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ABSTRACT

A Comparison of Perceptions and Implementation of Shared Governance between American and Chinese Higher-Education Institutions

by

Dianyu Zhang

The purpose of this quantitative study was to assess the status of institutional stakeholders’ perceptions and application of shared governance on an American higher education campus and a counterpart in China and determine if there were differences among the groups of stakeholders both within and between the institutions. A 2-inventory researcher-developed survey of shared governance was used to measure each factor.

The data analysis found significant differences among the 4 categories of participants at the Chinese institution. For the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (PSGI) the Chinese staff members reported significantly higher scores than all the other 3 categories. For the Implementation dimension of the PSGI the staff members and the students scored significantly higher than the administrators and the faculty members. For the 2 dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (ASGI) the administrators reported significantly higher scores than the other categories. At the participating American university a significant difference was found between the students and the administrators in the General Acceptance dimension of the PSGI. However, no other significant differences were found. Comparisons between the American institution and the Chinese institution found that the Chinese faculty members scored significantly higher than their American counterparts in the
General Acceptance dimension of the PSGI, but the American faculty members scored significantly higher in both the General Acceptance and the Implementation dimensions of the ASGI than the Chinese faculty members. The Chinese staff members and the Chinese students scored significantly higher than their American counterparts in both the General Acceptance and the Implementation dimensions of the PSGI, but the American staff members and the American students scored significantly higher in both the General Acceptance and the Implementation dimensions of the ASGI than their Chinese counterparts. Results of this study also indicate gender differences play no significant role in the reported scores of either the General Acceptance dimension or the Implementation dimension of the 2 inventories, and that years of service differences play a significant role only in two Chinese groups: the Chinese 31-or-more group in the PSGI and the 11-to-20 group in the ASGI.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In a changing climate both American and Chinese universities are facing numerous trends and challenges. American Higher education is confronted with a decline of public funding, a public view transition from higher education benefiting society to benefiting the individual, pressure for more accountability in institutional governance, administrators pressured to increase retention to demonstrate outcomes-driven accountability, and increasing demand from nontraditional students and for distance learning (Burgan, 2004; Carey, 2004; Cohen, 1998; Collis, 2004; Tierney, 2004b). Other challenges include sharing authority between faculty senates, labor unions, and administrators seeking to include more stakeholders in governance processes and inadequate time for effective faculty involvement in shared governance (Aronowitz, 2006; Burgan, 2004; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Chinese institutions of higher education are faced with a policy of deepening reform and openness, dealing with the relationship between knowledge generation and its application, applying electronic means and multimedia in instruction, participating in globalization, alleviating administrization, and sharing responsibility with all internal stakeholders (Li, 2011; Liu & Jin, 2011; Ma & Hu, 2010; Yang & Wu, 2009).

Colleges and universities in China and the U.S. are involved in common challenges. Administrators at institutions of higher education are deeply concerned about whether to offer larger classes and to offer traditional courses at workday hours or online or on nights and weekends. College administrators are also making decisions about whether to encourage faculty to focus on teaching or on research, to enroll well qualified students or offer disadvantaged
students opportunities by running remedial courses, or to provide a traditional education of liberal arts and sciences or prepare students for career.

Statement of the Problem

A detailed review of the history of American higher education and that of Chinese higher education revealed that China has a longer history of higher education. China has had institutions of higher education since 124 B.C. (Sun, 2010). In the U.S. the first college was established in 1636. China’s experience and level of development remain low as a result of slow social development, scarce resources and a lack of developmental consistency in higher education. In terms of institutional governance Chinese institutions of higher education practice the president accountability system under the leadership of the Communist Party of China (Higher Education Law of the People’s Republic of China, 1998, Clause 39). Both the Party Secretary and the President report to the government. Democratic procedures are confined to the Board of Regents, the Academic Council, the Faculty and Staff Congress, and the President Open Day, a policy of meeting students. The organization of the institution is an identical copy of government agencies, which, according to Liu and Jin (2011), leads to bureaucracy, administerization, low efficiency, tension, and lack of professionalism. Although no study was found that addressed stakeholders’ satisfaction with administrators’ governance of the institution a negative perception prevails. Since 2006 there have been numerous calls for innovations in Chinese institutional governance, among which the most powerful voice is eliminating administerization and applying shared governance (Li, 2011; Liu & Jin, 2011; Ma & Hu, 2010; Qu, 2006; Yang & Wu, 2009; Yu, 2010; Yu, Zhang, & Su, 2008).

Since the establishment of Harvard College in 1636 American higher education has experienced a long and consistent journey of development. Over more than 370 years American
higher education has passed through four phases: colonial and early American colleges (1636–1800), growth and change (1800–1900), expansion of higher education (1900–1960), and access and choice (1960–the 21st Century) (McCarthy, 2011). With regard to institutional governance, institutions started with the combination of lay boards of trustees, strong presidents, a weak professoriate, and the absence of a central authority for higher education (Cohen, 1998). For the last 75 years the basic structure of governance has remained the same. Many American universities practice shared governance as their overriding principle that guides decision-making (Kezar, Lester, & Anderson, 2006). In spite of the contributions made by shared governance Diamond’s (1991) national survey found that 70% of campus faculty, administrators, and staff believed that decision-making processes were working ineffectively. Another national survey of 40,000 faculty members at 421 institutions found that only 52% full-time faculty at 4-year public institutions believed that the relationship between faculty and administration was satisfactory or very satisfactory (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2006). Drummond and Reitsch (1995) stated both university administrators and faculty members have a similar opinion regarding the desirability of shared governance. Waugh (2003) pointed out the tendency for college and university presidents to focus more on the management of their institutions and less on the processes of shared governance in decision making because of the pressures for efficiency and the achievement of performance goals.

The most commonly referenced definition of shared governance, found in the Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure published by the AAUP, defined shared governance as a shared responsibility among faculty, administrators, trustees, and where appropriate, students (AAUP Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, 1966). According to Mortimer and Sathre (2007) the role of shared governance is to formulate
and implement meaningful ways to engage large numbers of people in the decision-making process. Faculty, administrators, and boards are the three groups of stakeholders that usually have the major responsibility for sharing and making shared governance work. As institutions become larger and more complex other groups of stakeholders such as students, support staff, and adjunct faculty want their voices heard in the governance process (Cohen, 1998; Leach, 2008; Mallory, 2007). Shared governance requires mutual respect and submission and effective communication (Oliver & Hyun, 2011).

In the process of its evolution and implementation shared governance was sometimes charged with irrelevancy and inefficiency (Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Colleges, 1996). Facing the doubt of the relevancy of shared governance, Leach (2008) stated that as a result of the trends, challenges, and tensions the need for effective shared governance has never been greater than it is in today’s rapidly changing environment. To make shared governance effective attention has to be drawn to institutional diversity that exists from one institution to the next making it impossible to prescribe a one-fits-all solution for shared governance (Minor, 2003). Different groups of stakeholders can be assigned responsibility for respective areas, but as illustrated by Birnbaum’s (1988) Collegiate Model, shared governance is a process characterized by fluidity because there are both singular and shared areas of responsibility for both the administrative and technical elements of the institution. Morphew (1999) viewed shared governance not as a static condition but as fluid over time, which will respond to environmental changes or change in the tasks of the institution or a combination of both. Considering the diversity and the new situations that may arise institutional stakeholders should anticipate experimentation and innovation in campus shared governance (Keller 2004).
The purpose of this study is to assess American and Chinese administrators’, faculty’s, staff’s, and students’ acceptance and perceptions of shared governance, the level and implementation of shared governance at the two participating universities, and to compare Chinese administrators’, faculty’s, staff’s, and students’ acceptance and perceptions of shared governance and level and implementation of shared governance with those of their American counterparts. This study includes an identification of similarities and differences in opinions and attitudes toward shared governance between stakeholders at the participating American and Chinese universities. The survey is also intended to identify the status of shared governance at the participating universities.

**Research Questions**

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, the following 16 research questions provided the focus for examination of data.

1. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university?

2. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university?

3. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university?
4. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the

*Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation)
among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university?

5. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the

*Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation)
between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the
participating universities?

6. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the

*Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation)
between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the
participating universities?

7. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the

*Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation)
between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members
at the participating universities?

8. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the

*Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation)
between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members
at the participating universities?

9. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the

*Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation)
between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at
the participating universities?
10. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities?

11. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities?

12. Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities?

13. At the participating American university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

14. At the participating American university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

15. At the participating Chinese university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between
male and female participants in regard to years of service?

16. At the participating Chinese university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

**Significance of the Study**

The most significant aspect of this study was to compare the Chinese administrators’, faculty’s, staff’s, and students’ knowledge and perceptions of shared governance with those of their American counterparts. There is almost no research available regarding a comparison between the Chinese administrators’, faculty’s, staff’s, and students’ knowledge and perceptions of shared governance with those of their American counterparts. According to Kezar et al. (2006) for the last 75 years American universities have practiced shared governance as their overriding principle that guides decision making. In China, however, top-down management prevails in higher education. However, since 2006 many Chinese scholars have been engaged in introducing shared governance to Chinese educators by publishing research articles in prominent national academic journals. In the meantime there have been numerous calls for innovations in Chinese institutional governance, among which the most powerful voice is eliminating administratorization and applying shared governance. Through investigating Chinese and American administrators’, faculty’s, staff’s, and students’ perceptions and institutional implementation of shared governance evidence-based data were collected to show the knowledge, perception, and implementation of shared governance of the Chinese groups of stakeholders and their American counterparts.
The second level of significance is related to diagnosing problems that may exist in implementing shared governance in American institutions. As the literature review revealed there is a need for increased research on shared governance in such areas as distribution of power in decision making, presidents’ more focus on the management of their institutions and less on the processes of shared governance, and the participation and representation of new groups of stakeholders such as students, staff, and adjunct faculty. The findings of this study may help to increase stakeholders’ awareness of experimentation and innovation in shared governance and to search for effective ways to improve the sharing of information and making decisions.

**Definition of Terms**

Shared Governance – The most commonly referenced definition of shared governance, found in the Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure published by the AAUP, defined shared governance as a shared responsibility among faculty, administrators, trustees, and, where appropriate, students (AAUP Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, 1966). A most recent definition of shared governance phrased by Florida State University (2011) is the participation of faculty, staff, and students as applicable, administrators, the president, and trustees in the institutional decision and policy making processes to promote the institutional vision and mission, academic integrity, sustainability of the dynamic academic environment, and retain public accountability.

