of consideration and initiating structure, (b) organizational characteristics, and (c) faculty job satisfaction in baccalaureate nursing programs in private colleges. Consideration was defined as behavior, indicating mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth between the supervisor and the group. Initiating structure was defined as behavior in which the supervisor organized and defined group activities and his/her relation to the group. A total of 181 faculty from 23 different programs participated in the study.

After obtaining statistically significant correlations of moderate strength, the author suggested that both consideration and initiating structures exerted critical influences on the development of faculty job satisfaction. Correlation coefficients for nurse faculty job satisfaction and the organizational characteristics of size, structure, pay, and tenure were not significantly different from zero. Therefore, Kennerly (1989) concluded that the selected organization characteristics did not exert a direct influence on the development of job satisfaction in the nursing programs studied.
Analysis of data for consideration, initiating structure, size, program structure, pay, and tenure reflected a relatively good fit with job satisfaction (Kennerly, 1989). Further analysis indicated that consideration, initiating structure, number of nurse faculty, and number of students in college contributed significantly to the prediction of nurse faculty job satisfaction. Regression weights for structure, tenure, pay, and number of nursing majors were not statistically significant (Kennerly).

Kennerly (1989) concluded that the existence of both high consideration and high initiating structure behaviors in relation to high ratings of job satisfaction in the programs studied suggested that organizational settings may indeed play a distinct role in facilitating the development of faculty job satisfaction. The author further stated that with the tendency of faculty to indicate a high level of satisfaction with the job in absence of significant correlations with pay, structure, and tenure suggested that faculty did not perceive these variables as substantial factors influencing their work environment (Kennerly).

Bahrawy (1984) investigated perceived levels of actual and ideal participation and satisfaction related to the governance of baccalaureate schools of nursing. Data were collected from 294 full-time nursing faculty in colleges and universities in three east coast states. Areas of governance studied were academic affairs, student affairs, personnel affairs, public affairs, and financial affairs.
Bahrawy related these areas of participation to: (a) professional characteristics of nursing educators, and (b) organizational structure characteristics of the school of nursing.

Results indicated that nursing faculty actually participated substantially in academic affairs, but were less involved in student affairs, personnel affairs, public affairs, and financial affairs which are traditionally administrative in nature (Bahrawy, 1984). The author reported that regardless of the level of actual participation, the faculty desired greater participation in all areas of governance.

Nursing faculty were generally satisfied with their level of participation in all areas regardless of the actual level of participation, except for financial affairs (Bahrawy, 1984). Faculty were dissatisfied with the perceived level of participation in financial affairs.

The majority of nursing faculty agreed that participation in governance was limited by a lack of socialization into the faculty role, heavy teaching loads, frequent absences from campus, and the disadvantages faced by women in a male dominated profession (Bahrawy, 1984). The author reported that the majority of the respondents agreed that participation in governance was facilitated by faculty members’ belief in participation in governance, their belief that participation increases morale and productivity, support of faculty participation in governance by nursing education administrators, and a
strong influence of tenured faculty in decision-making processes.

Summary

Research on university governance was plentiful prior to 1985. In those studies, the analysis of governance of colleges and universities took several major routes and a multiplicity of treatments was used. A frequent method of data collection was the interview which, although it provided a rich source of data, did not allow for control of bias and decreased the ability to demonstrate adequate sample representation. In addition to the varied methodologies, no conceptual framework for researching the decision-making structures and processes of colleges and universities had been used.

In terms of the amount of faculty participation in university governance, research has found that faculty, in general, agreed that not only should they have an active and influential role in institutional decision-making, but they also had a responsibility to participate in governing themselves (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Dykes, 1968; Gilmour, 1991; Lee, 1991; Williams et al., 1987). Although faculty supported sharing authority with administration, faculty were reluctant to assume the burdens of participation in governance activities (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; Dykes; Gilmour; Lee; Williams et al.). Research has also shown that increased faculty power, authority, and autonomy have been associated with large, more complex
institutions (Baldridge et al., 1973; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989; Clark, 1987; Gilmour). As the size and complexity of an institution decreased, administrative dominance and autocracy increased (Baldridge et al.; Clark). Conversely, it has been reported that there is more participation at smaller institutions with greatest participation noted in faculty 40 years or older (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching). Major impediments to participation have been reported to include: (a) increased emphasis on research, (b) increased growth and complexity of institutions, (c) inadequate rewards for faculty service, and (d) too few incentives for faculty to participate (Dykes; Gilmour; Lee; Williams et al.).

Research has found that the academic department served as the major site for faculty participation in university governance (Baldridge et al., 1973; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989; Dykes, 1968). However, in complex research institutions faculty control of decision-making was at the divisional and all-campus levels (Clark, 1987). In addition to participation in decision-making at the departmental level and through committee activities at the departmental and university levels, faculty governance bodies were found to have a positive influence on the governance structure and processes of academic institutions (Birnbaum, 1991; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Gilmour, 1991; Lee, 1991). Ineffectiveness of faculty governance bodies was
reported to be related to: (a) inadequate rewards for faculty service, (b) a lack of qualified faculty willing to participate, (c) a lack of financial support, and (d) a lack of interaction and support from administrators (Gilmour; Lee; Williams et al., 1987).

Satisfaction with the faculty governance role has varied. Earliest research found that a majority of faculty were dissatisfied with their small role in participation (Dykes, 1968; Grandjean et al., 1976). More recent studies have found that faculty, especially at larger research institutions, were satisfied with their degree of influence in the decision-making processes (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989; Clark, 1987). Decreased faculty satisfaction with the governance system has been associated with administrative practices of bureaucracy (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982, 1989; Clark; Dykes).

Research has found that unions were not a threat to faculty governance bodies, particularly at large institutions where faculty tended to be more powerfully positioned (Clark, 1987; Gilmour, 1991) and faculty senates and collective bargaining units could peacefully co-exist in a dual track model of academic governance with separate spheres of influence (Baldridge & Kemerer, 1976; Gilmour; Lee, 1979, 1991; Kemerer & Baldridge, 1981). Research has found that on college campuses, unionization increased faculty's formal governance powers and broadened the scope of faculty influence, but at the same time decreased the
informal influence faculty had on institutional decision-making (Lee, 1979).

Research has found that faculty have been most influential in academic issues (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Dykes, 1968; Mortimer et al., 1976; Williams & Zirkel, 1988) and faculty have awarded higher legitimacy to curricular decisions (Mortimer et al.). It has been reported that issue areas that belonged in the faculty domain have expanded to include economic and management issues (Gilmour, 1991) and varying levels of legitimacy are assigned to different issue decision patterns within the same institution (Mortimer et al.). Because of the variety of organizational patterns found in higher education, Mortimer et al. recommended that research about decision-making should be done within institutional types instead of across types. In spite of this recommendation, the majority of research reviewed was from across institutional organizational types.

Research studies on governance in schools of nursing were sparse. The primary variable studied was job satisfaction, with decision-making as the independent variable. Research has found that nurse educators considered participation in decision-making as an important job characteristic for nursing faculty (Grandjean et al., 1976; Juhl, 1989) and an open organizational climate with an opportunity for a voice in determining school of nursing policy was more likely to facilitate the development of job satisfaction in nurse educators (Donohue, 1986; Grandjean
Nursing faculty participation in university governance is a well-supported concept, yet little research has been reported. It has been reported that the greatest nursing faculty involvement was in academic affairs, and nursing faculty desired greater participation in student affairs, personnel affairs, public affairs, and financial affairs (Bahrawy, 1984). Of significance to nurse educators were results which indicated that nursing faculty participation in governance was limited by a lack of socialization into the faculty role, heavy teaching loads, frequent absences from campus, and the disadvantages faced by women in a male dominated profession (Bahrawy). Other factors limiting nurse educators' participation were conflicts between the desire for autonomy and bureaucratic practices within schools of nursing and the multiple demands of both the academic and clinical role expectations of nursing faculty (Bahrawy; Clark, 1987; Donohue, 1986; Grandjean et al., 1976; Grandjean et al., 1982; Juhl, 1989; Kennerly, 1989).

Research has found that nursing faculty were generally satisfied with their level of participation in student affairs, personnel affairs, and public affairs (Bahrawy, 1984). However, it has been reported that nursing faculty are not satisfied with their level of participation in financial affairs (Bahrawy).

It has been reported that there is a resurgence in interest in university governance issues (Birnbaum, 1991;
Gilmour, 1991). Recent demographic, financial, social, and political changes have not only influenced this renewed interest but have also affected the role of faculty as a participant in university governance. Much of available research on university governance was completed a decade ago and current information on faculty participation in university governance is needed.

Schools of nursing are established components of colleges and universities. However, most of the research, which is limited, conducted on faculty governance in schools of nursing has been in the areas of job satisfaction and centralization of decision-making. Despite the many professional and academic benefits of participation in university governance, it has been reported that nurse educators participate at a minimum level of governance in decision-making processes for policy formulation in schools of nursing (Bahrawy, 1984; Redman & Barley, 1978). Numerous organizational, professional, and personal factors may serve to impede nurse educators' participation in university governance. Participation in governance activities may be related not only to these factors, but to faculty perceptions of faculty participation in university governance as well (Bahrawy; Williams et al., 1987). Information about nurse educators' perceptions of participation in university governance is needed to determine factors that may influence nurse educators' actual participation in university governance.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

This chapter reviews the purpose of the study, the research design, and instrumentation of the study. A discussion of the data collection procedure and a plan for statistical analysis are presented. Limitations of the study are provided.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify nurse educators' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance. Four research questions generated from this purpose were:

1. What are the personal characteristics of nurse educators in Category I and Category II institutions?

2. What are the perceptions of nurse educators regarding faculty participation in university governance?

3. What factors underlie nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance?

4. Is there a difference between nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors when institutional category is considered?
Design of the Study

A descriptive survey design was used to examine nurse educators' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance. The concepts of role expectations and perceptions provided the theoretical basis for this study. Data were collected from nurse educators about their perceptions of faculty participation in university governance. In addition, data on personal characteristics were collected.

Instrumentation

Data were collected using two investigator-constructed instruments: Personal Data Questionnaire (Appendix A) and a modified Faculty Participation Survey (Appendix B), originally developed by Williams et al. (1987). Permission to use the Faculty Participation Survey was obtained from the primary author (Appendix C).

Personal Data Questionnaire

This investigator-developed questionnaire consisted of 18 questions and was designed to collect information about personal variables that could influence faculty perceptions and participation in university governance. Specifically, these variables were: (a) age, (b) sex, (c) highest degree earned, (d) rank, (e) tenure status, (f) type of program in which teaching, (g) approximate percentage of time spent in teaching at different program levels (baccalaureate, masters, and/or doctorate), and (h) years in teaching. Additional questions were developed to determine number of years the current school of nursing had been in existence,
nurse educators’ level of faculty participation in university governance through committee activities, approximate percentage of time spent in activities of the nurse educator role, and the number of professionally related activities completed. To determine nurse educators’ satisfaction with their level of participation at the department/school and college/university levels and the overall institution, questions were asked about their satisfaction with current level of participation at the department/school and college/university levels and their intent to remain at the current school of nursing. Although items possessed face validity, a pilot study was carried out. Participants in the pilot study were requested to comment on the clarity of the questionnaire. Based on recommendations received, modifications for the sake of clarity were made.

Faculty Participation Survey

A survey instrument was constructed to solicit perceptions of nurse educators in colleges and universities regarding faculty participation in university governance. The survey instrument was adapted from interview items developed by Williams et al. (1987) who had used the items in a Q-sort format. Williams et al. developed the statements based on a review of relevant literature and open-ended discussions with colleagues. Pretesting was done by Williams et al. for the purpose of comparing alternative ways of sorting the items and reducing the
total number of items. No measures of reliability or validity were reported by the authors.