Stakeholder – It indicates a person, group, organization, or system that affects or can be affected by an organization's actions and results. Srikanthan and Dalrymple (2003) recognized four main stakeholder groupings within higher education: providers, users of the product, users of the output, and employees of the sector. Stakeholders in higher education are
classified into internal and external stakeholders. Providers and users of the output are external stakeholders, and users of the product and employees of the sector internal stakeholders. This study focuses on the internal stakeholders. Students are the users of the product, and employees of the sector include faculty, administrators, board of trustees, and staff.

Administerization – For the present study, administerization refers to the excessive, inappropriate, or officious overuse or application of administrative procedure in addressing institutional problems (Yang & Wu, 2009). Liu and Jin (2011) stated that administerization or administrative power dominates all institutional processes and procedures in Chinese colleges and universities where academic governance and student government are not available.

Limitations and Delimitations

The major limitation of this study was that the survey was completed in two different ways, online with SurveyMonkey for American participants and on-ground or face-to-face survey for Chinese participants because a technical tool like SurveyMonkey was not available in China. This difference might cause some variety in the selection of participants. Another limitation of this study was that the survey instrument was designed and used for the first time during this research. There may be limitations or bias associated with the wording, semantics, the categorizing of questions, and other aspects of the instrument. To minimize any of such limitations, Ramo’s (2001) AAUP indicators of sound governance and Kaplan’s (2001) survey tool for universities to assess governance on their campuses sponsored by the AAUP and the ACAD were consulted and referenced. To improve reliability and validity of the survey two survey development activities were conducted using the survey instrument. One of the studies
was conducted with doctoral fellows at a department of a college of education and the other with graduate students in two classes of statistics taught by two professors at the same department of the college of education.

The population included four groups of stakeholders (administrator, faculty, student, and staff) at one 4-year American public university and one 4-year Chinese public university. Although this population may represent the other populations at similar institutions of higher education in the two countries, the results may not be generalizable to other populations because of the complexity of institutions of higher education.

Overview of the Study

This study was designed to assess the status of institutional stakeholders’ perceptions of shared governance and application of shared governance on an American higher education campus and at a counterpart in China to determine if there were differences among the groups of stakeholders both at the same institution and between the institutions. Chapter 1 was intended to establish the need and basis for this research study to be conducted. It includes an introduction to the study, statement of the purpose of the study, research questions, definitions of relevant terms, and the limitations and delimitations of the study. Chapter 2 includes a review of the literature on shared governance. Chapter 3 provides the methodology used to answer the 12 research questions. Chapter 4 presents data analysis and the findings of the study and Chapter 5 provides a summary, conclusions, implications for practice, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter serves as a review of the literature, research, and studies related to the concept of shared governance and its implementation in higher education. The literature review begins from a summary description of the history of American higher education and the history of Chinese education in general and Chinese higher education in particular. Then the review provides detailed information on shared governance in higher education in the U.S. and in China.

History of American Higher Education

Birnbaum (1988) stated that American higher education has been the envy of the world. American institutions attract international students from all the countries and regions in the world. In 2008 the number of international students reached 624,500, an increase of about 60% compared to that in 1990 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010, #270). Research universities have an internationally recognized ability to attract expertise. According to Thelin, Edwards, and Moyen (n.d.) American higher education has developed into a knowledge industry that represents 3% of the gross national product.

According to demographics collected for 2003 and 2004 and published in 2005 by Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (2005) 4,391 American institutions enrolled over 17.5 million students. These institutions were classified into three types: public institutions, nonprofit private institutions, and for-profit institutions. These institutions included associate’s degree offering institutions, research institutions, master’s degree offering institutions, baccalaureate institutions, and special focus institutions. More than half of the associate’s degree offering institutions were for-profit. Almost 60% of the research institutions were public. Fifty-three percent of master’s level institutions were nonprofit private institutions. Over 41.4% of all
institutions of American higher education were associate’s degree offering institutions (1,078), enrolling 39% of all students. Two hundred eighty-three research institutions, accounting for 6.4% of all institutions, enrolled more than 4.9 million students, or 28% of all students. Enrolling about 22% of all students, the 663 master’s level institutions accounted for about 15% of all institutions. Baccalaureate institutions comprised 17.4% of all institutions and enrolled 7.9% of all students. The 864 special-focus institutions accounted for 19.7% of all institutions and enrolled 3.2% of all students.

Thelin, Edwards, and Moyen (n.d.) stated that the history of American higher education is a success story of growth and expansion. Dating back to the time when Harvard College was founded in 1636, American higher education has a longer history than its nation. In the colonial era it was the Oxford and Cambridge alumni’s belief that education was essential and the Puritans’ emphasis of a learned clergy and an educated civil leadership that generated the institutions. In respect to the history of American higher education during the past 370 years, factors such as national needs, global pressures, political agendas, scientific and technological pursuits, economic opportunities, and social expectations have contributed to its current prosperity. Although some critics complain that the American higher education system is slow to change compared to many countries with a much longer history, American higher education, as noted by McCarthy (2011), has really experienced a rapid expansion.

Different educational historians drew the time lines for the phases in the development of American higher education in different ways. Cohen (1998) framed the more than 370 years of American postsecondary education into five phases: establishing the collegiate form in the colonies (1636–1789), diffusion of small colleges in the emergent nation (1790–1869), university transformation as the nation industrializes (1870–1944), mass higher education in the

Colonial and Early American Colleges (1636–1800)

The year 1636 was the beginning of American higher education with the establishment of Harvard College. After Harvard College, another eight institutions of higher learning were founded in the American colonies. The goal of establishing the colonial colleges was to ensure a civilized society with knowledgeable leaders and an educated clergy. The religious mission of these colleges was paramount. The University of Pennsylvania was the only early colonial college that was not church related, and its first curriculum included the classics and the more practical sciences. There was no distinction between public and private colleges. Governments and benefactors provided major financial support for the institutions. For some colleges pronounced efforts to Christianize native people was a successful source of fund-raising. In institutional structure and governance, authority was centered in an external board who empowered the institutional president and to which the president reported. Most of the presidents were clergymen and classroom teachers. During the first 100 years the instructional staffs were
composed primarily of tutors. In the last 50 years of this period permanent faculty, professors, began to supplement the tutors, indicating that faculty careers began to develop. In size the colonial colleges were very small, rarely enrolling more than 100 students, and few were able to complete their degrees. But according to Thelin, Edwards, and Moyen (n.d.) the young men who attended the colonial colleges made historic and extraordinary contributions to both political thought and action. They were very influential in politics and national affairs. The legacy of the colonial colleges produced a generation of American leaders and thinkers. According to Trow (1974), concerning student enrollment, higher education experienced three phases: elite higher education for the purpose of shaping the mind and developing character, mass higher education for elite to acquire skills, and universal higher education for large numbers of people to prepare them for life in a society marked by rapid technical and social change. However, the colonial colleges had their limitations. Because their access was exclusive and reserved for the elite, white Christian males, they refused to matriculate women and African-Americans.

Growth and Change (1800 –1900)

During the 1800s in the context of population growth, territory expansion to the West, independence from the Great Britain, and industrialization American higher education experienced a century of rapid expansion. Although hundreds of colleges opened and failed prior to the Civil War, 182 small permanent liberal arts colleges were founded. Alongside colleges was the proliferation of private educational academies. The establishment of these colleges formed the “college building boom.” Around 1850 out of a total national population of 23 million more than 250,000 students were enrolled by 6,000 academies, and about 25,000 students were enrolled by 239 colleges (McCarthy, 2011). The movement to develop a lower-level public school system encouraged the growth of higher education and made colleges expand
science and mathematics offerings. The Dartmouth College case contributed to the first
description of the distinction between private and public institutions and made possible the
tremendous growth of private institutions.

During this time period higher education began to experience a process of diversification.
The Yale Report of 1828 recorded the open debate over the purpose of higher education: for
passing knowledge from one generation to the next or for a more utilitarian purpose. While some
institutions retained the traditional college atmosphere and continued their focus on the liberal
arts with a strong religious foundation, others incorporated science into the curriculum and
adopted a research orientation that placed emphasis on the importance of using institutional
resources to solve problems and advance society. To produce a sufficient number of teachers for
public elementary schools, normal schools were established. Since 1837, when the first liberal
arts college for women was founded, a group of women colleges called the Seven Sisters
Colleges was established. Women also began to attend institutions previously exclusively for
men. By 1900 according to Woody (1929) over 71% of the whole number of institutions
admitted women and 85,000 women were enrolled, accounting for 36.8% of all students. Black
leaders and reform-minded Whites made progress in educating African Americans. Historically
Black colleges and universities were established. Between 1865 and 1890 over 200 Black private
institutions were founded in the South. By 1900 all the southern and border states had
government-supported Black colleges.

The normal school movement took place to provide qualified teachers for public
education. The first normal school was opened for women in 1839, followed by many others.
Later normal schools expanded to a 4-year curriculum and began to award degrees. Progress was
made in professional education, particularly in law and medicine. The apprenticeship system
developed into the requirement of a bachelor’s degree. Catholic colleges and universities were established to provide Catholic education to insure the young grow up in the faith. Ninety-eight Catholic institutions were founded, using a curriculum that combined secondary and higher education between 1850 and 1900. Universities that were established by the state governments opened. The state universities were designed to be free of religious domination and offer advanced instruction of all the branches of science. During Jackson’s presidency the value of the classical curriculum was questioned while the desire for practical application and the growth of the sciences made possible the birth of research universities, graduate institutions, and technical schools. The idea of offering a grant of land to support education gave birth to land-grant colleges. In addition to offering land to support education the federal government provided other types of support either to promote research or to encourage individual students to pursue higher education.

Institutions were under the control of governing boards that were composed of clergymen and later became more secular. Those who served the boards of trustees tended to be rich, powerful, or influential men. The president received delegation and authority from the board and began to serve as the spokesman for the board. The secular president started to play the modern role of soliciting contributions from wealthy benefactors and leading the faculty through years of great change. Teaching became an academic profession, and professors began to be viewed as experts. Tutorship came to its end with such academic appointments as instructor, assistant professor, and professor. As teaching, research, and professionalization developed varied academic associations were established. Students were more often engaged in athletics and fraternities than in religious societies. However, discrimination against women in admissions still continued. The situation didn’t improve until the second half of the 20th Century.
Expansion of Higher Education (1900–1960)

It was a time of great change: the two World Wars, stock market crash, the Great Depression, and the movement towards fairness and inclusion. Those events affected higher education as they did other areas of the society. The years between 1945 and 1970 were regarded as higher education’s golden age. It was also a century for the dramatic evolution of the established institutions through the process of standardization. Standards were set up for such institutional procedures as admission, accreditation, research, curriculum diversification, federal funding, and technology. Higher education became widely accessible and entered the phase of mass enrollment. By 1960 there were about 10 million undergraduate students, almost half of whom were women. Many young people chose to pursue higher education because it meant good times, pleasant friendships, and life-long prestige. Coeducation developed, but Black students still did not have equal opportunities. However, while the industrial model provided vocational training for most Black students, the historically Black colleges and universities continued to offer higher education to prepare Black graduates for leadership and professional roles. Institutional variety was further enhanced by the existence of professional schools, 2-year and junior colleges, research universities, agricultural and technical programs at the land-grant colleges, and graduate programs. According to Lucas (2006) the number of students doubled about every 15 years along with the number of faculty, and that of Ph.D.s doubled about every 11 years. Standardized testing was brought into use with the opening of the Educational Testing Service in 1948. While fraternities kept gaining in popularity other student organizations such as sororities, Black Greek-letter organizations, and clubs came into being. Intercollegiate athletics, particularly football and basketball, became very popular and soared in commercial appeal. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) was founded in 1910 to serve as, according to
Lapchick and Slaughter (1994), the power behind college sport and the defender of ethical behavior. During this time period the faculty began to transform into an academic professorate with academic ranks, academic freedom, and tenure.

Factors such as institutional size, diversification, varying educational philosophies, emergence of academic departments, and larger numbers of students contributed to the rapid growth of administration. Governing boards were composed of businessmen and presidents. Faculty became more concerned about expectations for faculty productivity, conduct, and requirements for promotion than student conduct and the student’s personal well-being. Consequently, a new class of student personnel administrators appeared. Administration began to operate by following standardized practices.

**Access and Choice (1960–the 21st Century)**

In the midst of numerous social, economic, political, military, scientific, and technological developments and changes such as the Civil Rights Movement, the Feminist Movement, and modern communications the federal government played a significant role in passing educational legislation. Among the most far-reaching laws were the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, and the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Higher Education Act of 1965 brought great change to postsecondary education by establishing important new programs to aid students and colleges. This legislation enabled the federal government to assume the significant responsibility for ensuring higher education access, affordability, and choice, especially for students from disadvantaged socioeconomic groups. The federal government provided financial aid programs to help high-needs students, while state and local governments financed institutions to keep tuition low for all students.
In institutional governance expansion of higher education caused institutions to undergo a “managerial revolution” in decision making and attempts at coordination. It also led to the proliferation of an increasingly complex academic bureaucracy. Among the outcomes was faculty’s interaction with students and parents lessened. Since the mid-1900s faculty members’ responsibilities of teaching, engaging in scholarly activities, and offering service to the institution and the community have not changed significantly. Most universities continue to protect and defend the ideals of tenure and academic freedom. Online instruction has gained acceptance and will continue to grow and change the nature of undergraduate life in significant ways.

Institutions enrolled an increasingly diverse student body in areas of gender and ethnicity. Widespread student dissatisfaction over student service, free speech, antiwar protests, and issues of civil rights and social justice affected many campuses. With 61% of all secondary school seniors or about 12 million undergraduate students accepted into college in 1991 institutions entered the phase of universal access to higher education. The numbers of women students and students from traditionally underrepresented groups increased as well. By 2000 women constituted nearly half the students entering law school and about 40% of first-year medical students. Women even constituted a majority of the Ph.D. recipients in biology, literature, and the humanities although they were still underrepresented in such graduate fields as engineering and the physical sciences. In 2007 32% of all students were minorities, among whom Black students accounted for about 13%, Asian or Pacific Islander students 7%, and nonresident aliens about 3% (McCarthy, 2011).

American higher education is confronted with many problems and issues. Since 1985 colleges and universities have been traveling on a financial roller coaster. Many institutions
struggle with the question of how to achieve both equality and excellence. Boyer (1987) identified eight points of tension that undergraduate education is involved in: the transition from school to college, the goals and curriculum of education, the priorities of the faculty, the condition of teaching and learning, the quality of campus life, the governance of the college, assessing outcomes, and the connection between the campus and the world. The purpose of higher education is still a question that many institutions of higher education struggle with in the 21st Century.

In spite of the hardships and challenges, the bright side of the American higher education is obvious. Higher education has acquired the strength and stability of being a mature industry. It has been respected as a means to legitimacy, literacy, and respectability by all sectors of American society. What is most promising is that opportunities reside in challenges. With expanding access, advanced technologies, demographic shifts, great social change, economic realities, and new national priorities the potential for innovative evolution of American higher education is tremendous.

Cohen (1998) predicted these trends in American higher education will continue into the 21st Century. According to Cohen higher education will maintain its significant contributions to individual mobility, economic development, and research designed to assist industry. Few new universities will be built. Institutions will be financed by state, federal, and private philanthropic funds. The concept of open access will still hold, but as online instruction gains in popularity percentages of full-time on-campus students will drop. While the likelihood of employing part-time staff remains strong, it is not likely for the faculty to be highly professionalized. With new subspecialties and additional occupational groups, generated curriculum will continue broadening and favor vocationalism.
History of Chinese Higher Education

Education in Ancient China

According to Sun (2010) the history of education in China began with the birth of Chinese civilization more than 5,000 years ago. Organized education in China can be dated back to about 2100 B.C. at the time of Shun, a historical period in ancient China. At that time the school was called Xiang. Seven-year-olds were supposed to go to Lower Xiang, and 15-year-olds went to Upper Xiang. However, the school was prepared for nobles’ offspring, where they learned Six Arts: rites, music, archery, charioteering, calligraphy, and mathematics. In the Western Zhou Dynasty between the 11th Century B.C. and 770 B.C. the educational system was learning at the government hall (Xue Zai Guan Fu), or known as government education (Guan Xue). It was a school system run by the government or the Imperial Court for aristocrats’ and high-ranking officials’ children. In the capital city five national schools were set up. At 12, boys learned arts related to rituals and when older, archery and chariot driving, while girls learned rituals, correct deportment, silk production, and weaving. The Western Zhou Dynasty was also the time when family education started. Confucius, the great thinker and famous philosopher in Chinese history, taught his son poetry and rites at home and was, therefore, regarded as the founder of family education. But family education did not become a systematic educational system. During the Spring and Autumn Warring States period between 770 B.C. and 256 B.C. education became more popular. Confucius broke the rule of learning at the government hall. He encouraged learning for all hierarchical levels and for all ages and opening the door of education to the masses. He established his own school and started to spread his teaching, thoughts, and views. He became the founder of private education in China, known as private institution (Si Xue). Out of the 3,000 disciples he taught 72 continued and developed their teacher’s system of thoughts,
Confucianism. Taoism was another school of philosophy widely taught, which led afterwards to many schools being developed in the Warring States Period. Ever since Confucius’s time private schools existed alongside with government schools. For hundreds of years young students primarily used three texts in Chinese: the Thousand Character Classic, the Hundred Family Surnames, and the Three Character Classic.

In the succeeding dynasties significant events and policies made a powerful impact on the development of education in China. In the Qin Dynasty Qin Shi Huang (259 B.C.–210 B.C.) favored Legalism, a Chinese philosophy that believes in three tools — law, tactic, and power, to govern the country, and rejected other philosophies by burning their books and burying the scholars live. It set the keynote for the patriarchal society in which women were usually not educated and stayed home to do housework. Not until 921 years later did Empress Wu (624–705) challenge the patriarchal rule in 691 and elevate the position of women. In the Han Dynasty Emperor Wu (156 B.C.–87 B.C.) favored Confucianism and set up the Imperial Academy (Taixue), the highest rank of educational establishment between the Han Dynasty and the Sui Dynasty. At the age of 7 boys were thought ready to start learning basic skills in reading, writing, and calculation. At the Imperial Academy students studied Confucius’s Five Classics. The students took examinations and those who received good scores would be given official titles. But in many cases selection of talented people was conducted through a system of “Recommendation through Observation,” which usually led to nepotism and corruption. The Sui Dynasty managed to unify the several states into one country. To create a strong and well educated civil service and employ the best talents in the country, the Sui Dynasty initiated a system of integrating learning with examination and administration, which proved to be fairer and more effective. Students practiced writing and accumulated knowledge of the Chinese
classical books. Talented people were selected through a system called the Imperial Examination in Chinese for positions in civil service. It was put into practice during the Sui Dynasty and lasted more than 1,300 years until the last examination during the Qing Dynasty, the last dynasty in the history of China. This examination system gave children from poor families opportunities to take the government exam and enabled them to bring honor to their families. A special examination for smart young children called Tongziju was administered, which was similar in many ways to today's special classes for gifted children. Thus regardless of parentage or age males were eligible to realize their self-development.

The collapse of the Qing Dynasty (1616–1911) marked the beginning of modern education in China. Among the many events that contributed to the development of modern education in China two deserve special mentioning. One is that many people went overseas to study and brought back modern educational ideas and Western philosophies. The other is that Christian missionaries arrived and had built more than 2,000 church schools that accommodated over 40,000 students. Based on the middle school education model some churches ran college classes. As a result, private schools called Sishu were replaced by public schools called New Schools managed by the county government. The new schools were not politically oriented, a variety of subjects were provided, and tuition and other fees were affordable. The Jingzhen Girls’ School, founded by Yuanshan in 1898, is generally considered the first girls’ school established by the Chinese. In 1928 the Ministry of Education of the Republic of China was founded, which contributed to the further development of modern education in China.

According to Li, Zhang, Li, and Lei (2011) between 1949, the year when the People’s Republic of China was founded, and 1976, the year when the Great Revolution ended, political campaigns caused havoc to education in China. It was Mao Zedong’s thought that education
must serve the proletariat. He ordered that while focusing on learning students must also learn how to be farmers, workers, and soldiers. Consequently students managed to learn virtually nothing useful successfully. Li et al. (2011) asserted that after 1953 the situation deteriorated to such an extent that many teachers were tortured, fired, or imprisoned, and students refused to come to class. The teaching profession was viewed as menial. At the peak of the Great Cultural Revolution classrooms were deserted and schools were paralyzed. Between 1968 and the end of the Great Cultural Revolution a campaign, literally translated as “up the mountain and into the village,” dispatched millions of high school graduates to the countryside for proletarian re-education.