For the purposes of this study, modifications were made to Williams et al.'s (1987) items. Of the original 58 statements in the study by Williams et al., 6 statements were deleted, 4 statements were combined into 2, and 4 statements were divided into 8. The six statements that were deleted were determined to provide limited information related to faculty participation in university governance as operationally defined for the purposes of this study. In Williams et al.'s original study, women and minorities were considered to be two separate groups. Because of the high percentage of women in nursing, four of the original survey statements which addressed women or minority groups were combined. Four of the original statements developed by Williams et al. were compound statements. These compound statements were divided into separate statements. Terminology within the statements was adjusted for consistency with terminology used for this research. The resulting survey instrument contained 54 declarative statements.

Because of the modifications and a lack of published data on the validity and reliability of Williams et al.'s (1987) original instrument, the modified survey instrument was pretested in a pilot study. Comments from the pilot study were used to further modify and refine the instrument.
The final survey consisted of 54 declarative statements. The respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement/disagreement with each statement by selecting one of the five response options on a Likert scale of (1) strongly agree, (2) moderately agree, (3) neutral, (4) moderately disagree, and (5) strongly disagree.

**Protection of Human Rights**

An application was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Alabama at Birmingham for the protection of human rights. Approval of the study with exempt status was granted (Appendix D).

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted to examine the clarity of directions and statements on the Personal Data Questionnaire and Faculty Participation Survey in two schools of nursing, one each from a Category I and Category II institution. These two schools were eliminated from the pool of potential institutions in the study population. Based on a return rate of 44.18% (N = 19) and a limited number of comments, only two statements on the questionnaire were shortened and reworded. Only one of the study participants commented on the length of the survey; therefore, no attempt was made to reduce the overall length.

**Subjects**

The population for this study included registered nurses employed as full-time faculty members in
baccalaureate, master's, and/or doctorate degree programs in nursing at public or private institutions of higher education located within the jurisdiction of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). The published list of National League for Nursing (NLN)-accredited baccalaureate and master's programs in nursing and a list of doctoral programs administered by the educational unit in nursing were used to obtain a complete list of eligible schools (Council of Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs, 1989b; Division of Nursing, 1990).

Originally, the 1987 Carnegie Classification of institutions of higher education was used to classify the parent institution in which each school of nursing was located. However, it was necessary to reduce the number of institutional categories from seven to two to ensure adequate cell size from which a random sample of institutions could be drawn. Based on the parent institution, each of the identified nursing programs was categorized in one of two categories. Institutions that were classified as Specialized by the Carnegie Classification System and offered a doctorate degree in nursing program were placed in Category I. Specialized institutions not offering a doctorate degree in nursing program were placed in Category II.

A total of 148 NLN-accredited baccalaureate nursing programs were operating within the SREB jurisdiction at the time the study was conducted. The total population consisted of 38 baccalaureate nursing programs located in
institutions categorized as Category I and 110 baccalaureate nursing programs located in institutions categorized as Category II. There were 50 NLN-accredited master degree programs in the SREB states (Category I: 30; Category II: 20). Forty-seven master’s programs were located in institutions with both a baccalaureate and master’s program in nursing. Two of the remaining master’s programs were in Category I institutions and one master’s program was in a Category II institution. Fifteen doctoral programs were at institutions located in SREB states. Each of the 15 programs were located in institutions which also offered baccalaureate and master’s programs. Fourteen of the doctoral programs were located in Category I institutions, with one in a Category II institution. The resulting population was 40 Category I institutions and 111 Category II institutions.

Sample size for each institutional category was based on at least 50% of the total number of institutions within each category. This meant that the institutional sample size was 20 Category I institutions and 56 Category II institutions. The designated number of institutions from each category was selected using a systematic sampling design.

A nonprobability sampling of convenience was used to select participants who met eligibility criteria. Program directors of each nursing program at each of the selected institutions were sent a letter explaining the study and requesting permission for the faculty to participate. If
consent was given, a list of all full-time nurse educators who met the following eligibility criteria was requested: (a) full-time faculty employed since at least the beginning of the 1990-91 academic year; (b) employed in baccalaureate or higher degree nursing programs; (c) rank of assistant, associate, or full professor; and (d) not serving as dean, department chair, and/or program director. A follow-up letter requesting permission for faculty participation was sent 3 weeks after the initial request to all program directors who did not respond to the initial invitation for participation. This method provided a sample size of 379 nurse educators from 13 different Category I institutions and 421 nurse educators from 37 different Category II institutions (total of 800 eligible faculty participants). According to Stevens (1986), when using factor analysis an absolute minimum of five individuals per variable is required for reliable factors. The Faculty Participation Survey contained 54 statements which resulted in a minimum of 270 participants required.

Questionnaire packets were sent to the work address of each nurse educator employed at the selected institutions where permission had been given for the faculty to participate. A cover letter (Appendix E) was included with each packet to the faculty member explaining the purposes of the study, giving an assurance that procedures to achieve anonymity and maintain confidentiality would be followed, and providing information about the risks or benefits to the respondent and others. An estimate of the
time required for completion and explicit instructions on how to complete and return the questionnaires were included. A stamped self-addressed envelope was provided for the return of the questionnaires. In addition, if nurse educators desired a summary of the study results, they were requested to place their name and address on the outside of the return envelope.

Each questionnaire packet was coded for the purposes of follow-up. Three weeks after the initial mailing, a followup letter requesting participation was sent to each nurse educator who had not returned the questionnaire.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive data were collected from respondents to answer the first three research questions. The statistical hypothesis which related to question four was:

There is no statistically significant difference between perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors of nurse educators employed in Category I institutions and perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors of nurse educators employed in Category II institutions.

Data received from responding nurse educators were coded and keyed for analysis on the PRIME computer system, using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) statistical program.

To answer the first research question regarding the personal characteristics of nurse educators in Category I and Category II institutions, frequency distributions and descriptive statistics on all data from the Personnel Data Questionnaire were obtained. The results were used to
describe the personal characteristics of the obtained study sample.

Research question two concerned the perceptions of nurse educators regarding faculty participation in university governance. Frequency distributions and descriptive statistics on all statements on the Faculty Participation Survey were used to describe nurse educators' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance.

Research question three asked what factors were underlying nurse educator's perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance. Principal components analysis was used to answer this question. According to Hair, Anderson, and Tatham (1987), principal components analysis is a type of factor analysis which is used to examine the underlying patterns or relationships for a large number of variables and determine if the information can be condensed or summarized in a smaller set of factors or components. The Faculty Participation Survey contained 54 statements or variables. Since the third research question asked what were the factors which were underlying nurse educator's perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance, principal components analysis was deemed to be the appropriate data treatment to answer the question.

Research question four, concerned with differences between nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the
factors when institutional category was considered, was addressed by a series of \( t \)-tests with an alpha level of .05.

When multiple \( t \)-tests are used the alpha level is inflated, there is a higher probability of type I error, and significant results may occur by chance; however, it was determined that the \( t \)-test was the appropriate data treatment to examine for differences between the two institutional categories. If significant results were found, replication of this study could be undertaken to determine if the significance occurred by chance.

**Limitations**

Limitations of this study were:

1. The population was limited to nurse educators employed as full-time faculty in nursing programs in institutions of higher education within the jurisdiction of the SREB, who had the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. Deans, department chairs, and/or program directors were excluded.

2. The data collection instruments relied on self-reports of the respondents.

3. The lack of control of other variables which may affect perceptions of faculty participation in university governance such as institutional organizational structure, leadership style or personal characteristics of the program director, or job satisfaction were also considered limitations of this study.
Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance. Two questionnaires were used to gather self-reported data. Subjects were obtained from faculty in a baccalaureate, masters and/or doctorate program in nursing within institutions of higher education classified as either a Category I or Category II institution. The schools of nursing were randomly selected from within SREB jurisdiction. Data analysis included use of descriptive statistics, principal components analysis, and t-tests. Chapter IV presents and discusses the findings of the study.
CHAPTER IV
Findings and Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss the findings of the study. The findings are reported and discussed according to the following research questions:

1. What are the personal characteristics of nurse educators in Category I and Category II institutions?

2. What are the perceptions of nurse educators regarding faculty participation in university governance?

3. What factors underlie nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance?

4. Is there a difference between nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors when institutional category is considered?

In addition, the results of testing of the following statistical hypothesis are reported and discussed:

There is no statistically significant difference between perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors of nurse educators employed in Category I institutions and perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors of nurse educators employed in Category II institutions.
The population, sample, and respondents for the study are summarized by institutional category. These data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Population, Sample, and Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Category</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number f %</td>
<td>Total Number f %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREB schools</td>
<td>40 100.0</td>
<td>111 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools invited</td>
<td>20 50.0</td>
<td>56 50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools who agreed</td>
<td>14 35.0</td>
<td>37 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools represented in responses</td>
<td>13 32.5</td>
<td>37 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in schools who agreed to participate</td>
<td>379 100.0</td>
<td>421 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty who responded</td>
<td>216 56.9</td>
<td>237 56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable surveys</td>
<td>188 49.6</td>
<td>213 50.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 20 Category I institutions and 56 Category II institutions of higher education located within the jurisdiction of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), each of which had a baccalaureate, master's, and/or doctorate program in nursing, were randomly selected for participation in this study. The nursing program director at each institution was asked for permission to survey those full-time nurse educators employed who met the eligibility criteria. Written permission to survey nursing
faculty was granted by 14 of the Category I institutions and 37 of the Category II institutions. A total of 800 questionnaires were sent to the nurse educators at their work address. Of the total 800 questionnaires mailed, 453 (56.6%) were returned. Fifty-two questionnaires were deleted from the study due to ineligibility of the respondents (instructors, program directors, or part-time faculty). The final total of questionnaires acceptable for data analysis was 401 for a response rate of 50.1%. According to Stevens (1986), when using factor analysis, an absolute minimum of five respondents per variable is required for reliable factors. The Faculty Participation Survey contained 54 statements which resulted in a minimum of 270 respondents required for reliable factors. There were 131 respondents more than the absolute minimum, with approximately 7 respondents per variable.

For both categories of institutions, the majority of respondents were female (Category I: 176, 93.6%; Category II: 200, 93.8%). The range of ages by institutional category for nurse educators who responded is found in Table 2. The data show that the nurse educators in this study were middle age and older, with 163 (87%) of Category I respondents 40 years of age or older and 161 (75.8%) of Category II respondents 40 years of age or older.

Table 3 describes the number of nurse educators in each academic rank by institutional category. The data show that regardless of institutional category, the majority of nurse educators who responded were assistant
Table 2

Range of Ages by Institutional Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Institutional Category I</th>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Category II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 187)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 212)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Academic Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Institutional Category I</th>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Category II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 188)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 213)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

professors. The smallest number of nurse educators was noted in the rank of professor. There were two times more faculty holding the rank of professor in Category I
institutions than in Category II institutions. Little
difference was noted in tenure status between institutional
categories with 82 (44.3%) of nurse educators in Category I
holding tenure and 86 (42.4%) of those in Category II
holding tenure.

Consideration was given to years of teaching in the
current school of nursing, as well as total years of
teaching nursing. Table 4 provides the range of reported
years teaching at the current school of nursing by
institutional category. It is shown that in both
categories of institutions, the majority of nurse educators
had been teaching at the current school of nursing for a
period of 10 years or less. The mean score for faculty in
Category I institutions was 10.4 years as compared to 8.5
years for faculty in Category II institutions.