Since the downfall of the Gang of Four and especially Deng Xiaoping’s Reform and Opening-up policy the development of education in China has had a resurgence. In the past 2 decades education in China has experienced a rapid change and a successful transition from quantity to quality, that is, from increasing the number of schools and institutions and the size of enrollment to enhancing teaching effectiveness, research, and learning outcomes (Sun, 2010). Modern day China has a complete educational system that covers all the levels of schools and institutions and various groups of students. The system starts from the kindergarten into which children ranging from 3 to 5 years of age are accepted. The age of 6 is the legal age for kids to start elementary school. According to the Compulsory Education Law of the People’s Republic of China, which was developed in 1986 and revised in 2006, the first 9 years of elementary and secondary education are free and compulsory although the policy may not be well implemented, but the last 3 years of secondary education and postsecondary education requires tuition and fees. At the end of the 9-year free education students are required to take the Standard Examination for Junior Middle School Graduates, the results of which decide the track of senior secondary
education the student is qualified to take. The best students are enrolled into the general senior secondary school where they study for 3 years and prepare for the National College Entrance Examination (NCEE). The rest of the students are enrolled and educated in technical and vocational schools for technical or professional training in 3- to 4-year programs. For most high school graduates NCEE determines their future (Sun, 2010). Prior to 1989 higher education was for the elite with 1% or 2% of examinees admitted. Between 1999 and 2011 there had been a dramatic expansion year by year. In 2006 the percentage of admitted students increased up to 22% and in 2011 further to 26% (China Education Online, 2013).

Ancient Academies in China

The Imperial Academy (Taixue), established by Emperor Wu of the Han Dynasty in 124 B.C., was the earliest form of higher education institution in China. The purpose of its establishment was to educate elite for the reign of the Dynasty. Taixue is regarded as the first national central institution of higher education in the Eastern part of the world. Its prosperity lasted for over 700 years and didn’t decline until 589. At the beginning only 50 students were enrolled, but at the peak of its development the enrollment reached up to 10,000 students. While using Confucian Classics as texts, the Imperial Academy emphasized the function of examination and encouraged self-learning. In the Song Dynasty (960–1279) Taixue developed into a complete system of teaching and learning. It required that students be recruited from common people’s talented children and the offspring of officials below the eighth grade of rank. The complete time for learning at the Imperial Academy was 8 years. Because of the students’ different levels of knowledge, their age ranged between 12 and 60.

In 278 Emperor Wu of the Western Jin Dynasty founded another Imperial Academy called Guozixue or Guozijian. The establishment of Guozixue did not terminate Taixue (Sun,
They coexisted and served as the highest institutions teaching Confucian Classics. In the Tang Dynasty Guozixue had a maximum enrollment of 300 students from noble families and 24 teachers. Following the Tang system the Song Dynasty set 200 students as the maximum number. In 1272 the Yuan Dynasty founded a Mongolian Guozixue because the rulers were Mongolians but simultaneously made the Chinese Guozixue available. In the Ming Dynasty Guozijian was available in both Beijing and Nanjing. The Nanjing Guozijian, founded in 258, had a vast campus and became so famous that many countries sent students there to study. The Beijing Guozijian, established in 1306, served as both an institution of learning and the highest organization of administration of national education.

Another type of ancient academy was called Shuyuan. In 635 the first Shuyuan, Jiuzong Shuyuan, was founded in the Tang Dynasty. Shuyuan experienced a long history of more than 1,000 years. It thrived in the Song Dynasty and was popular in the Ming and Qing Dynasties. In the Ming Dynasty the number of Shuyuan increased to over 1,200. While some of these academies were government-owned, most were private. The function of this type of institution was to cultivate talented people, to encourage a devotion to learning, and to spread the Chinese culture (Sun, 2010). Some of the private academies encouraged academic freedom and free speech, and exposed social problems. As a higher education agency it played a combined role of storing books, teaching, and research. At the beginning of Shuyuan’s development the academies were usually built in the neighborhood of temples, or in the mountains, or woods. Shuyuan aimed to educate students to acquire knowledge and moral values rather than pass examinations for higher positions. But many students from these academies could work as officials when they passed the graduation exams held by the government; therefore, Shuyuan also played the role of
selecting the elite and providing leaders for the country. Teaching was primarily conducted in the form of self-learning, supplemented by public lectures and teachers’ guidance.

Shuyuan enjoyed such a widespread influence that some other countries duplicated this form of institution. In North Korea the number of Shuyuan once reached 670; there were also a large number of academies of this type in Japan. The Shuyuan in Naples, Italy was built in 1732, and one was established in San Francisco, California in the U.S. (Sun, 2010).

Higher-Education Institutions in Modern China

Although Chinese higher education can date back to 124 B.C. (the Han Dynasty) mass higher education, according to Surowski (2000), was not shaped until the end of the 19th Century when it was realized that to strengthen a country talented people had to be cultivated and to cultivate talented people education had to flourish. In 1895 with Emperor Guangxu’s (1871–1908) approval Beiyang University was established in Tianjin, now Tianjin University. Tianjin University was the first institution of higher learning in modern China. Following Beiyang University were Shanghai Jiao Tong University founded in 1896 and Zhejiang University established in 1897. By 1931 there were 39 universities, 17 colleges, and 23 professional schools founded in China; by 1949, 205 institutions of higher learning had been established, among which 55 were comprehensive universities.

China based its newly founded higher education system on the Western European model, whose influence may originate from the missionary movement, while in the Northeastern part of China the Japanese model dominated. When Cai Yuanpei served as President of Beijing University between 1916 and 1923 academic freedom was advocated and men and women were enrolled to learn at the same institution.
Colleges and Universities in the New China (the People’s Republic of China)

After the People’s Republic of China was founded in 1949 the Western European model gave way to that of the Soviet Union although Taiwan maintained its Western European model and Hong Kong practiced a British style of higher education system. In alignment with the Soviet Union model a countrywide adjustment of colleges and university departments took place in which the priority was shifted to educating skilled personnel for industrial construction and teachers, developing specialized colleges, and adjusting and strengthening the comprehensive universities. Because Soviet higher education emphasized specialization rather than comprehensiveness, specialized subject colleges were established or became independent of comprehensive universities. This higher education system served the purpose of the government at that time, and trained the first generation of highly needed intellectuals to build the new economy. However, the worsening relationship between China and the Soviet Union in the late 1950s and the mid-1960s caused China to adopt a Confucian-Western style at higher education. The goal of Chinese higher education in this period, as interpreted by Hayhoe (1989), was to adopt the teaching method known as the “unity of theory and practice” to educate workers for national construction who would be able to master knowledge, make scientific and technical accomplishments, and serve the people wholeheartedly. For the purposes of serving the government led by the Chinese Communist Party and the needs of the rapid economic development in the new country, between 1949 and 1953 the number of comprehensive universities was reduced to 13 and enrollment in the fields of humanities and social sciences decreased drastically from 33.1% to 14.9% (Ouyang, 2004). But the “Great Leap Forward” movement (1958–1962) caused a dramatic growth in the number of higher institutions from 229 up to 1,289, which shocked the Chinese government to such an extent that it decreased the
number to 434 in 1965 (China Statistical Yearbook 1996). The Great Cultural Revolution brought the development of higher education to an abrupt halt in 1966. The Great Cultural Revolution lasted for a decade, leaving Chinese people uneducated with a devastating impact on the Chinese higher education. It was not until 1977 that the NCEE (National College Entrance Exam) was resumed and the universities were reopened (Sun, 2010).

In 1977 the restoration of Deng Xiaoping to General Secretary of the Central Committee brought numerous changes including a new educational policy. To meet the political and economic needs higher education was not only normalized but adjusted and expanded to match international standards. As stated by Ouyang (2004), an inclusive higher education system was established with different subjects, different categories, and different levels. As a result of the multiple measures taken 1,022 universities and colleges were educating 3,408,760 students by 1998 (China Statistical Yearbook 1999). Between 1996 and 2000 many higher institutions merged, bringing the number of major colleges and universities down to 212.

Today Chinese higher education system shows more resemblance to the American system of higher education. Two- and 3-year colleges award associate degrees, 4-year colleges and universities offer academic and vocational courses that lead to bachelor degrees, and universities and research institutions offer master’s and doctoral degrees. According to the statistics reported by the Netherlands Education Support Office Beijing (2005), these institutions can be framed into regular universities, technical universities, specialized institutions for agriculture, foreign languages, and medicine, vocational colleges, and specialized colleges. They can be further categorized into 1,650 regular public higher institutions, 528 adult institutions, and 214 private higher institutions. These institutions are administered in four different ways. The majority of them are administered by provincial governments; some major universities are under
the direct control of the Ministry of Education; some universities receive a joint supervision from central and local authorities; a very small number of institutions are affiliated to the various ministries or departments of the state.

During the modern era there has been a dramatic increase in the number of students registered at China’s institutions of higher education. In 1949 the number was 140,000, in 1995 that number jumped up to 1,630,000, and in 2008 it reached 27,000,000 (MoE Enrollment, 2008). Most of the students are enrolled at the undergraduate level or below, and the ratio between graduate and undergraduate was around 1:15 in 2005.

Tuition is a critical component of higher education in China because it means development to the institution and access to the student. Prior to 1985 higher education had been free. Between 1985 and 1988 a training fee for those enrolled beyond the nationally planned number was charged. Since 1989 all students were required to pay tuition because, as stated in the Outline of Chinese Education Reform and Development in 1993, higher education is noncompulsory. But before 1996 tuition was very low at the level of several hundred RMB. Between 1997 and 2006 tuition fees were on the increase with an average increase of 30% to 50% per year. In 2006 it reached 5,500RMB. Noticing the drastic increase in tuition Ji Baocheng, President of Renmin University of China, a prestigious university located in Beijing, suggested that it should not increase any further (Ji, 2007). Now tuition averages between 5,500 and 6,000RMB.

Going overseas to study has always been a goal of many Chinese students. In 1985, the Chinese government advanced the policy of supporting students to go abroad, encouraging them to come back, and giving them the freedom of exit and entry (Zhu, 1994). The return of Hong Kong in 1997 quickened the steps of international cooperation between Chinese and foreign
institutions. New ways of cooperation and partnership like 1+2+1 (1 year at home university, 2 years at foreign university, and another 1 year at home university), 2+2 (2 years at home university and then 2 years at foreign university) joint programs have been explored and proved beneficial to the home university, the foreign university, and the student. The total number of students studying abroad has exceeded one million, while only one quarter of the students going out returned to China after their study programs. But the recent trend indicates that the percent of students returning to China is increasing (Sun, 2010).

While thousands of students go abroad to study every year at home China is also experiencing a process of internationalization that takes place in two ways. The first aspect relative to internationalization concerns the admission of students from other countries. In alignment with the policy stated in the action plan of the Ministry of Education international students will be enrolled into selected institutions and academic disciplines (MoE Action Plan, 2005). The number of international students studying in China was 78,323 in 2005. Now the number is beyond 100,000. The other aspect is related to the programs offered in China by foreign higher education institutions. Generally speaking, it is a difficult mission to start off-shore educational activities in China because the complex process of getting a program accredited is under the control of the Regulations of the People’s Republic of China on Chinese-Foreign Cooperation in Running Schools (Foreign Cooperation 2007). These programs are mainly offered by US, UK, and Australian higher education institutions. In 2003, 712 programs were officially accredited and accepted as joint programs, but only 150 were allowed to confer non-Chinese degrees.

Reform in Chinese higher education has been a priority since the 1980s. According to Yuan (2000) significant changes in the internal and external environments for higher education
called for corresponding reforms in its organizational structure. It was stated in the 2003-2007 Action Plan for Invigorating Education that five areas would be highlighted in the reform movement: from central regulation to more local autonomy, from elite to mass education, from specialization to breadth, from public to more private, from national to international. To ensure the quality of higher education Project 211 and Project 985 were launched respectively in 1995 and in 1998. As a result of the projects a group of major universities specially and sufficiently funded have made great endeavors in improving the quality of teaching, research, administration, and institutional efficiency. The projects will help to contribute to developing some competitive world-class universities and research institutions.

Shared Governance in the U.S. and in China

Review of American and Chinese Institutional Governance

Governance, as stated by Birnbaum (1988), is the concept that best distinguishes institutions of higher education from other organizations. On the one hand, as Cohen (1998) stated, governance usually refers to the formal structure by which policies are developed and decisions made. On the other hand Birnbaum (1988) explained that not having any single or widely accepted definition, governance may be used to refer to institutional structures, legal relationships, authority patterns, rights and responsibilities, and decision-making processes. Put in a simplified way governance is about who is in charge of the institution. It is the means to implementing ideas that either respond to problems or provide new strategies (Tierney & Lechuga, 2004c).

The combination of lay boards of trustees, strong presidents, a weak professoriate, and the absence of a central authority of higher education represents the governance pattern of American higher institutions (Cohen, 1998). In the case of governance Thelin (2004) suggested
considering legacies beyond Oxford and Cambridge. Because the college founders in the colonial era detested the autonomy of the Oxford scholars, they turned away from faculty control to the Scottish universities’ reliance on an external board. The consequence was that a university president did not report to the faculty but to the board of trustees or the board of visitors, and the faculty was subject to the scrutiny of a governing board and its appointed administrators. This governance structure initiated and used at Harvard College established a model still in use today. The trustees had the authority to award degrees and employ the staff for all the important positions like the president, tutors, and professors. Although the faculty was empowered with some self-governance relative to curriculum and admissions requirements it was no more than token representation on the boards of trustees (Cohen, 1998).

In the subsequent history of college governance, as summarized by Cohen (1998), the major change was that businessmen and politicians replaced clergymen in governing boards. During the Emergent Nation Era (1790–1869) in the U.S. college presidents increasingly came to be seen as the representative of the trustees, less as members of the faculty. When professors replaced tutors the faculty gained a sense of independence and self-worth. But by the time the faculty established its firm position in research, scholarship, and autonomy the institutional governance model got firmly established, so that it was difficult to change it. The faculty pursued their own interests without gaining voice in institutional management. Business leaders dominated boards, and college presidents became innovators. Students had no voice in curricular affairs, institutional management, or any other aspect of student life.

According to Cohen (1998) during the University Transformation Era (1870–1944) institutional governance became more secular. The system of higher education was formed more by voluntary agreements, imitation, internal competition, and general rules of conduct than by
legislation. Governance developed in the direction of administrative hierarchies and bureaucratic management systems. Accrediting and professional associations began to play a significant role by acting as quasi-governmental entities. The governing board continued its oversight of the institution and represented the institution to the public. The president took pride in acting as a pragmatist, empire builder, fundraiser, and expert at public relations. The faculty tended to stay within their own academic departments which became more democratic, with rotating chairs, offering equal voting rights and equal voices for the members. Academic senates were established but merely played an advisory role and failed to exert significant influence over university management. Student affairs turned into a separate category, and by the end of the era most institutions had a student government, but the students in American institutions were never as much politically empowered as their counterparts in Europe and Latin America.

State level coordination during the Mass Higher Education Era (1945–1975), as stated by Cohen (1998), gave birth to state-level governance, which made the institutions within a system more equal but did not reduce competition among them. As institutions became larger most of them came to display a strong resemblance to business corporations, governmental bureaus, or agencies in which different constituent groups competed for a greater share of power. As institutional governance moved toward larger units the administration was subdivided into smaller units to manage the complexities of larger units and to comply with state and federal regulations. In the process of allocating economic resources and reforming educational programs administrators fell into conflict with faculty, students, and alumni groups, which eventually led to the division of administrative structure into three general functions: academic affairs, student affairs, and business affairs. Vice presidents for academic affairs, administration, health, and finance were added to a board of regents and president. The role of presidents changed from
leader of the educational program to manager of the bureaucracy. In some cases an increasingly well organized and powerful academic senate had gained not only practically total responsibility for what happened within the departments but various universitywide responsibilities as well. The faculty senate would facilitate communication among the departments and between the faculty and the administration. It would also ensure that the president’s role was limited to macromanaging, fundraising, and representing the institution to the governing board. The faculty took responsibility for admissions and graduation requirements, the appointment, promotion, and dismissal of professors, the purchase of books and journals by the library, and research and public service projects. During the Mass Higher Education Era student governments became well developed, so that they included honor systems, advisory councils to the faculty, committees empowered with discipline, oversight of residence halls, and management of extracurricular activities. Although the goal of university-wide community government with faculty, administrators, and students sharing power together had not been reached, student associations emerged as one more pressure group. As a result of the student activism of the 1960s students gained seats on institutional governing boards and on college committees so that they were able to participate in the process of decision making.

During the Contemporary Era (1976–1998), with governmental oversight authority given to the state level coordinating boards, birth of numerous interinstitutional associations, and process of accreditation, the big business of higher education became ever more subject to extramural management (Cohen, 1998). Internally the roles of trustees and administrators remained pretty much the same as before. While engaged in fundraising and campus politics and being responsive to the board of trustees the president had to be attentive to the faculty, students, alumni, and local community. The president’s ability to manage large-scale enterprises was
emphasized more than the ability to make scholarly accomplishments. The 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities gave the faculty the primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process. Shared governance, which was intended to enable every constituent group to have a part in deciding every issue, replaced collegial governance.

Although higher education in ancient China had never enjoyed prosperity and remained on a small scale, according to Yu and Xiong (1999), central governments strengthened management of higher education by establishing Guozijian, a government agency. In the process of governing higher education institutions two models of governance were developed. One model was managing institutions at two levels: the central government and local governments. Jijiu, head of Guozijian or Taixue in charge of education, was responsible for the administration of the public institutions under the control of the central government. Changshi, a local official, took the responsibility of managing the local public institutions. The other model was a combination of centralized management and management by specific guilds. The centralized management took charge of general affairs in education, and guilds were responsible for specialized institutions in such disciplines as medicine and astronomy. Democracy was not practiced in any area of the feudal society and education was no exception. Therefore, the faculty, staff, and students were not empowered to play any role in institutional governance. In short, as a result of slow social development, scarce categories in education, and lack of multiple levels on a large scale the structure of institutional governance was very simple (Min, 2010).

After the establishment of the People’s Republic of China higher education, according to Min (2010), has developed in a system of centralized planning. All the major colleges and
universities were public, funded by the government, and included in the blueprint of the national development. Therefore, university presidents are appointed by the government and the faculty and staff are given an equal identity as those working in government departments.

Min (2010) divided the institutional governance in the New China into two phases: the Pre-Reform Period and the Reform and Opening Period. The Pre-Reform Period covered the first 30 years after 1949. In 1950 it was stipulated by the Ministry of Education that the president serve as the head of the institution representing and reporting to the government. The president was responsible for affairs in instruction, research, and administration, and the Chinese Communist Party (CPC) took charge of political affairs so that the administration and the Party were independent of each other. In 1955 the policy changed, stipulating that the Council of Administrative Affairs, which was under the leadership of the CPC, took charge of the university. The Council was designed to practice collective leadership with the president presiding over it, but in fact the CPC monopolized the administration. During the Great Cultural Revolution administrative power was taken over by the institutional Revolutionary Commission and the role of the president existed in name only. The management style and organization of units followed those of the government. Centralistic planning prevails in curriculum design, syllabi, and instructional contents and requirements. The faculty were selected from the best graduates. Centralization was also implemented in examination, student admissions, and assignment of graduates. The Student Affairs Department, the Communist Youth League, and the Student Union were responsible for student life. Min (2010), who saw a more positive side of the institutional management in this period, described it as a period when the Chinese institutional management system was established and improved. The system matched well to the political, economic, and cultural development at that time. The centralistic planning system helped to
bring the steady development of colleges and universities, tightened the ties between institutions and the government, and made great contributions to the national economy.

The Reform and Opening Period, as reported by Min (2010), was marked by the 3rd Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China held in 1978. In 1978 the Ministry of Education changed the 1955 policy of institutional administration by the Council of Administrative Affairs under the leadership of the CPC into division of responsibilities among presidents under the leadership of the CPC; that is, under the leadership of the CPC the president and vice-presidents of the institution took charge of different colleges and departments. In 1985 the policy was modified in the light of a policy issued by the Central Committee of the CPC into institutional administration by the president. During the application of this leadership system Chinese higher education completed a series of reforms in instructional contents, pedagogy, rules, improving outcomes, enrollment plan, assignment of graduates, and institutional autonomy. Higher education, considered beyond the range of compulsory education, began to charge students tuition and fees. At graduation students were given the options of finding job by themselves or getting assigned by the government to certain employment. Higher education completed its transition from elite education to mass education. In 1998 Higher Education Law of the People’s Republic of China was issued, in which it was announced that public institutions must comply with the president accountability system under the leadership of the CPC (Clause 39). In the current administrative system the CPC Secretary ranks highest institutionally, while at the college- or department-level the CPC Secretary ranks below the Dean, Director, or Chair.

Some internal organizations have been formed to participate in or share institutional governance. The Board of regents, composed of mostly renowned public figures, is a
consultative organization. The Board members are entitled to listening to the work report delivered by the president and advancing suggestions for the institutional development plan. More importantly they are expected to serve as ties between the institution and the external world. The Academic Council, usually made up of presidents, deans or chairs, and distinguished professors, is responsible for evaluating and making decisions relative to academic programs, instructional and research work plans, faculty improvement, and professional titles for the faculty. The Faculty and Staff Congress, which is held once a year, receives the work reports about the past and new academic years and proposals made by faculty and staff representatives. The President Open Day is a day that the president reserves for meeting students, getting their feedback, and hearing their suggestions and opinions. Despite the several forms of shared governance, final decision-making authority always rests with the CPC Secretary and Vice-Secretaries, and the President and Vice-Presidents.