Table 5 describes the range of total years teaching
nursing for respondents by institutional category. The
data show that there were similarities in total years of
teaching in schools of nursing with a relatively equal
distribution of faculty in both categories teaching between
1 and 10 years (Category I: 59, 31.6%; Category II: 86,
41.1%) and between 11 and 20 years (Category I: 92, 49.3%;
Category II: 106, 50.3%). The mean number of years
teaching nursing for faculty in Category I institutions was
14.6 years. In Category II institutions, the mean number
of years teaching nursing for faculty was 12.6 years.
### Table 4

**Years Teaching at the Current School of Nursing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Years</th>
<th>Institutional Category I (N = 188)</th>
<th>Institutional Category II (N = 213)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 25 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

**Total Years Teaching Nursing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Years</th>
<th>Institutional Category I (N = 188)</th>
<th>Institutional Category II (N = 213)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 25 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents were asked to indicate their highest degree earned and their major field of study. Table 6 shows the number of nurse educators and highest degree earned by institutional category. The data show that the majority (68.5%) of respondents in Category I institutions held a doctorate degree as the highest degree earned as compared to 38.8% of the respondents in Category II institutions. All of the respondents had at least a master's degree as the highest degree earned.

Table 6
Highest Degree Earned by Institutional Category

| Highest Degree Earned | Institutional Category I | | Institutional Category II | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                        | (N = 188)                | (N = 213)                |
| Master's - Nursing     | 49                       | 108                      | 50.7 |
| Master's - Other       | 1                        | 8                        | 3.7  |
| Post-Master's          | 5                        | 11                       | 5.1  |
| DSN/DNSc               | 20                       | 14                       | 6.5  |
| PhD - Nursing          | 27                       | 22                       | 10.3 |
| Doctorate - Other      | 82                       | 47                       | 22.0 |
| Post-doctorate         | 2                        | 0                        | 0.0  |
| Other                  | 2                        | 3                        | 1.4  |

Table 7 reports the respondents' major field of study for the highest degree earned for each institutional
category. The data show that an area of nursing (nursing administration, clinical specialty, or nursing science/research) was reported as the major field of study for the majority of respondents in both categories of institutions (Category I: 53.7%; Category II: 73.7%). Only 8.6% of the nurse educators in Category I institutions and 70.0% of the nurse educators in Category II institutions reported administration as the field of study for the highest degree earned.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Field of Study for the Highest Degree Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Specialty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Science/Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Non-nursing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching in different levels of educational programs was reported by the respondents. Data were gathered related to the level of nursing program(s) the respondent taught in, as well as the percentage of time spent teaching
in each type program. Some subjects reported teaching in more than one type of educational program; therefore, subjects could be represented in more than one category. Thus, the grand total of respondents who reported teaching at different levels of nursing programs for each institutional category was inflated. The majority of nurse educators in both Category I and Category II institutions (Category I: 61.7%; Category II: 92.4%) reported spending a range of 0% to 100% of their time teaching at the baccalaureate level. For both categories of institutions, the majority of nurse educators who reported teaching in baccalaureate programs spent more than 75% of their time teaching at this level. Forty-one (35.3%) of the nurse educators in Category I institutions who reported teaching at the baccalaureate level spent 100% of their time teaching at this level. In Category II institutions, 129 (65.4%) nurse educators reported 100% of their time was spent teaching at the baccalaureate level. The majority of the nurse educators in Category I institutions teaching at the master's level, spent more than 50% of their time teaching at that level as compared to the majority of nurse educators in Category II institutions who reported 50% or less of their time was spent teaching at the master's level. In both Category I and Category II institutions, the majority of nurse educators who reported teaching at the doctorate level spent 50% or less of their time teaching at this level.
The faculty role in higher education incorporates aspects of the three components of the university’s mission: teaching, research, and service. Data were gathered to examine what percentage of time faculty perceived they spent in each of these. Not all of the nurse educators in each institutional category reported spending some percentage of their time in all areas of the faculty role. Regardless of institutional category, the greatest percentage of nurse educators’ time was reported to be spent in teaching activities. Of total faculty in Category I institutions, 94.1% reported some percentage of time was spent in research or scholarly activities as compared to 86.3% of the total faculty in Category II institutions. For those nurse educators who reported time spent in research or scholarly activity, 56.4% of the faculty in Category II institutions reported less than 10% of their time was spent in those activities. In comparison, the majority of faculty in Category I institutions (69.3%) spent 20% or less of their time in those activities. Regardless of category, the majority of total faculty (Category I: 87.7%; Category II: 88.7%) reported spending a range of 0% to 50% of their time serving on institutional committees. For both categories, the majority of nurse educators reported spending 10% or less of their time in this activity (Category I: 72.6%; Category II: 76.6%). Ten percent or less of faculty time was spent on service activities to the community by the
majority of total faculty in both institutional categories (Category I: 61.7%; Category II: 62.9%).

Level of participation at the professional level was examined by gathering data on self-reported professional activities. Data were gathered on the number of publications, presentations, and attendance at professional meetings over the last 2 years. Table 8 describes the number of nurse educators in both institutional categories involved in each of these professional activities and the range for the number of activities reported. Not all of the nurse educators in each institutional category reported involvement in these professional activities.

The data show that a majority of the total nurse educators in Category I institutions (86.7%) reported at least one publication as opposed to the total nurse educators in Category II institutions (48.4%). For those reporting publishing activity, the majority of nurse educators in both categories reported three or less scholarly publications in the past 2 years. The majority of faculty in both categories reported presenting at professional meetings (Category I: 89.3%; Category II: 76%). In Category II institutions, the majority of those reporting (72.7%) made three or less presentations, while in Category I institutions, the majority of faculty reporting (81.5%) made six or less presentations in the past 2 years. There were similarities in the reported attendance at professional meetings with the majority of total faculty in both institutional categories reporting
Table 8

**Participation in Professional Activities by Institutional Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Category</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 188)</td>
<td>(N = 213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range</strong></td>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly publications</td>
<td>(N = 163)</td>
<td>(N = 104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>(N = 168)</td>
<td>(N = 162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at meetings</td>
<td>(N = 180)</td>
<td>(N = 204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance at six or less professional meetings in the past 2 years (Category I: 68.6%; Category II: 67.1%).

Participation in governance activities was measured by self-reports of membership and chairmanship on various committees at both the department/school of nursing level and college/university level. Reported committees were categorized according to committee types (Appendix F). Table 9 depicts the number of faculty for Categories I and II who reported participation at the department/school of
Table 9

Faculty Participation in Committees at Department/School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Type</th>
<th>Institutional Category I (N = 188)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Category II (N = 213)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy (Faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nursing level, the type of committee, and the faculty role on the committee. Table 10 depicts the number of faculty in Categories I and II who reported participation at the college/university level, the type of committee, and the faculty role on the committee. At both the department/school and college/university level, some subjects reported membership on more than one committee;
therefore, subjects could be represented more than once for each table. Thus, the grand total of respondents who reported participation at both levels is inflated.

The data show that the largest number of faculty in both institutional categories served on committees at the department/school level that dealt with the following issue areas: curricular, faculty affairs (professional and policy), and student affairs. Data in Table 10 show that fewer faculty in both institutional categories reported committee participation at the college/university level than at the department/school level. Of the faculty reporting participation at the college/university level for both institutional categories, the highest number of faculty was involved in governance committees.

Degree of faculty satisfaction with current level of participation in governance activities at both the department/school of nursing and college/university level was consistent, regardless of institutional category. The majority of faculty in both Category I and Category II institutions reported that they were satisfied with their current level of participation in governance activities at the department/school level (Category I: 133, 70.7%; Category II: 167, 78.4%). One hundred and twenty-seven (67.6%) of faculty in Category I institutions and 144 (67.6%) of faculty in Category II institutions were satisfied with their current level of participation in governance activities at the college/university level. Overall satisfaction with the institution was reflected in
that the majority of faculty reported their intent to remain in their current position for at least another 2 years (Category I: 168, 89.3%; Category II: 186, 87.3%).

Table 10

Faculty Participation in Committees at College/University Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Category</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 188)</td>
<td>(N = 213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Type</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy (Faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data of this study were collected from 401 nurse educators employed full-time in 13 Category I and 37 Category II institutions located in SREB with baccalaureate, master's, and/or doctorate degree nursing programs. The data collection instruments, a Faculty Participation Survey, and a Personal Data Questionnaire, were mailed to all nursing faculty who met the eligibility criteria in these randomly selected schools of nursing.

Of the 401 nurse educators who responded, the majority were females, 40 years of age or older, and held the rank of assistant professor. The majority of the nurse educators had taught at the current school of nursing for 10 years or less and averaged a total of 13 years teaching nursing. In Category I institutions, most of the subjects held a doctorate, while in Category II institutions, a master's in nursing was the highest degree earned. The majority of the nurse educators reported an area of study in nursing (nursing administration, clinical specialty, or nursing science/research) as the major field of study for the highest degree earned. The majority of nursing faculty in Category I institutions taught at the baccalaureate and/or master's level, while faculty in Category II institutions spent most of their time at the baccalaureate level. Nurse educators teaching at the baccalaureate level spent at least 75% of their time teaching at this level. When teaching at the master's level, nurse educators in Category I institutions reported 75% of their time was spent teaching at this level, while nurse educators in
Category II institutions reported less than 25% of their time was spent teaching at this level. This seemed appropriate since more institutions in Category I offered a master’s degree program in nursing than Category II institutions. Regardless of institutional category, nurse educators reported spending the greatest percentage of their time in teaching activities. More faculty in Category I institutions reported research or scholarly activity and tended to report a greater percentage of time in those activities. A majority of nurse educators in both institutional categories reported spending less than 10% of their time in institutional committee work or service to the community. A higher percentage of nurse educators in Category I institutions (86.7%) reported publishing activity in the past 2 years in comparison to the nurse educators in Category II institutions (48.4%). The majority of those who reported having had publications in both institutional categories, reported three or less scholarly publications in the past 2 years. Reports of attendance and presentations at professional meetings in the past 2 years were similar for nursing faculty in both institutional categories. A majority of faculty in both categories reported attending and presenting at professional meetings three or less times in the past 2 years. Nurse educators in both institutional categories reported participation on committees particularly at the department/school level. Fewer total faculty in both institutional categories reported participation on
committees at the college/university level than at the department/school level. The most frequent types of committees that nursing faculty served on at the department/school level were: curricular, faculty affairs (professional and policy), and student affairs. Committee involvement in governance bodies such as senates predominated at the college/university level. Most of the respondents reported that they were satisfied with their current level of participation at both the department/school and college/university levels. Nurse educators were satisfied with the institution as a whole as reflected by the majority reporting their intention to remain at their current institution for at least another 2 years.

Nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance was based on the scores on the Faculty Participation Survey indicating degree of agreement/disagreement with each statement. Nurse educators selected one of five response options in a Likert scale of (1) strongly agree, (2) moderately agree, (3) neutral, (4) moderately disagree, and (5) strongly disagree. The frequency, mean, and standard deviation (SD) for each statement on the Faculty Participation Survey for the sample and by institutional category are found in Appendix G.

Not all subjects responded to all survey statements. Statement 14 had less than 85% response rate from subjects in both institutional categories. Statement 14 was: "A faculty member who becomes involved in university
governance because of the importance he/she assigns to the issues with which university governance deals." Based on written comments, the poor response rate was due to poor wording of the statement; therefore, statement 14 was deleted from interpretation. Negatively stated items were scored in reverse.

Appendix G (Tables G-1 and G-2) show that on all statements, nurse educators' responses ranged from moderate agreement to moderate disagreement. No statement elicited a strong response either in agreement or disagreement. Nurse educators were in the most agreement (mean ≤ 2.25) with the following statements from the Faculty Participation Survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Faculty that fails to exercise its responsibility to participate in university governance runs risk of forfeiting those policy-making prerogatives that it does have to administration (mean: 1.50).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>The ultimate function of faculty participation in university governance is to enhance quality of institution (mean: 1.58).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>Major reward from faculty participation in university governance comes in the form of associations one gains with colleagues outside own department (mean: 1.66).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>Faculty and administration should share in developing broad outlines of institutional policy (mean: 1.67).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>Part of being faculty member at a college or university is being willing to help govern the institution (mean: 1.80).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>Faculty members should commit some time to university governance activities (mean: 1.85).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty role in policy making at an institution should be part of academic responsibility (mean: 1.89).

Faculty senates should have the institutional authority to serve needs of the faculty (mean: 1.93).

Faculty participation in university governance succeeds to the extent it creates a setting within which faculty can grow as teachers and researchers (mean: 1.97).

Faculty participation in university governance should be part of the university reward system (mean: 1.97).

Faculty participation in university governance can be source of intellectual enhancement (mean: 2.03).

Faculty senate serves useful purpose in ensuring faculty's voice heard in developing institution-wide policy (mean: 2.03).

Newer faculty need association with faculty in other departments that accrues from participation in university governance (mean: 2.03).

Faculty should have larger role in policy making of an institution (mean: 2.10).

Faculty are well served by debate and exchange of information between faculty and administration that occurs in faculty senate (mean: 2.11).

Administration should defer to faculty when it comes to matters of academic policy (mean: 2.18).

Nurse educators were in the most disagreement (mean > or = 3.75) with the following statements from the Faculty Participation Survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>Faculty should concentrate on teaching, research, and public service and leave administration to administrators (mean: 4.06).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Administration should be allowed to carry brunt of policy-making responsibilities (mean: 4.02).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Faculty involvement in university governance detracts from time better spent in laboratory, classroom, or library (mean: 4.00).

Further discussion of individual survey statements is included with discussions of the remaining research questions.

To answer research question three, principal components analysis with orthogonal rotations using VARIMAX was conducted. Statement averages were first substituted for missing data to allow retention of all subjects and preserve data not missing on other statements from these subjects. Principal components analysis was applied to faculty responses on the Faculty Participation Survey to derive linear combinations (the principal components) of the original statements. An oblique rotation was conducted but the correlations among the factors were so low that it was determined that the orthogonal rotation would be satisfactory. Orthogonal rotation was then selected because of the intent to use the factor results in subsequent statistical analysis (Hair et al., 1987). The objective of all methods of rotation is to simplify the rows and/or columns of the factor matrix to facilitate interpretation (Hair et al.). The VARIMAX rotation approach simplifies the columns by making values in each column as close to zero as possible. The maximum possible simplification is reached if there are only 1's and 0's in a single column. When the variable factor correlations are either close to +1 or -1, it indicates a clear association.
between the variable and the factor. A correlation close to 0 indicates a clear lack of association (Hair et al.).

To determine the estimated number of factors to extract, the latent root and scree test criteria were applied. In principal components analysis only the factors having latent roots (eigenvalues) greater than 1 are considered significant (Hair et al., 1987). According to Hair et al., "the rationale for the eigenvalue criterion is that any individual factor should account for at least the variance of single variable if it is to be retained for interpretation" (p. 247). After initial factor analysis, nine factors had eigenvalues of greater than 1 and five additional factors had eigenvalues equal to 1. Factors with latent roots less than 1 were considered insignificant and were disregarded. Hair et al. cautioned that when more than 50 variables are involved it is not uncommon for too many factors to be extracted. Therefore, the scree tail test was also used to identify the number of factors that could be extracted before the amount of unique variance began to dominate the common variance structure. The scree test plotted the latent roots against the number of factors in the border of extraction. The point at which the curve first straightened out was considered the maximum number of factors to extract. In applying the scree tail test, it was determined that the maximum number of factors to extract was 10.

Based on results of the latent root and scree test criterion, trial rotations were conducted and resulted in
six possible factor solutions, ranging from 5 to 10 factors per solution. In interpreting the factors, loadings greater than + or - .30 were considered significant and loadings equal to or greater than .50 were considered very significant (Hair et al., 1987). Loadings less than + or - 0.30 were considered insignificant and were not used for interpretation.

Statements from the Faculty Participation Survey in each factor were evaluated for consistent themes. An 8-factor solution was chosen for use in subsequent statistical analysis because a common meaning could be assigned to the statements that had significant loadings for each of the factors. According to Hair et al. (1987), the ability to interpret the nature of the variables is an extremely important consideration in determining the number of variables to extract. Statements 31, 45, 46, and 53 (see Appendix B) did not have significant loadings for any factor; therefore, they were deleted from interpretation. Statement 14 had less than 85% response rate from subjects in both institutional categories; therefore, the statement was also deleted from interpretation. A statement that double loaded on two factors was placed in the factor with which it best fitted conceptually.

For statistical analysis of subsequent research questions, factor averages were chosen for use instead of factor scores. Factor scores would have included elements of all 54 statements on the Faculty Participation Survey in each score. To enhance interpretability, only the factor
averages for statements that had significant loadings on each factor were used. Factor averages for each subject were determined by totaling the statements for each factor and calculating the average. The final factor average for each factor was based on the average of all subjects' factor average. Table 11 provides the factor solution, the statements that had a significant loading value for a factor, and the loading value.

The factors with the corresponding statements from the Faculty Participation Survey (FPS) were named as follows:

**Factor 1. Nonparticipation: Why Faculty Do Not Participate in University Governance**

**Statement Synopsis of FPS Statement Number**

- (2) Committees are not as effective as should be
- (4) Not enough rewards
- (6) Not worthwhile
- (9) Thankless job
- (10) Suffer for time in governance
- (11) Untenured faculty at risk if involved
- (13) Governance arena for expression of personal needs
- (28) Time spent not worth the effort

**Factor 2. Participation: Why Faculty Should Participate in University Governance**

**Statement Synopsis of FPS Statement Number**

- (7) Might forfeit policy prerogatives
- (20) Part of academic responsibility
- (24) Should commit some time
- (25) Should share in developing policy
- (27) Participation will enhance institutional quality
Table 11

**Factor Solution with Significant Loading Values for Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>*0.32212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.48074</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.52237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.64374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.47671</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58568</td>
<td>*0.52545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.66396</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70200</td>
<td>0.59671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.38773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.39561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.36324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.33653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.56098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.60117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.64630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.54680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.66563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.56329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*0.44131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.61069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.678497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*0.31397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.61127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.52775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Double loaded*
(29) Part of being a faculty member is being willing to help govern the institution

(30) Reward is association with colleagues outside the department

(49) Senate should have authority to serve faculty needs

Factor 3. Rationale: Why Faculty Should Not Participate in University Governance

Statement Synopsis of FPS Statement Number

(1) Detracts from time in lab, classroom

(3) Administration should be carrying the brunt

(8) Modest level is all that should be expected

(15) Faculty should limit concerns to academic matters

(18) Faculty should not have to administrate

(21) Faculty make greatest contribution at department level

(32) Faculty make the greatest contribution in national professional organizations rather than governance at the institutional level

(33) Most effective faculty contribution to governance is informal governance structure

(39) State agencies influence more important than faculty

(44) Central administration in best position of influence

(51) Faculty should concentrate on teaching, not administration

(52) Policy decisions are responsibility of administration

(54) Most important decisions are made by administration
Factor 4. Unions: Role of Unions in University Governance

Statement Synopsis of FPS Statement Number

(23) Faculty representation stronger with collective bargaining
(38) Need union to get money
(40) Union helps in times of low funding
*(41) Unions might cause adversarial relationships

Factor 5. Administration: Administration’s Role in University Governance

Statement Synopsis of FPS Statement Number

(5) Administration doesn’t want faculty involved
*(16) Administration should defer to faculty when academic matters
*(17) Should reduce administrators’ role, increase faculty’s role
*(26) Faculty should have larger role
(35) Administrators make all really critical decisions

Factor 6. Senates: Role of Faculty Governing Organizations

Statement Synopsis of FPS Statement Number

(37) Faculty senate useful to represent faculty
(42) Faculty senate serves as center of debate
(43) Without union, AAUP useful role in upholding faculty rights
*(50) Senate does not serve faculty needs

Factor 7. Motivations: Motivations for Faculty Participation in University Governance

Statement Synopsis of FPS Statement Number

(12) Source of intellectual enhancement
(19) Participation succeeds when faculty grow as teachers and researchers
Newer faculty need associations gained from participation.

Can find rewards unavailable at department level.

Factor 8. Groups: Other Groups Which Influence Institutional Decision-Making

Statement Synopsis of FPS Statement Number

Minorities have a special burden to represent.

Faculty should join forces with outside groups to ensure representation.

Governance should include involvement in politics.

Survey items indicated by a (*) were reversed scored. In summary, the eight factors were:

Factor 1. Nonparticipation: Why Faculty Do Not Participate in University Governance

Factor 2. Participation: Why Faculty Should Participate in University Governance

Factor 3. Rationale: Why Faculty Should Not Participate in University Governance

Factor 4. Unions: Role of Unions in University Governance

Factor 5. Administration: Administration’s Role in University Governance

Factor 6. Senates: Role of Faculty Governing Organizations

Factor 7. Motivations: Motivations for Faculty Participation in University Governance

Factor 8. Groups: Other Groups Which Influence Institutional Decision Making

Nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors are described in Table 12. The frequency, mean, and standard deviation for each factor is listed. The data show that, based on the mean scores for Factor 2:
Table 12
Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations of Factors Underlying Nurse Educators' Perceptions Regarding Faculty Participation in University Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor (N = 401)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nonparticipation</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.958</td>
<td>0.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Participation</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1.739</td>
<td>0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rationale</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.512</td>
<td>0.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Unions</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Administration</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.339</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Senates</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.403</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Motivations</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.228</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Groups</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.732</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation (1.739) and Factor 7: Motivations (2.228), nurse educators were in moderate agreement with these two factors. Nurse educators were more neutral with Factor 1: Nonparticipation (2.958), Factor 4: Unions (3.269), Factor 5: Administration (3.339), Factor 6: Senates (2.403), and Factor 8: Groups (2.732). The most disagreement was with Factor 3: Rationale (3.512). The standard deviation of 0.715 for Factor 1 indicated some disagreement among the nurse educators about why faculty do not participate in university governance. The standard deviation of 0.818 for Factor 4 indicated a lot of disagreement among the respondents over unions. The standard deviation of 0.751 on Factor 8 indicated that respondents were in some
disagreement on other groups’ influence in institutional decision-making.

This researcher sought to identify what factors actually existed as the underlying factors to nurse educators’ perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance. Principal components analysis was applied to the statements on the Faculty Participation Survey. An 8-factor solution was chosen for use in subsequent analysis and data interpretation as common themes for each factor could be identified. Based on evaluation and determination of consistent themes, the results indicated that nurse educators’ perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance were based on eight factors, which included: (a) Nonparticipation: Why faculty do not participate in university governance, (b) Participation: Why faculty should participate in university governance, (c) Rationale: Why faculty should not participate in university governance, (d) Unions: Role of unions in university governance, (e) Administration: Administration’s role in university governance, (f) Senates: Role of faculty governing organizations, (g) Motivations: Motivations for faculty participation in university governance, and (h) Groups: Other groups which influence institutional decision-making. An assumption underlying this study was that the Faculty Participation Survey measured the perceptions of faculty participation in university governance. The assumption was confirmed to the extent
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that eight factors could be identified that described nurse educators' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance.