As institutions of higher education become large and complex there have been conflicts for power among different stakeholders. In America tensions between trustees and faculty are reflected in two extreme assumptions: on the one hand, as stated by Fisher (1984), it has been suggested that trustees should consider simplifying governance by stripping all the other campus groups of governance prerogatives. On the other hand, as presented by Besse (1973), the faculty believe that they are the university, empowered with the authority over the function of the university.

The administered university, as defined by Lunsford (1970), has widened the gulf between faculty and administration, which in turn leads to misunderstandings between the two major stakeholders. Birnbaum (1988) stated that administrators come to see the faculty as self-interested, unconcerned with controlling costs or unwilling to respond to legitimate requests for
accountability, while in the eyes of the faculty the administrators are moving further away from the central academic concerns that define the institution. The reality is that as higher education acquires more features of market models of organization boards and administrators increasingly apply bureaucratic models of decision making to areas that formally were the domain of faculty members (Helms & Price, 2005).

Although, as Drummond and Reitsch (1995) stated, both university administrators and faculty members have a uniform opinion regarding the desirability of shared governance Waugh (2003) pointed out the tendency for college and university presidents to focus more on the management of their institutions and less on the processes of shared governance in decision making because of the pressures for efficiency and the achievement of performance goals. Presidents feel more accountable to external constituencies, particularly the public officials and business leaders involved in hiring them and supplementing their salaries and benefits, and less accountable to the faculty and other internal constituencies. Professional administrators hired by presidents and having no academic experience in turn feel more accountable to their administrative superiors and less accountable to faculty, students, and others within the institution. Waugh (2003) concluded that the robustness of shared governance is decreasing and that if current trends continue shared governance may no longer be possible.

Traditionally, governance in higher education was confined within the bounds of administrators and faculty and most literature relative to shared governance discussed the relationship between and among the governing board, administrators, and faculty. But the AAUP phrased the relationship as the interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others (Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, 1966). As institutions become larger and more complex other stakeholders, especially internal groups such
as staff and students, need to have their voice in institutional governance (Cohen, 1998). In a survey of 2,000 college presidents it was found that students and staff are the top two stakeholders who provide presidents with their greatest sense of reward (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2007).

As institutions of higher education differ from each other ways of governance for different institutions may also vary. Fish (2007) stated that there is no reason to assume that the governance structure of one college or university should be the same as that of another college or university because there is no general mode of governance. Birnbaum (1988) argued that systemic differences between colleges and universities such as the nature of the faculty, the appropriate roles of various constituencies in governance, and issues of organization and structure significantly influence the ways that institutions are governed and managed. This may explain at least in part why the University of California, Berkeley, has one of the country’s strongest faculty governance system while the University of Michigan has a weaker system more representative of national norms (Hollinger, 2001). Minor (2003) claimed that it is impossible to prescribe a one-fits-all solution for shared governance because of the great institutional diversity that exists from one institution to the next. Keller (2004), considering the new situations that may arise, anticipated experimentation and innovation in campus governance.

According to Liu and Jin (2011) in China top-down management has prevailed in higher education since its birth. Institutional leaders see their institutions as comparable to business firms in their structure and authority patterns and believe that academic decisions do not require faculty involvement. But as stated by Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (1978) traditional management theories do not apply to academic institutions because academic institutions are so different from other institutions like business firms. Waugh (1998) stressed the managerial threat
to institutional governance, which leads to conflicts between managerial and academic cultures, distrust between the faculty and administration, and centralization of authority and decision-making. Birnbaum (1988) affirmed that administrative authority that tries to control the other stakeholders by offering material benefits or by giving orders would increase their alienation and decrease the effectiveness of normative power. The current democratic procedures at Chinese institutions such as the Academic Council, the Faculty and Staff Congress, and the President Open Day are not adequately empowered to be effectively involved in the institutional decision making process (Liu & Jin, 2011). However, since 2006 many educators (Gan, 2008; Li, 2011; Liu, 2011; Liu & Gu, 2012; Ma & Hu, 2010; Qu, 2006; Wang, 2011; Wei, 2008; Yu, 2010; Yu, Zhang, & Su, 2008) in China have come to realize that institutional characteristics determine that the ways used to manage business firms do not apply effectively to institutional governance. The three levels of responsibility and control—technical, managerial, and institutional, as defined by Thompson (1967), require corresponding authority to be given to the group of stakeholders that is qualified to take the responsibility and control (Zhou, 2011). Since 2006 there have been numerous calls for innovations in Chinese institutional governance, among which the most powerful voice is eliminating administerization and applying shared governance (Liu & Jin, 2011; Yang & Wu, 2009).

**Perceptions of Shared Governance**

Definitions of shared governance abound. The most commonly referenced definition of shared governance, found in the Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure published by the AAUP, defined shared governance as a shared responsibility among faculty, administrators, trustees, and, where appropriate, students (AAUP Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, 1966). Cohen (1998) defined shared governance as the concept
every constituent group should have a part in deciding every issue. At the California State University (2001) shared governance was defined as the relationship between the administration and the faculty in which the faculty participate in giving direction and advice to the university on important policy decisions. A most recent definition of shared governance phrased by the Florida State University (2011) is the participation of faculty, staff, and students as applicable, administrators, the president, and trustees in the institutional decision and policy-making processes to promote the institutional vision and mission, academic integrity, and sustainability of the dynamic academic environment and retain public accountability.

Faculty, administrators, and boards are the major governance partners. As institutions become larger and more complex students and staff feel the need for participation in institutional governance and are beginning to gain meaningful involvement in governance. Therefore, shared governance, according to Cohen (1998), means a shared responsibility and joint effort in decision making by all the major groups of stakeholders, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students. In 1988 a California legislative act required that the governing board of each community college district consult with the faculty, administrators, support staff, and student representatives whenever policies or procedures on academic and professional matters were under review (Cohen, 1998). Student involvement in governance, as stated by Cohen (1998), was supposed to train students for citizenship, give them experience in policy making, provide for student expression, develop leaders, and in general enhance the morale of the college community. In 1999 students were included in the participants in shared governance at Central Michigan University (Davenport, Daniels, Jones, Kesseler, & Mowrey, 2000). The students were empowered to participate both formally and informally in governance. In 2007 Terry Dupler (as cited in Curley, 2007), associate professor of Fitness and Human Performance, faculty chair of
Facilities and Resources Committee and University Planning Committee representative at the University of Houston-Clear Lake, reiterated that the students will keep their voice whatever changes are made to the shared governance process. Mallory (2007) included staff as one of the domains in shared leadership that is supposed to respect the acknowledged division of responsibilities found in academic shared governance. As many staff members work in administrative areas that require specialized expertise their input deserves more attention. The formation of the Staff Senate, the last stakeholder organization for shared governance, represents the important role, though often considered auxiliary, that staff members play in connecting and communicating effectively with the president and senior administrators, and working efficiently for the president, senior administrators, faculty, and students (Yu, 2010).

The significance of applying the principle of shared governance to higher education institutional governance, as put by the Statement on the Reorganization of Public Higher Education in Tennessee, is supporting a high quality education, preserving available resources, entailing shared measures of accountability, encouraging institutional efficiencies, and developing a sense of institutional and system ownership among all stakeholders that is crucial to strengthening the sense of community on which higher education thrives. Eckel (2000) explored empirically the ability of shared governance systems to make institutional hard decisions such as discontinuing academic programs. The result of the four cases investigated suggested that shared governance is productive in making difficult decisions. Drummond and Reitsch (1995) suggested that shared governance contributes to improved faculty attitudes about the organization that lead to better outcomes in productivity and interpersonal relations. By developing stronger systems of shared governance in their institutions educational leaders would be well served. Building a shared vision is a factor that promotes organizational change and can
address the barrier of formalization by providing faculty input into the decision-making process (Burgess, 2004). While surveying the deterioration of faculty influence in higher education, Burgan (2006) suggested that improving life on campus depends on faculty members’ engagement with their administrative colleagues as well as their students.

Although Glenny and Dalglish (1973) viewed the governing board as the institution, it is very rare now that trustees dominate the decision making process. Birnbaum’s question was answered by a report released by the Carnegie Foundation informing that decision making should be spread among trustees, presidents, and faculty (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982). According to Kezar et al. (2006) for the last 75 years American universities have practiced shared governance as their overriding principle that guides decision making. Morphew (1999) stated that interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others becomes indispensable and integral as the tasks performed by institutions of higher education get various and complex. Although it may be true that the real world of academic decision making, as described by Cohen (1998), is faculty and administrative committees where tedious, lengthy, boring discussions of the most mundane details take place without conclusions ever being reached, institutional shared governance is necessary. Shared governance is to formulate and implement meaningful ways to engage large numbers of people in the sharing process (Mortimer & Sathre, 2007). Other terms equivalent to shared governance seen in the literature include shared leadership, shared decision making, decentralization, decisional involvement, collaborative governance, and professional governance.

Birnbaum (1988) identified teaching, research, and service as the three commonly articulated institutional missions. For the fulfillment of those missions faculty, students, administrators, and staff must actualize governance as a shared responsibility and joint effort,
with the weight given to the views of each group dependent on the specific issues under
discussion. For example the faculty are empowered to take primary responsibility for the
fundamental areas of curriculum, instruction, faculty status, and the academic aspects of student

Mintzberg (1983) proposed a set of four internal power systems: the system of authority,
the system of ideology, the system of expertise, and the system of politics. This set of power
systems is considered the basic sources for controlling organizational life. Within Mintzberg’s
power systems, when work is so complex that experts or professionals are required, the systems
of authority and ideology are rarely sufficient even though the two systems promote coordination
and compliance. When experts or professionals must come to the forefront, demands for
autonomy arise to make decisions on the basis of professional considerations rather than on the
basis of authority or ideology. Mintzberg argued that administrators must share power with
professionals because professionalized teaching will make teacher empowerment become a
reality rather than a slogan and enable more schools to develop organizational structures
characterized by professional bureaucracies.