In general, nurse educators were relatively neutral with the reasons why faculty do not participate in university governance (Factor 1). In evaluating specific reasons why faculty do not participate, nurse educators were in moderate agreement to neutral with the statements on the questionnaire that measured this factor. A majority of respondents (61.3%) in this study were in at least moderate agreement that lack of rewards was a reason why faculty were less likely to participate in governance activities. This finding is consistent with other researchers' results (Dykes, 1968; Gilmour, 1991; Lee, 1991; Williams et al., 1987). In this study, 65% of the respondents moderately agreed that ineffective committees was another reason faculty were less willing to participate in university governance. Respondents were relatively neutral when asked if they perceived whether faculty suffered for active participation or whether governance was an arena for expression of personal needs. Nurse educators were divided when asked if they perceived participation as a thankless job and whether the time spent was worth the effort. For both statements, about 41% at least moderately agreed and approximately 45% moderately disagreed with the statements. These findings are consistent with results of other studies that have reported faculty are supportive of faculty participation in university governance yet
reluctant to assume the burdens of participation (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Dykes; Gilmour; Lee; Williams et al.).

Nurse educators moderately agreed with reasons why faculty should participate in university governance (Factor 2). In evaluation of statements which loaded on this factor, nurse educators' responses for why one should participate in university governance could be categorized in two groups: a professional perspective and an academic perspective. These results are supportive of the organizing framework. According to Mauksch (1982), the components of the role of nursing faculty members can be divided into categories. The principle or primary role included academic responsibilities. Peripheral role components incorporate those role components related to being a member of a profession. An underlying assumption to this study was that nurse educators had a right and a responsibility to participate in university governance. This assumption was validated to the extent that the respondents supported the professional and academic reasons for participation in university governance.

The first group of reasons reflected a professional perspective. In this group, nurse educators were in most agreement (mean scores: 1.50 to 1.70) with the following: (a) 67% strongly agreed that faculty who fail to exercise its responsibility to participate in university governance run the risk of forfeiting policy-making prerogatives to the administration; (b) 93.4% moderately agreed that
faculty and administration should share in developing broad outlines of institutional policy; (c) 92.9% moderately agreed that the ultimate function of faculty participation in university governance is to enhance the quality of the institution; and (d) 93.9% moderately agreed that a reward from participating is the associations with colleagues outside one's own department. These findings are consistent with Williams et al. (1987) who reported a high level of agreement from faculty for the first three statements. An underlying assumption of this study was faculty participation in university governance enhanced the quality of institutional decisions. This assumption was confirmed in this study based on the strength of nurse educators' agreement (mean 1.58) with the statement that the ultimate function of faculty participation in university governance is to enhance the quality of the institution.

The second group of statements related to why faculty should participate in university governance reflected an academic role perspective. These statements received less support from the respondents. Nurse educators were in moderate agreement (mean scores: 1.88 to 1.95) with the following reasons why faculty should participate in university governance: (a) faculty participation should be part of academic responsibility (87%); (b) faculty should commit some time to governance (90%); and (c) part of being a faculty member is being willing to help govern the institution (91.4%). These results are consistent with
previous findings (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Dykes, 1968; Gilmour, 1991; Lee, 1991; Williams et al., 1987). Williams et al. reported that 67% of respondents agreed that the faculty's role in making institutional policy should be part of their academic responsibility and should be rewarded accordingly.

Conceptually, statements loading on Factor 3: Rationale, Reasons Why Faculty Should Not Participate in University Governance, best explained possible reasons why faculty should not participate in university governance. However, respondents were either neutral or moderately disagreed with these reasons. This suggested that although reasons exist for not participating in university governance, nurse educators responding did not perceive the reasons to be important enough to prevent their participation in university governance.

Baldridge and Kemerer (1976) affirmed that faculty were more interested in teaching and research than administration. Marriner and Craigie (1977) also suggested that nurse faculty tended to be more heavily involved in the teaching aspect of faculty life. Results of this survey showed that the majority of nurse educators spent at least 62.4% of their professional time in teaching activities, and approximately 10% of their professional time in performing service to the community and in research or scholarly activities. However, 77% of the nurse educators who responded at least moderately disagreed that time spent in governance activities detracted from time
that could be better spent in teaching, research, and/or service activities. Approximately 85% of the nurse educators moderately disagreed that faculty should concentrate on teaching not governance.

In addition, respondents disagreed with statements that focused on administration's responsibility for decision-making. Results showed that 78% moderately disagreed that administration should be carrying most of the decision-making responsibility and 70.3% moderately disagreed that policy decisions are the responsibility of the administration. In addition, 58.2% did not agree that administration was in the best position to understand the needs of the university. Only 51.8% moderately agreed that most of the important decisions are made by the administration.

In general, by moderately disagreeing with why faculty should not participate in university governance, the nurse educators who responded supported the perceptions that faculty participation in governance is part of their academic role responsibilities and that faculty and administration should share in institutional decision-making. Moderate disagreement with reasons why faculty should not participate in university governance is consistent with other research findings that supported the faculty role in university governance (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Dykes, 1968; Gilmour, 1991; Williams et al., 1987). Williams et al. reported 57% of respondents rejected a statement that
asserted that faculty should not have to administer the institution but should concentrate instead on teaching, research, and service. Williams et al. also reported that 93% of respondents agreed that faculty and administration should share in developing guidelines for institutional policy.

Nurse educators (78.8%) moderately disagreed that faculty should limit their concerns to academic matters. This is consistent with Gilmour (1991) who reported an expansion of faculty influence beyond academics into economic and management issues.

Subjects were neutral or in moderate disagreement that faculty could make greatest contributions through governance activities at the department level, informal governance structures, or by participating in national organizations. Results showed that 68.3% at least moderately disagreed that the most effective faculty contribution to governance is outside the formal governance structures. Approximately 53% at least moderately disagreed that faculty make the greatest contribution at the department level rather than at the institutional level of governance. A majority of respondents (51.7%) at least moderately disagreed that faculty could make the greatest contribution to their professional well-being at the national level rather than through governance activities at the institutional level. The lack of significant support for participation at the department level is inconsistent with previous research findings. Several authors have
reported that the academic department served as the major site for faculty participation in university governance (Baldridge et al., 1973; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989; Clark, 1987; Dykes, 1968).

The mean for Factor 4: Unions, demonstrated no strong opinions related to the role of unions in university governance. However, the standard deviation of the factor reflected differences in opinion among nurse educators who responded. The mean scores of significant statements loading on the factor demonstrated neutral opinions as far as unions strengthening faculty representation or helping in times of low funding. Nurse educators (51%) moderately disagreed that unions were needed when there were financial problems. Nurse educators (58.5%) moderately agreed that unions may cause adversarial relationships. These findings do not support previous research findings that reported that dual track models of academic governance with separate spheres of influence can peacefully co-exist (Baldridge & Kemerer, 1976; Gilmour, 1991; Lee, 1979, 1991; Kemerer & Baldridge, 1981). Findings of this study suggested that nurse educators did not support the need for unions. A possible explanation may be related to the professional role of respondents. According to Clark (1987), "self-control stands at the very heart of professionalism" (p. 174). Clark further reported that powerfully positioned professionals felt they did not need unions. No data were gathered related to the presence of a collective bargaining
unit or nurse educators' past experiences with such a unit so interpretability of findings was limited.

In regard to the administration's role in university governance (Factor 5), 73.2% of the nurse educators who responded at least moderately agreed that faculty should have a larger role in policy making; yet only 33.4% moderately agreed that the administration's role should be decreased and the faculty role increased. These findings lend support to the results of Juhl's (1989) study. Juhl reported that nurse educators were striving for higher job autonomy and greater participation in organizational governance. Juhl stated that these individuals preferred more control in organizational decision making but not at the expense of the middle hierarchical levels. A majority of nurse educators (56.6%) at least moderately agreed that administration makes all the critical decisions before faculty even became involved, but at the same time, only 55.3% moderately disagreed that administration would prefer to exclude the faculty from meaningful involvement in university governance.

Nurse educators again supported faculty involvement in academic matters with 69.7% moderately agreeing that administration should defer to faculty when an academic issue was involved. This result lends support to previous findings that faculty have traditionally been the most influential in academic issues (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Dykes, 1968; Mortimer et al., 1976; Williams & Zirkel, 1988). The high percentage
of respondents who agreed that academic issues were part of
the faculty domain is consistent with Mortimer et al. who
reported that faculty view academic issues in governance as
more legitimate.

Factor 6: Senates provided limited information on
nurse educators' perceptions as only four statements had
significant loadings. Approximately 78% of the nurse
educators who responded moderately agreed that faculty
senate bodies are useful for ensuring that the faculty
voice is heard and serve faculty well by providing a
mechanism for debate and exchange of information. On the
other hand, only 44.4% of the respondents moderately agreed
that the faculty senate was able to serve the needs of the
faculty. These findings are consistent with other
research. Gilmour (1991) reported 79% of study respondents
agreed that governance bodies had an important governance
role. Williams et al. (1987) reported that participation
in the faculty senate is a meaningful form of involvement
in governance. Furthermore, the majority of Williams et
al.'s subjects agreed that the senate serves a useful
purpose in ensuring that the faculty voice will be heard
(Williams et al.).

The number of statements with significant loadings on
Factor 7: Motivations was limited, thereby decreasing the
ability to interpret the factor. The most significant
statements which did load related to governance activities
providing opportunities for faculty to achieve personal
needs. The subjects of this study moderately agreed that
the main factors for motivating faculty to participate in university governance (Factor 7) were:

1. Faculty participation in university governance can be a source of intellectual enhancement (78.2%).

2. Faculty participation in university governance succeeds to the extent it creates a setting within which faculty can grow as teachers and researchers (78.7%).

3. Newer faculty need the association with faculty from other departments that accrues from participation in university governance (81.7%).

Slightly less than 50% of the nursing faculty who responded moderately agreed that the ability for faculty to find personal rewards not available at the department/school level was a motivating factor.

Nurse educators tended to report neutral responses in relationship to other groups which may influence institutional decision making (Factor 8: Groups). This factor only had three statements with significant loadings; therefore, the relevance of findings was limited. Conceptually the statements appeared to have a limited relationship with each other which further decreased interpretability. Approximately 50% of the nurse educators who responded moderately agreed with the following: (a) minority and women faculty have a special burden to represent their groups' views in policy-making, (b) faculty involved in university governance must join with outside groups to ensure their interests are well represented within the institution, and (c) involvement in state
governmental political processes is an important faculty function in university governance.

To test the null hypothesis that there was no statistical difference between perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors of nurse educators employed in Category I institutions and perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors of nurse educators employed in Category II institutions, a series of t-tests on factor averages was used. Table 13 shows the mean and standard deviation for each factor average by institutional category. The t-test results confirmed that there were no differences between nurse educators perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance when institutional category was considered; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Based on the review of research, it was anticipated that a difference in nurse educators’ perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance would exist when institutional category was considered. Previous studies have reported that increased faculty power, authority, and autonomy have been associated with large complex institutions (Baldridge et al., 1973; Clark, 1987; Gilmour, 1991). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989) reported greater faculty participation in institutional policy making in smaller institutions. In addition, autocratic administrative practices, more common at smaller institutions, have been
Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations of Factor Averages by Institutional Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Institutional Category I (N = 188)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Category II (N = 213)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nonparticipation</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Participation</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rationale</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Unions</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Administration</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Senates</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Motivations</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Groups</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

associated with decreased faculty satisfaction with the governance system (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982, 1989; Clark; Dykes, 1968). It was expected that the anticipated presence of differing organizational structures, administrative practices, levels of participation, and faculty satisfaction, characteristic of different sized institutions would result in a difference in nurse educators' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance when institutional category was considered. Results of this study did not support that there were any statistically significant
differences in nurse educators' perceptions based on the factors when institutional category was considered.

One possible explanation for the lack of difference is related to the definitions used for institutional size. The definitions used in this study for Categories I and II institutions may not be the same as those definitions used by other researchers. Institutions were categorized according to the operational definitions and no specific data were collected about institutional size.

Another possible explanation for the lack of difference in nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance in spite of employment by different sized institutions was the similarities in personal characteristics among the respondents, for example: gender, age, academic rank, and time in teaching both at the current institution and total years. For both institutional categories, approximately 93% of the sample were female, 75% or more were 40 years or older, and 60% or more held the rank of assistant professor. Most nurse educators had been employed at the current institution 10 years or less with a mean of 9 years. Total years in teaching was similarly distributed for faculty in both institutional categories with a mean of approximately 13 years.

Another possible explanation is related to the cultural heritage of the nursing profession and nursing education. The cultural heritage related to what nursing is, and what constitutes nursing education, may produce
similarities in values and beliefs about nursing regardless of the size of the institution. In conjunction with this cultural heritage, the existing organizational structure of schools of nursing may not only affect nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation but also interfere with faculty participation in university governance. Bureaucratic and traditional family models of governance have long been associated with schools of nursing (Bauder, 1982a; Williamson, 1972). Clark (1987) reported that practices of bureaucracy are more evident in professional fields which are heavily invested in clinical practice. This long association with bureaucratic systems has not only made it difficult to internalize the concepts of collegiality and shared authority, but nurse educators may be slower to question their rights and responsibilities for participation in governance (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Beyer & Marshall, 1981; Hegyvary, 1990). Thus, not only may differing perceptions exist but nurse educators may be less likely to participate in university governance.

Other factors may also have a greater influence on faculty perceptions than institutional category. Bahrawy (1984) reported that the majority of nursing faculty agreed that participation in governance was limited by a lack of socialization into the faculty role, heavy teaching loads, frequent absences from campus, and the disadvantages faced by women in a male dominated profession. It is possible that these factors and similar personal characteristics of the respondents had a greater affect on shaping nurse
educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance than institutional category of the employing college or university.

Other Significant Findings

Age

To evaluate whether there was any statistically significant difference by age of nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors, the ANOVA procedure was used on each factor average. Less than 1% (N = 2) of the respondents for both institutional categories reported their age to be between 20 and 29 years, and approximately 5% (N = 12) of the respondents reported their age to be 60 years or more; therefore, to ensure adequate cell size the ages of the respondents were collapsed into the following three groups: (a) 20 to 39 years; (b) 40 to 49 years; and (c) 50 years and older. Table 14 provides the factor average means and standard deviations by age category.

Based on the data presented, the analyses of variance demonstrated no significance on Factors 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8. Using the Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch multiple range test on Factor 2: Participation, the 40-49 age group had significantly higher (p < .05) scores than the 50+ age group. This indicated that the 50+ age group of respondents more strongly agreed with the reasons why faculty should participate in university governance than the 40 to 49 age group. The 20 to 39 age group was in the
Table 14

**Means and Standard Deviations of Factor Averages by Age Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>20-39 years (N = 75)</th>
<th>40-49 years (N = 189)</th>
<th>50+ years (N = 135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Mean: 2.95, SD: 0.67</td>
<td>Mean: 2.88, SD: 0.070</td>
<td>Mean: 3.06, SD: 0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Mean: 1.72, SD: 0.34</td>
<td>Mean: 1.80, SD: 0.49</td>
<td>Mean: 1.65, SD: 0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Mean: 3.53, SD: 0.46</td>
<td>Mean: 3.49, SD: 0.58</td>
<td>Mean: 3.53, SD: 0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>Mean: 3.17, SD: 0.75</td>
<td>Mean: 3.30, SD: 0.82</td>
<td>Mean: 3.26, SD: 0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>Mean: 3.37, SD: 0.39</td>
<td>Mean: 3.32, SD: 0.52</td>
<td>Mean: 3.34, SD: 0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6</td>
<td>Mean: 2.44, SD: 0.60</td>
<td>Mean: 2.43, SD: 0.65</td>
<td>Mean: 2.31, SD: 0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7</td>
<td>Mean: 2.16, SD: 0.49</td>
<td>Mean: 2.30, SD: 0.48</td>
<td>Mean: 2.15, SD: 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 8</td>
<td>Mean: 2.75, SD: 0.70</td>
<td>Mean: 2.66, SD: 0.72</td>
<td>Mean: 2.81, SD: 0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

middle and not significantly different from either the 40 to 49 age group or the 50+ age group. The Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch multiple range test did not show any significance on Factor 7: Motivations. However, using t-tests as an individual comparison method, results showed that the 40 to 49 age group was significantly higher (p < 0.5) than the 50+ age group and the 20 to 39 age group. This indicated that the 40 to 49 age group was in less agreement with what motivates a faculty member to...
participate in university governance than either of the other two age groups. There was no significant difference between the 20 to 39 age group and the 50+ age group.

**Tenure Status**

To evaluate whether there was any statistically significant difference in nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors when tenure status was considered, a series of t-tests was conducted on factor averages. Table 15 provides the factor average means and standard deviations based on tenure status. The data show that there was a statistically significant difference (p < .05) in perceptions on Factor 2: Participation, Why Faculty Should Participate in University Governance, when tenure status was considered. Tenured faculty were in more agreement with the reasons why they should participate in university governance than nontenured faculty.

**Academic Rank**

To evaluate whether there was any statistically significant difference in nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors when academic rank was considered, the ANOVA procedure was used on each factor average. Table 16 provides the factor average means and standard deviation by academic rank.

The analysis of variance demonstrated a statistically significant difference (p < .05) for Factor 8: Groups, Other Groups Which Influence Institutional Decision-Making.
Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations of Factor Averages by Tenure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Nontenured (N = 220)</th>
<th>Tenured (N = 168)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nonparticipation</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2 Participation</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rationale</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Unions</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Administration</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Senates</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Motivations</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Groups</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Professors were less likely to agree than assistant or associate professors that other groups influenced institutional decision-making.

According to Floyd (1985), younger, nontenured faculty are often advised to avoid university governance activities because it may not only detract from their teaching and publishing activities but may also cause difficulties when promotion, merit, and tenure decisions are made. Williamson (1972) stated that a large number of senior faculty in schools of nursing have become institutionally oriented and are less likely than younger faculty to assume...
Table 16

**Means and Standard Deviations of Factor Averages by Academic Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

A participatory role in governance. Conversely, Williams et al. (1987) noted that younger faculty frequently concentrate on teaching and research while a select few tenured senior faculty make decisions requiring faculty input. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989) reported greater levels of participation from faculty who were 40 years of age or older.

Findings of this study provided partial support to the previous studies. Based on age, the only significant
differences found in this study were perceptions regarding
why faculty should participate in university governance
(Factor 2) and motivations for faculty participation in
university governance (Factor 7). The 50+ age group agreed
more strongly with the reasons why faculty should
participate in university governance than the 20 to 39 age
group and the 40 to 49 age group. Specifically, the 50+
age group believed more strongly than the other two age
groups that participation in university governance was part
of a faculty member’s academic role responsibility. The 40
to 49 age group agreed less strongly than the other two age
groups with what motivates a faculty member to participate
in university governance. The 50+ age group agreed more
strongly than the 40 to 49 age group that participation in
university governance provided opportunities for faculty to
move outside the department for personal rewards and to
interact with colleagues in other disciplines.

To be awarded tenure in the academic setting, a
faculty member must complete a probationary period,
typically 5 years or more in length (Williams et al.,
1987). This would suggest that tenured faculty would most
likely fall into either the second (40 to 49 years) or
third (50+ years) age group categories used to analyze
data. The results of this study suggest that reasons why a
faculty member should participate in university governance
can be viewed from a professional and academic perspective.
Younger, nontenured faculty are typically novice faculty
members. Many of them have recently left the clinical area
as their primary employment (Bahrawy, 1984). Clinical agencies tend to be based on different forms of organizational structures and be more bureaucratic in nature than institutions of higher education. Therefore, the younger, nontenured faculty who must concentrate on learning the mechanics of teaching, often have not had sufficient time or opportunities to acquire the professional and academic values inherent to the academic setting. Conversely, Juhl (1989) reported that nontenured faculty believed they had more influence in decision-making than tenured faculty. This suggests that nontenured faculty would have stronger opinions than tenured faculty regarding faculty participation in university governance.

However, the results of this study showed there was a statistically significant difference in nurse educators' perceptions regarding why faculty should participate in university governance (Factor 2), when tenure status was considered. Tenured faculty were more in agreement with the reasons why faculty members should participate in university governance than nontenured faculty. More specifically, tenured faculty agreed more strongly than the nontenured faculty that participation in university governance was part of the faculty's academic role responsibility, and institutional decision-making should be shared with administration. According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1982), one of the most serious problems facing higher education is the affect of governmental and trustee's interventions on
institutional decision-making. Based on the results of this study, professors were less likely to agree than assistant or associate professors that other external groups influenced institutional decision-making (Factor 8). This factor had only three significant statements which loaded on it which decreased its relevance and interpretability. Only one statement within Factor 8 demonstrated a statistical significance based on rank. Professors disagreed more than assistant or associate professors that involvement in political processes was a faculty function in university governance. It is unclear as to why professors were less likely to view external groups as influential in institutional decision-making, especially political processes. Professors comprised 10% of the subjects and were mainly employed at Category I institutions. It is possible that at the larger, more complex institutions the influence of external groups is either negligible or not as obvious. There tends to be multiple administrative levels in larger institutions, thus distancing faculty from the final decision making activity. In such an instance, influence of external groups may be less noticeable.

**Summary**

Data concerning personal and professional characteristics of the 401 nurse educators were gathered from the Personal Data Questionnaire. Frequencies, means, and standard deviations were performed. To identify the factors underlying nurse educators perceptions regarding
faculty participation in university governance, data were
gathered from the Faculty Participation Survey. Principal
components analysis with orthogonal rotations using VARIMAX
was applied to reduce the original 54 statements to 6
possible factor solutions. An 8-factor solution was chosen
for analysis and interpretation of the data because
consistent themes could be identified in each of the
factors. The eight factors were named based on the
consistent themes that emerged from statement evaluation.
Respondents moderately agreed to moderately disagreed with
the identified factors underlying their perceptions
regarding faculty participation in university governance.
Series of t-tests on factor averages were performed to test
for differences between nurse educators' perceptions
regarding faculty participation in university governance
according to the factors when institutional category was
considered. No differences were found in nurse educators'
perceptions regarding faculty participation in university
governance according to the factors when institutional
category was considered; therefore, the null hypothesis was
accepted.