On the basis of Mintzberg’s systems of power, Hoy and Miskel (2001) concluded that
school administrators must be ready to share power, and that hoarding power may lead to teacher
and student dissatisfaction, alienation, and hostility. Hoy and Miskel prescribed four imperatives
based on Mintzberg’s power systems for effective administrators. First, administrators must
extend their system of authority because leadership requires more than formal authority. Second,
administrators must make use of the system of ideology or the organization culture as another
source of authority. Third, administrators must use the system of expertise by sharing power with
their teachers. Fourth, administrators must limit the use of the system of politics based on knowing and understanding it (Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

Birnbaum (1988) emphasized the application of referent and expert power at colleges and universities. He described that faculty care more about internalized principles of academic freedom and ethical behavior and communications from colleagues who can share their values. If administrators use such forms of power as coercive, legitimate, or reward power other than referent and expert power, they will cause alienation and reduce committed participation in institutional affairs. Birnbaum (1988) also analyzed the process of decentralization of administrative authority. He believed that decentralization of educational decision making results from increased faculty specialization and decreased administrative authority. Decentralization in turn causes further faculty specialization and more reduction of administrative authority. Wergin (2007) suggested that leadership through decentralization practices the concept of shared governance and help academic professionals find their leadership voice by embracing a more lateral view where leadership roles are available to everyone rather than the hierarchical view where authority resides in the few.

According to the AGB Statement on Institutional Governance, a conscious effort should be made to ensure that no more than one stakeholder group is empowered with the authority to take charge of a certain area. Based on the principle of collaboration the administration, faculty, and governing board should play their respective roles in faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure. Communication and consultation with stakeholder groups, as made clear by the AGB Statement on Institutional Governance, are required for such issues as student financial-aid policies and broad financial-planning assumptions (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 2001). However, as illustrated by Birnbaum’s (1988) Collegiate
Model, shared governance is a process characterized by fluidity because there are both singular and shared areas of responsibility for both the administrative and technical elements of the institution.

For the sake of meeting the new challenges facing institutional governance, all key associations of higher learning such as AAUP, AGB, and ACE support the concept of shared governance. American institutions of higher education have come to embrace both the concept and practice of shared governance. Shared governance is often a challenging and slow process in higher education but it is a necessary process (Kezer, 2001; Mortimer & Sathre, 2007; Smith, 2002). Birnbaum (2004) argued that although shared governance may slow down the decision-making process, it brings more thorough discussion and a sense of order and stability for the institution. Charges that those institutions that emphasize academic values are risking disruption and failure because of a lack of quick enough response to a changing environment are inaccurate and misplaced. He believed that such institutions would not confront any crisis of governance. Drummond and Reitsch (1995) stated, after a survey of 1,191 respondents from 605 universities, that both university administrators and faculty members have a uniform opinion regarding the desirability of shared governance although there are opportunities to increase the degree of meaningful shared governance. Cox (2000) reported that the shared aspects of governance were working very well in the various systems for consultation and decision making created by individual institutions and received general support from both faculty and administrators. Minor (2003) concluded after a study of 4-year colleges and universities that all groups of stakeholders consider shared governance a strong institutional value. Helms and Price’s (2005) survey at the Boston College found that 90% of faculty respondents said that they view participation in shared governance as a worthwhile faculty responsibility.
In the process of reorganizing public higher education in Tennessee the AAUP strongly suggested that all efforts be based on shared governance. It was believed that by appropriately sharing responsibility and cooperative action the essential stakeholders of a higher-education system can not only advance the academic mission of the system but also contribute to system efficiency and rationality with the timely and proper use of expertise. It was suggested that shared governance be incorporated into any reorganization plan and the process of designing any proposed plan. For the fulfillment of the full benefits of the principle of shared governance shared governance must be established in the reorganization process. (Tennessee AAUP Statement on the reorganization of public higher education in Tennessee, 2009)

East Tennessee State University (2012b) made meaningful and continuing cooperation between the faculty and administration of the institution a mechanism for fulfilling the institutional mission. Communication is considered essential to fostering mutual trust and respect and ensuring full discussion of important matters and adequate reaction from different groups of stakeholders. The faculty are entitled to the right and obligation and encouraged to participate fully and actively in the process of making decisions that pertain to academic matters and faculty welfare.

According to Davenport et al. (2000) many institutions experience difficulties with shared governance because of a lack of consensus on the specific levels of involvement for stakeholders in decision making on campuses. Among the proponents of shared governance opinions vary in terms of the levels of shared governance or how much shared governance is adequate. Drummond and Reitsch (1995) believed that the higher the level of shared governance is the better it is for the quality of governance. Kaplan (2001) claimed that the descending order of the five-scale continuum—determination, joint action, consultation, discussion, and none, is
not meant to imply that determination is considered more desirable than joint action or consultation. Drummond and Reitsch (1995) conducted research on the relationship between the levels of shared governance and participant perception of the quality of the institutional governance with a large sample that totaled 605 universities randomly drawn from the Carnegie listing. To track how much shared governance is administered in the practice of shared governance they identified four different levels of shared governance: administration makes most decisions, faculty views sought and sometimes used, faculty views actively sought and used, and faculty input vital and can block decision. The first two descriptions represent lower levels of shared governance and the latter two higher levels. Put in descriptive language, the four levels that are sequenced from low to high are described as follows: Level 1: The administration makes most of the decisions, while faculty input mostly involves academic matters only; Level 2: Faculty views are sought by the administration and sometimes affect administrative decisions; Level 3: Faculty opinion is actively sought by the administration and is regularly used in the decision making process; Level 4: Faculty input is a vital component of the decision-making process, so much so that faculty can prevent administrative decision from becoming policy.

The total number of 1,191 respondents to Drummond and Reitsch’s (1995) survey included 468 administrators and 723 faculty members. They completed their research with the conclusion that participant attitudes towards the quality of the institutional environment are significantly related to the perceived level of participation in the shared governance system. That is to say, the greater the level of shared governance is, the better faculty members feel about the governance of their institution. Drummond and Reitsch suggested that institutional stakeholders’ confidence in the decision making process increases as the degree of shared governance rises. But they also saw opportunities to increase meaningful shared governance because, as their
survey revealed, only about 15% of colleges and universities took advantage of the observed benefits of the highest level of shared governance.

Kaplan (2001), with the sponsorship of the AAUP and ACAD (the American Conference of Academic Deans), conducted a survey that identified five levels of shared governance between the administration and faculty: none, discussion, consultation, joint action, and determination. Kaplan made it clear that the order of the five levels is not meant to imply that determination is considered more desirable than joint action or consultation. In descriptive language the five levels sequenced from low to high are described as follows. None indicates no faculty participation. Discussion means the availability of an informal expression of opinion from the faculty or individual faculty members, or of a formal expression of opinion only from administratively selected committees. Consultation indicates a formal procedure or established practice that provides a means for the faculty to present its judgment in the form of a recommendation, vote or other expression sufficiently explicit to record the position or positions taken by the faculty. Joint action means the requirement for formal agreement by both the faculty and other components of the institution for confirmatory action or policy determination. Determination means that the faculty of an academic unit or its duly authorized representatives have final legislative or operational authority with respect to the policy or action, and any other technically required approvals or concurrences are only pro forma.

Out of a survey population of 1,303 institutions 350 public and 532 private institutions responded to the 15 items included in the six categories of faculty status, academic operation, academic planning and policy, selection of administrators and department chair, financial planning and policy, and organization of faculty agencies. Kaplan’s survey results revealed that the level of determination applied only to the item of selecting members for institutionwide
committees, senate, and similar committees (53.14%). The level of joint action fell onto types of
degrees offered (53.63%), setting of the average teaching loads (33.26%), appointing department
chairs or heads (37.89%), and decisions that establish the authority of faculty in campus
governance (50.92%). The level of consultation was maintained for relative sizes of the faculty
of various disciplines (40.99%), construction programs for buildings and other facilities
(41.20%), appointing the academic dean (53.58%), and short-range budgetary planning (38.68%).
The discussion level applied to discussions about individual faculty salaries (30.14). The
statistical results showed that institutional shared governance tended to converge to the middle
levels of the five-scale continuum, joint action and consultation.

By giving open-ended questions for respondents to answer Tierney and Minor (2003)
identified three levels of shared governance: consultative decision making, distributed decision
making, and fully collaborative decision making. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents
supported the consultative level, which means although the faculty’s opinion and advice is
sought it doesn’t go beyond information sharing and discussion, and authority remains with the
senior administrators and the board of trustees. The distributed decision making was supported
by 26% of the respondents. On this level decisions are made by different groups of stakeholders
responsible for specific issues. Forty-seven percent of the respondents supported fully
collaborative decision making, which means that the faculty and administration make decisions
jointly and consensus is the goal.

An institutional belief in the importance of shared governance may not parallel to the level
at which shared governance is actually implemented. At the California State University the 2000
survey indicated that although a high percentage of different stakeholders perceived existence of
shared governance as very important the level of information sharing remained very low. Lack of
top-down information flow was represented in the small number of faculty and chairs who were well informed of the activities and roles of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and the local campus administration (The California State University, 2001).

A high level of shared governance, as Drummond and Reitsch (1995) argued, is significant, but it is equally important, as Davenport et al. (2000) believed, for the institution to establish a process of open inquiry that is nonthreatening, objective, and inclusive. It should be an inquiry driven by shared governance that is based upon an agreed upon operational definition and the roles played by each group. Brown (2001) argued that the optimal level of shared governance varies by decision type. Because the effects vary by the type of decisions in which faculty participate increased faculty participation may be good or bad. Therefore, to get reliable results of the optimal level of shared governance a survey needs to disaggregate the data by faculty participation into different decision types. Tierney (2004a) suggested that instead of trying to reach consensus on a single level of shared governance, institutional communities should strive to work creatively on multiple levels to achieve the goals of the institution. Stakeholders can make shared governance work effectively by pursuing multiple levels if they can establish trust, a common language, and consensus on the core mission, values, and identity of the institution, and practice what is preached.

The state of mind or attitude of participants in collegial decision-making process, a synonym for shared governance, serves as an important factor that determines the success of the process. Without a set of attitudes that support it, shared governance cannot thrive. Necessary attitudes that are most often noted towards shared governance are trust, mutual respect, civility, honesty, truthfulness, early and effective communication, broad and frequent consultation, transparent processes, and open and frank discussion (The California State University, 2001). A
2000 survey at CSU revealed strong support for the mutual trust and openness, but the institution was obliged to emphasize the importance of a positive attitude because in reality mutual skepticism and cynicism dominated the campuses. The survey findings indicated that the faculty perceived that the administration refused to treat them as equal partners in the institutional governance. The faculty were even skeptical of the existence of shared governance. It was believed at CSU that the notions of trust and respect are more important than formal structures and processes and that the absence of the notions indicates that shared governance does not really exist (The California State University, 2001). The survey also stressed the need for improved communication at all levels because communication is not only widely recognized as essential for shared governance to function well but also helps to build trust. Secrecy or inadequate communication leads to distrust. Shared governance does not exist if decisions or courses of action are communicated after the fact (The California State University, 2001). At the California State University system a belief in the importance of shared governance was regarded as a critical attitude that makes shared governance work (The California State University, 2001). The 2000 survey showed that at the level of campus governance 95% of faculty, 100% of campus chairs, 97% of CSU senators, 87% of provosts, and 75% of presidents perceived existence of shared governance as very important.