Series of t-tests were performed to test for
differences between nurse educators' perceptions regarding
faculty participation in university governance according to
the factors when tenure status was considered. Analysis of
variance was used to test for differences in nurse
educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in
university governance according to the factors based on age
category. Statistical significance \((p < .05)\) was found on Factor 2: Participation, Why Faculty Should Participate in University Governance, when age and tenure status were considered. Tenured faculty and those who were 50 years of age or older were more in agreement than nontenured faculty and faculty who were less than 50 years of age, with the reasons why faculty should participate in university governance, especially those reasons related to academic role responsibility. Statistical significance \((p < .05)\) was found on Factor 7: Motivations, Motivations For Faculty Participation in University Governance, when age was considered. Faculty who were in the 40 to 49 year age group were in less agreement than faculty who were in the 20 to 39 year and the 50+ year age groups with what motivates a faculty member to participate in university governance. Faculty in the 50+ age group agreed more strongly with personal reasons which motivated faculty to participate in university governance. Statistical significance \((p < .05)\) was shown for Factor 8: Groups, Other Groups Which Influence Institutional Decision Making, based on academic rank. Professors were less likely to agree than assistant or associate professors that other groups influenced institutional decision-making. Specifically, professors were less likely to agree that involvement in political processes was a faculty function of participation in university governance.
CHAPTER V
Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

This final chapter presents a summary of the study and discusses the conclusions, implications, and recommendations. Recommendations for future research are made.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to measure nurse educators' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance. A descriptive study design was used for this purpose. Data were gathered from 401 nurse educators employed full-time as faculty in 13 Category I and 37 Category II institutions located in Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) with baccalaureate, master's, and/or doctorate degree nursing programs. The data collection instruments, a Personal Data Questionnaire and a Faculty Participation Survey, were mailed to all nursing faculty who met eligibility criteria in these randomly selected schools of nursing.

Descriptive statistics, principal components analysis, and t-tests were used to answer the research questions and the hypothesis of the study. Statistical significance was p < .05.
Data analysis yielded the following findings for the respective four research questions:

1. Factors which underlie nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance were reduced to an eight factor solution which contained the following factors: (a) nonparticipation, (b) participation, (c) rationale, (d) unions, (e) administration, (f) senates, (g) motivations, and (h) groups. Four statements on the Faculty Participation Survey did not significantly measure any of the factors of the factor solution and were thus eliminated from further interpretation. These four statements were statements 31, 45, 46, and 53 (See Appendix B).

2. There was no statistically significant difference in nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance according to the factors when institutional category was considered; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

T-tests and ANOVA procedure were used to test for any other significant differences. Other significant findings were:

1. There was a statistically significant positive ($p < .05$) relationship between age and Factor 2: Participation, Why Faculty Should Participate in University Governance, and between tenure status and Factor 2: Participation, Why Faculty Should Participate in University Governance.
2. There was a statistically significant (p < .05) positive relationship between age and Factor 7: Motivations, Motivations for Faculty Participation in University Governance.

3. There was a statistically significant (p < .05) relationship between academic rank and Factor 8: Groups, Other Groups Which Influence Institutional Decision Making.

Conclusions

This study measured nurse educators’ perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance. Using principal components analysis it was possible to identify and describe the underlying factors of nurse educators’ perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance.

Results of this study suggested that nurse educators had a variety of perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance regardless of size and complexity of the institution within which the school of nursing was located. However, the respondents, in general, held no strong opinions about the eight factors underlying faculty perceptions regarding university governance. In addition, results suggested that nurse educators who responded felt some degree of ambivalence about whether the time and effort required for faculty participation in university governance were worth the effort.

Reasons why faculty should participate in university governance appeared to be based on both a professional and
an academic perspective. From a professional perspective, nurse educators believed that institutional decision-making should be shared between administration and faculty, and not be the sole responsibility of administration. Nurse educators, especially if tenured, felt that if they did not participate in policy making decisions with administration, they would lose that prerogative. Conceptually, nurse educators appeared to want a larger role in university governance, particularly when the issues dealt with academic matters, but at the same time nurse educators did not support the reduction of the administration's role in university governance.

From the academic perspective, nurse educators did not agree that they should concentrate on teaching over other activities nor did they feel that participation in university governance took away time that could be better spent on teaching or research activities. The respondents, especially those who were tenured and 50 years of age or older, perceived that participation in university governance was part of their academic role responsibilities and they were obligated to commit some time to governance activities.

Although nurse educators were more satisfied with their current level of participation at the department/school level than at the college/university level, only 35% of the subjects felt that the greatest contribution faculty could make to governance was at the department level as opposed to the institutional level.
through formal governance structures. However, at the same
time nurse educators perceived formal governance structures
to be ineffective in meeting faculty's needs and the most
important decisions were being made by the administration
before faculty were involved. This could help explain the
higher satisfaction of nurse educators with governance at
the department/school level where participation may be
better supported and faculty input was included in the
decision making process. Thus, nurse educators perceived
that participation in university governance, particularly
at the institutional level, was not worth the effort nor
were there enough rewards for faculty to be willing to
participate.

Nurse educators spent a majority of their professional
time in teaching activities. Their remaining time was
spent in service to the community and the institution and
in professional activities which included publications,
presentations, and attendance at professional meetings.
Although self-reports of use of time may not have been
accurate, the reports also may not have reflected
preparation time or time off-campus for travel or clinical
activities. In addition, as women, nurse educators
frequently have personal responsibilities that are not only
time consuming but may conflict with fulfilling other
academic or professional responsibilities. Thus, little
time may remain for involvement in all activities
pertaining to the role of nursing faculty member and
consequently for participation in university governance.
Therefore, although nurse educators supported faculty participation in university governance from both a professional and academic perspective, the lack of time, lack of rewards, and ineffective committee structures may be major factors influencing nursing faculty perceptions and participation in university governance.

**Implications**

Current trends suggest that higher education will continue to be faced with budgetary and academic restrictions which may result in centralization of decision-making. The governance of collegiate schools of nursing becomes extremely important as many schools are experiencing a change in roles and functions in response to projected trends and current issues facing higher education and nursing. Frequent formal and informal communication between faculty and administration will be vital to provide an environment conducive to fuller participation in decision-making in schools of nursing. Administration needs to remain supportive of the importance of faculty participation in governance and encourage a collaborative effort (Williams et al., 1987). Projections for the future of academia combined with the results of this study provide implications for nursing education and nursing research.

Socialization of nurse educators into the role of university faculty member may alter the perceptions nurse educators hold and may make participation more likely (Williams et al., 1987). Mauksch (1982) strongly advocated there be a specific plan for socialization into the total
academic role. Mentoring has been one method that has been a successful strategy for enhancing role socialization (Bahrawy, 1984; Mauksch). Orientation programs provided jointly by the school of nursing and the university would help define the institutional organizational structure and clarify expectations of faculty for their role in participating in governance activities at different institutional levels.

Although socialization into the academic role could assist nurse educators in identifying and internalizing professional and academic values specific to the institution, more realistic preparation should be offered in masters programs in nursing education or nursing administration with a focus on higher education administration and organization. Student teaching experiences should not only focus on clinical and classroom teaching but also incorporate all aspects of the faculty role. For example, attendance at faculty and committee meetings could be part of the structured learning experience. Consideration could also be given to providing academic administrative internships for those interested in the administrative role to familiarize them with governance activities and roles. These programs could provide the theoretical basis for governance activities as well as a clear model of expected role behaviors.

Prior to assuming the academic role, the nurse educator needs to be aware of institutional expectations regarding faculty participation in university governance.
Pre-employment interviews should be used as an opportunity for the faculty member to determine mechanisms for faculty participation, expectations for the level of participation, administrative structure, and decision-making patterns of the institution. Concurrently, administration should identify the nurse educator's perceptions related to these factors to determine compatibility of the nurse educator with the institution.

Since governance and administration are reportedly becoming more complex in schools of nursing in universities in recent years, the needs of faculty who are currently employed should be considered. As leadership figures, organizational structures, or decision-making patterns change, professional development programs emphasizing governance roles, organizational behavior, and participatory management could be offered.

In order to alter nurse educators' perceptions and encourage participation in university governance, consideration should be given to developing a reward system that would recognize faculty contributions to university governance and serve to motivate faculty participation in university governance. Institutional policies related to faculty evaluation, promotion, tenure, and merit decisions should reflect the institutional value for faculty participation in university governance. Another alternative is providing faculty release time for assuming key positions in governance activities. Consideration could be given to allowing faculty to establish their own
priorities in the areas of teaching, research, and service. For example, once a faculty member has obtained tenure through the traditional means, the faculty member could be allowed to pursue his/her own areas of interest as long as the faculty of the school of nursing collectively met the tri-fold mission of the institution.

Formal governance structures are important mechanisms for faculty participation in university governance. Therefore, it is important that these structures are perceived to be effective in meeting faculty’s needs. Consideration should be given to developing a periodic review of formal governance structures. A collaborative effort between faculty and administration for the purpose of evaluating the purposes, functions, and membership of university governance structures would be one way to address this issue. Factors could be identified that interfere with the effectiveness of the governance structures and solutions could be developed.

Institutional committee membership is frequently limited by either rank or tenure status. In addition, membership may be determined on the basis of election or appointment. As a result, younger, nontenured faculty often have fewer opportunities to serve on committees at the institutional level. One means to address this is the establishment of committee membership guidelines that allow for broad representation and permit nontenured faculty or faculty with a lower rank to serve on institutional committees when appropriate. Program directors and deans
need to encourage faculty to volunteer their services and recommend faculty for appointment when possible. Once a faculty member is elected or appointed to a committee, administration needs to remain supportive of the nursing faculty's efforts in participation in university governance.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made.

1. The eight factors identified in this study need to be tested further and considered in faculty governance conceptual frameworks.

2. Future studies on university governance are needed which include a national sample of nursing faculty subjects particularly within one institutional category.

3. Future studies on university governance are needed which control for institutional variables such as organizational structure and administrative leadership styles.

4. Additional studies are needed in the following areas:

   (a) Comparison between education administrators' and nurse educators' perceptions of faculty participation in university governance, (b) comparisons of nurse educators' perceptions with the perceptions of faculty in other disciplines or professional schools, (c) comparisons of actual versus perceived levels of participation in university governance, (d) identification of factors
besides perceptions which enhance or impede nurse educators’ participation in university governance, and (e) identification of the governance patterns in department/schools of nursing.

Summary

This study explored the perceptions of nurse educators regarding faculty participation in university governance. It was anticipated that examination of these beliefs would assist in explaining why nurse educators chose or not chose to participate in university governance. Knowledge about nurse educators’ perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance can influence efforts of administration and faculty in identifying measures to improve the socialization process of new nurse educators, to improve recruitment and retention of nurse educators, and to foster faculty participation in university governance. The need for further research in the areas of education was identified. Research in the area of university governance, particularly factors which influence faculty participation in university governance, can provide strategies to assist faculty and administrators in encouraging faculty participation in university governance. Participation in university governance by nurse educators will allow them to exert their influence in governance of the school of nursing and the university in order to maintain quality programs and serve the needs of society.
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Personal Data

Please respond to each of the following by placing a check on the appropriate line.

1. Sex
   (1) _____ male   (2) _____ female

2. Age
   (1) _____ 20-29   (4) _____ 50-59
   (2) _____ 30-39   (5) _____ 60 and over
   (3) _____ 40-49

3. Highest degree earned
   (1) _____ Masters in Nursing
   (2) _____ Masters other discipline
   (3) _____ Post-Masters
   (4) _____ DSN
   (5) _____ PhD in Nursing
   (6) _____ Doctorate other discipline
   (7) _____ Post-doctorate
   (8) _____ Other: please specify ________

4. Major field of study for highest degree earned: ______________

5. Current academic rank
   (1) _____ Assistant Professor
   (2) _____ Associate Professor
   (3) _____ Professor

6. Full-time?
   (1) _____ Yes   (2) _____ No

7. Tenured?
   (1) _____ Yes   (2) _____ No

8. Are you currently a program director, department chair, or dean of a nursing program?
   (1) _____ Yes   (2) _____ No

9. Indicate type of nursing program(s) in which you currently teach: (Check all that apply.)
   (1) _____ Baccalaureate
   (2) _____ Masters
   (3) _____ Doctorate

10. If you teach in more than one type of program, please indicate the approximate percentage of your time that is spent in each:
    (1) _____ % Baccalaureate
        (2) _____ % Masters
        (3) _____ % Doctorate

11. Indicate number of years current nursing school has been in existence: ______________________

12. Indicate number of years you have been teaching at your current school of nursing: ______________________

13. Indicate total number of years you have been teaching in nursing programs in higher education: ______________________
14. List all standing committees of the school of nursing and/or college or university that you have participated on during the past two years. Place an asterisk (*) in front of committees which you are chairing or have chaired.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(*) Department/School of Nursing Committee</th>
<th>(*) College or University Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Please indicate the approximate percentage of your total professional time you spend in each of the following activities in an average academic year:

(1) Teaching
(2) Research/Scholarly activity
(3) Institutional committees
(4) Service to the community
(5) Other, please specify

16. Do you intend on remaining in your current school of nursing for the next two years?

(1) _____ Yes (2) _____ No

17. Indicate the number of each of the following you have completed in the past two years.

(1) Scholarly publications
(2) Presentations at professional meetings
(3) Attendance at professional meetings

18. Indicate whether or not you are satisfied with your current level of participation in governance activities for each of the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/school of nursing</th>
<th>(1) _____ Yes (2) _____ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>(1) _____ Yes (2) _____ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Faculty Participation Survey
Faculty Participation Survey

For the purposes of this survey, faculty participation in university governance is defined as: Nurse educator involvement in the institutional decision making structures and processes applied to issues related to educational and administrative policy, long-range planning, allocation of resources, and determination of faculty status. Faculty involvement can be either formally through membership on standing or ad hoc committees/councils/task forces at the department/school of nursing or college/university level; or informally through department/school of nursing faculty meetings.

Directions: Using the following scale of 1 to 5, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements by circling the number that most closely represents your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Faculty involvement in university governance detracts from time that could better be spent in the laboratory, classroom, or library.

2. Faculty committees are not as effective as they should be.

3. Administrators should be allowed to carry the brunt of policy-making responsibilities.

4. There are not enough rewards for faculty members to want to become involved in university governance.

5. The administration would prefer to exclude faculty members from any kind of meaningful involvement in university governance.

6. It is not worthwhile for faculty members to become involved in university governance.

7. A faculty that fails to exercise its responsibility to participate in university governance runs the risk of forfeiting those policy-making prerogatives that it does have to the administration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. A modest level of faculty involvement in university governance is all that should be expected of faculty members.  

9. Faculty participation in university governance is a thankless job.  

10. Too often faculty members who have devoted hours of their time to university governance have suffered when tenure, promotion, and merit pay decisions are being made.  

11. Untenured faculty members participate in university governance at considerable risk.  

12. Faculty participation in university governance can be a source of intellectual enhancement.  

13. University governance becomes the arena for the expression of personal needs for power and prestige.  

14. A faculty member who becomes involved in university governance because of the importance he/she assigns to the issues with which university governance deals.  

15. Faculty participation in university governance should limit its concerns to matters dealing with student admission, curriculum, graduation requirements, and the selection and retention of faculty.  

16. The administration should defer to the faculty when it comes to matters of academic policy.  

17. An institution would function better if the role of the administration were significantly reduced in favor of an expansion of the faculty's role.  

18. Faculty members should not have to administer an institution.  

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Faculty participation in university governance succeeds to the extent that it creates a setting within which faculty members can grow as teachers and researchers.

20. The faculty's role in making policy at an institution should be a part of their academic responsibility.

21. The place where faculty members stand to make the greatest contribution to their own welfare is at the departmental or school level rather than the college or university level of governance.

22. Minority and women faculty members carry a special burden in university governance, because there are so few of them and they feel the obligation to represent minority or women's views whenever and wherever academic policies are being made.

23. Faculty representation in university governance is stronger in those institutions that engage in collective bargaining.

24. Faculty members should commit some time to university governance activities.

25. Faculty and administration should share in developing broad outlines of institutional policy.

26. The faculty should have a larger role in policy making at an institution.

27. The ultimate function of faculty participation in university governance is to enhance the quality of the institution.

28. If the faculty role is only advisory and the final word rests with the Board and the President, faculty time spent in university governance is not worth the effort.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Part of being a faculty member at a college or university is being willing to help govern it.  
30. A major reward from faculty participation in university governance comes in the form of associations one gains with colleagues outside one's own department.  
31. Faculty members are indifferent to the impact that their involvement in university governance will have on the character or quality of the institution.  
32. The place where faculty members stand to make the greatest contribution to their own professional well-being is at the national level within their own discipline or profession rather than through governance activities at the institutional level.  
33. The most effective faculty contributions to the governance of an institution are of an ad hoc, informal nature and originate outside the formal governance structure of the institution.  
34. Faculty members involved in university governance must join forces with outside forces such as the alumni, city and state officials, business, and labor to ensure that their interests are well represented within the institution.  
35. The really critical decisions are made by deans, the Provost, or the President before faculty ever becomes involved in them.  
36. Involvement in the political processes within state government should be among the important faculty functions of university governance.
The faculty senate serves a useful purpose in insuring that the faculty's voice will be heard in developing institution-wide policy.

Faculty need a union or collective bargaining unit if they hope to receive their fair share of the institution's budget.

The influence of external state agencies such as a Council on Postsecondary Education, to the state government, on matters of faculty concern is more important than the opinion of faculty.

When funding is reduced and the faculty finds itself paying the price, it helps if the faculty is represented by a faculty union.

An adversarial relationship between faculty and administration associated with union activity would make more difficult the reaching of agreements between the two groups.

The faculty is well served by the debate and the exchange of information between faculty and administration that occurs within the faculty senate.

In the absence of a faculty union the local chapter of AAUP serves a useful role in upholding faculty rights.

The central administration is in the best position to envision and articulate the mission of the institution.

Minority and women faculty members should not be expected to publish widely and to carry a full teaching load and at the same time represent their groups on all of the many committees and councils in university governance.

As faculty members become older and more established, they generally give more time to university governance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. Newer faculty members need the association with faculty in other departments that accrues from participation in university governance.

48. A faculty member unable to gain rewards within his or her department or discipline may find them in participating in university governance.

49. The faculty senate should have the institutional authority to serve the needs of the faculty.

50. Given the organizational structure of an institution, the faculty senate does not adequately serve the needs of the faculty.

51. Faculty should concentrate on their teaching, research, and public service and leave administration to the administrators.

52. Policy-making decisions are the responsibility of administration.

53. Faculty participation in university governance should be part of the university reward system.

54. Most important decisions are made by the administration.


c Janet J. Gross, 1991
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Appendix C

Permission to Use Faculty Participation Survey
September 3, 1990

Ms. Janet J. Gross

Dear Ms. Gross:

I should be most happy to have you use the interview items contained in the JHE article. I assume, of course, that you will appropriately cite the source of the items.

Unfortunately for your purposes, we made no reliability or validity checks.

I shall welcome a chance to read the results of your research.

Sincerely,

Don Williams
Associate Professor
Appendix D

Institutional Review Board Approval Form
FORM 4: IDENTIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OF RESEARCH PROJECTS INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) must complete this form for all applications for research and training grants, program project and center grants, demonstration grants, fellowships, traineeships, awards, and other proposals which might involve the use of human research subjects independent of source of funding.

This form does not apply to applications for grants limited to the support of construction, alterations and renovations, or research resources.

Principal Investigator: Janet J. Gross

Project Title: Nurse Educators' Perceptions Regarding Faculty Participation in University Governance

1. This is a Training Grant. Each research project involving human subjects proposed by trainees must be reviewed separately by the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

2. This application includes research involving human subjects. The IRB has reviewed and approved this application on ______________ in accordance with UAB's assurance approved by the United States Public Health Service. The project will be subject to annual continuing review as provided in that assurance.

   ___ This project received expedited review.

   ___ This project received full board review.

3. This application may include research involving human subjects. Review is pending by the IRB as provided by UAB's assurance. Completion of review will be certified by issuance of another Form 4 as soon as possible.

4. Exemption is approved based on number(s) 1.3.

Date: 11-24-90

Russell Cunningham, M.D.
Interim Chairman of the Institutional Review Board

UAB Station / Birmingham, Alabama 35294
An Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer
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Appendix E

Cover Letter
Dear Nurse Educator:

I am conducting doctoral dissertation research to identify nurse educators' perceptions regarding faculty participation in university governance. It is anticipated that by examining the perceptions of faculty currently employed in higher education, measures to affect the faculty role in university governance and institutional decision-making may be identified.

You are among a number of individual collegiate nurse educators selected for participation in this study. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire enclosed with this letter is coded. This code is for the purposes of mailing and data analysis so that you name will never be used in connection with the study. The contents of your questionnaire will be grouped with that of other participants. Individuals and schools will not be identified in the final report.

Completion and return of the enclosed questionnaire is your indication of consent to participate in the study. It will take approximately 30 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope. As your response is crucial for this study, I would appreciate your returning the questionnaire as soon as possible.

If you are interested in receiving a summary of the study results, please write "Copy of results requested" and your name and address on the back of the return envelope. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire.

I appreciate your assistance and cooperation in completing the questionnaire. If you have any questions or comments, please write them down or call (___) ____-____.

Sincerely,

Janet J. Gross, R.N., M.S.N.
Doctoral Candidate
University of Alabama School of Nursing
University of Alabama at Birmingham
Appendix F

Committee Types
Committee Types

Program/School Committees:

1. Curriculum
   a. Graduate curriculum
   b. Undergraduate curriculum
   c. Total program curriculum

2. Student Affairs
   a. Faculty-student relations
   b. Admission committee
   c. Academic standards
   d. International/minority students

3. Professional (faculty)
   a. Research committee
   b. Faculty practice
   c. Professional development
   d. Faculty evaluation
   e. Ethics committee

4. Policy (faculty)
   a. Promotion and tenure
   b. Affirmative action
   c. Faculty appeals/grievance

5. Governance
   a. Administrative Council
   b. Bylaws
   c. Strategic Planning
   d. Structure and governance

6. Program
   a. Self-study
   b. Level committees

College/University Committees:

1. Curriculum
   a. General education
   b. Graduate council
   c. Honors
2. Student affairs
   a. Campus/university life
   b. Health services
   c. Student appeals/grievances
   d. Admissions

3. Professional (faculty)
   a. Teaching effectiveness
   b. Research
   c. Institutional review board
   d. Faculty benefits/development

4. Policy (faculty)
   a. Promotion and tenure
   b. Affirmative action
   c. Appeals committee

5. Governance
   a. Faculty senate
   b. Presidential liaison
   c. Academic affairs
   d. Strategic planning

6. Academic support
   a. Computer/educational resources
   b. Library
   c. Safety

7. Program
   a. Women's studies
   b. Program evaluation
   c. Accreditation review
   d. Concert and lecture
Appendix G

Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations of Survey Statements
Table G-1

Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations of Statements by Institutional Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Category I*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Category II*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*10</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*11</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*16</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*19</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*31</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table G-1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Category I*</th>
<th></th>
<th>Category II*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*43</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*47</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*53</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = 188
** N = 213
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Table G-2

Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations of Statements for the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table G-2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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