Drummond and Reitsch (1995) noted that if faculty and administrators at an institution, compared to one in which faculty and administrators suffer pessimism and hold negative views, have a more positive attitude toward their shared governance the needs of the stakeholders will be served more effectively and efficiently. Positive attitudes that prevail in a university community contribute to an improved ability to accomplish the university’s mission and benefit teaching, research, and service. For shared governance to work, as Drummond and Reitsch
suggested, it must be embraced by top administrators. The truth is, according to Burgan (2004), administrators increasingly seek to include more stakeholders in governance processes. Hodgkinson’s (1974) research findings indicated that compared to faculty members administrators support shared governance to a greater extent and believe it to be more effective. In Drummond and Reitsch’s survey the administrators’ preference for Level 3 was 16.1% higher than that of the faculty. The administrators’ preference for Level 4, though not significantly higher, was 1.2% higher. Administrators’ positive attitudes towards shared governance are represented in the statements or documents issued and implemented by 4-year public universities. The California State University (2001) documented its attitude, a belief in the importance of shared governance, that is critical to making shared governance work and called on its abundant presence in the CSU. The Florida State University (2011) established its detailed document of shared governance, clarifying its definition, purpose, and components. At East Tennessee State University the Provost and Vice President embedded the spirit of shared governance in the mission of his office, promising to practice shared governance in the endeavors to lead successfully (East Tennessee State University, 2012a).

Administrators’ attitudes towards shared governance are often reflected in their institution’s attitudes in this regard. The California State University’s (2001) attitudes towards shared governance are embedded in the measures taken to implement shared governance effectively, which include recruiting and evaluating administrators on their ability to work in a shared governance environment, making collegial behavior the norm for administrators, and providing faculty with an important role in evaluating administrators. The institutional attitudes of the Florida State University and East Tennessee State University also represent those of the administrators at the respective institutions.
Rising expectations for tenure and promotion may leave less time for faculty to participate effectively in shared governance (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Faculty’s attitudes towards shared governance are distinctly represented in the purposes of collective bargaining: preserving faculty power and involvement in decision making, and establishing for faculty a role in the decision-making process (Kemerer & Baldrige, 1975). According to Duderstadt (2000) advisory authority rarely attracts faculty attention to institutional governance. What faculty want is executive authority that can engage them in the decision-making process.

Olson (2009) expressed his attitude towards shared governance by defining the word “shared” as meaning that everyone has a role, not meaning that every constituency gets to participate at every stage or that any constituency exercises complete control over the process. He considered it fitting and proper that certain constituencies are given primary responsibility over decision making in certain areas. His perception of shared governance was incarnated in the roles that the Florida State University identified for its stakeholders with respect to academic activities, administrative activities, strategic planning, faculty status, selection and review of academic administrators, and policy making related to academic welfare, rules of due process, and resolution (Florida State University, 2011).

An essay posted on the Faculty Voice Blog of Chicago State University by a faculty member named Birobi (2011), after describing how the CSU administration eliminated the university’s Economics department against the faculty’s recommendation and denied retention of five tenure-track faculty using unknown criteria but finally reversed its decision, expressed the attitude that the faculty and students at CSU need to be protected from arbitrary and capricious decisions in the areas of curriculum and faculty retention. The essay made the appeal that CSU should practice the type of university governance articulated in the 1966 statement and construct
a new university culture that involves the faculty in a meaningful way and does more than give lip service to the concepts of shared governance.

Fish (2007) expressed an interesting and thought provoking attitude towards shared governance. In general Fish supported Minor’s (2003) belief that it is impossible to have a one-fits-all solution for shared governance. The choice of shared governance is determined by the particular and well defined needs that an institution has. Rather than worship it or use it for the sake of using it or for the sake of democracy, use it when it is found to be useful. He is positive with sharing information and responsibility but negative with faculty sharing power with administrators because he assumes that what faculty really need is information not power and that those that are put in governing positions should be left alone and do their governing until they do it badly.

**Implementation of Shared Governance**

Moore (2010) described how shared governance should be implemented. Despite the many ways to implement shared governance, salient features of a shared governance model should include partnership between staff and leadership, inclusion of input from all impacted stakeholders, aiming for consensus decisions but having a back-up plan if consensus cannot be reached, being facilitative rather than directive, listening to all perspectives as much as possible, shared accountability, team ownership, and flexibility within boundaries. Blase and Blase (1999) believed that the implementation of shared governance should be based on five basic principles: constructing a system of trust, open communication of information, information sharing, multiple opinions, and compromise with multiple opinions. Scott and Caress (2005) discussed the challenges of implementation. To implement shared governance staff members must be prepared, and shared governance must be adjusted to for it to stay in alignment with the organizational
They emphasized that shared governance, as an ongoing and fluid process, requires continual assessment and reevaluation in order to be flexible and responsive to an ever-changing environment.

Tierney (2004a) specified four common models for shared governance implementation. The Legislative Model emphasizes formal structures such as the faculty senate and other formal organizations for faculty participation in administrative decision making. The Symbolic Model, while downplaying the formal rules and structures, emphasizes the interpretation and implementation of those rules both by individuals and the institution. The Consultative Model focuses on the range of issues discussed and the participant groups and emphasizes the importance of faculty having a voice. The Communicative Model focuses on how well important ideas are understood and agreed upon and emphasizes broad agreement on the strategic direction of the institution. He suggested implementing shared governance more effectively by working creatively within multiple models rather than getting stuck in a single model.

Although the level of implementing shared governance may vary from institution to institution, many institutions do take measures to implement shared governance. The University of California, Berkeley, has one of the country’s strongest faculty governance system (Hollinger, 2001). As Wang (2011) reviewed, UC Berkeley’s Faculty Senate was established in 1868. The faculty revolution from 1919 to 1920 made its first significant step towards shared governance among the faculty, the administration, and the governing board, and Berkeley became the first American university that was governed under the concept of shared governance. The Faculty Senate at Berkeley shares power with the administration in practically all areas of the institution. The faculty are entitled to more rights and enjoy a stronger enthusiasm in participating in shared governance (Wang, 2011).
Virginia State University (2012) created a list of the core values for the implementation of its shared governance: 1) Informed and inclusive decision making; 2) Transparency and clarity of operations and decision making; 3) Open communication between and among all groups of stakeholders; 4) Accountability; and 5) Mutual respect and trust. The institutional policy is to ensure that all members of the VSU community have a seat at the table working collaboratively and effectively to advance the interests of the university as a whole (Virginia State University, 2012).

According to Hollinger (2001) the University of Michigan has a weaker system that is more representative of national norms. Tappan (1961), one of its former presidents, proposed in 1958 that the faculty should enjoy sovereignty over teaching methods and the curriculum because scholars are the professionals who should be credited with the qualifications to build up universities. Hollinger (2001) compared the University of Michigan with UC Berkeley suggesting that UM shows a weaker system of shared governance at the institutional level but strong faculty power resides at the level of schools and colleges.

Davenport et al. (2000) reported the implementation of shared governance at Central Michigan University. The process began with the formation of an ad hoc committee that was assigned the task to survey faculty and administrators on the issue of institutional governance. At the end of the survey the committee submitted eight recommendations to the Academic Senate: (1) Turning the ad hoc committee into an implementation committee to work out a plan for implementing the recommended actions; (2) Reaching agreement on roles and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees, administration, faculty, and students in shared governance; (3) Improving communications; (4) Establishing a team approach to planning and problem solving; (5) Considering faculty input to decision making; (6) Continuing the current decision making
procedures unless they were formally modified; (7) Requiring decision makers to communicate their actions and/or decisions; and (8) Giving the university community on-going education relative to decision making policies and procedures (Davenport et al., 2000).

When the University of Iowa had a conflict with its faculty, the Iowa Conference AAUP Executive Board (2006) expressed its hope of a fair, peaceful, and respectful resolution of the shared governance problems at the university. The Iowa AAUP Conference encouraged the Iowa Board of Regents and the University of Iowa to reaffirm their commitment to the AAUP’s Statement on College and University Government and requested that that all governing boards seek to place one or more elected faculty on their boards on matters pertaining to curriculum, finances, presidential searches, and strategic direction in higher education.

Ramaley and Holland (2005) attributed the success of Portland State University in overcoming a major fiscal crisis to the combined efforts of PSU leadership, faculty, students, and external stakeholders. Between 1991 and 1996 the PSU community experienced sweeping changes in absorbing serious budget cuts, redesigning the undergraduate curriculum, and revising the institutional promotion and tenure guidelines. PSU went on to become the largest university in Oregon.

Advances have been made in creating opportunities for students to participate in shared governance. The Student Government Association (SGA) serves as the major force to draw students into the procedures of sharing information and making decisions at most U.S. colleges and universities. As required by the American Student Government Association (ASGA) (2013), the SGA of an institution must have a student representative and vote on campuswide governing and academic committees, including the institution's board of trustees. Over the past decade, scholars (Caruso, Bowen, & Adams-Dunford, 2006; Engstrom, Hallock, & Riemer, 2002; Frost,
have pressed student affairs to conceptualize its primary educator role to create empowering settings in which staff, faculty, and students participate in meaningful campus decision making. In a qualitative study, Engstrom et al. (2002) described how 38 students constructed issues of power and authority in a residentially based self-governance program. In Nickels, Rowland, and Fadase’s (2011) research on engaging undergraduate students to be agents of social change, by learning lessons from student affairs professionals, they proposed the Social Change Model of Leadership Development as a framework for public administration faculty to implement in designing and evaluating curricula that meet the demands of developing socially responsible students.

Even within a single university system such as the 16 campuses of the University of North Carolina the level and quality of shared governance, as Veit (2005) found out in a survey, was different on different campuses. On most of the campuses shared governance was thriving but on some smaller campuses shared governance was considerably less robust. Faculty complaints abounded as administrators routinely made curricular decisions without any faculty consultation, faculty heard about changes to tenure policies only after the changes had been ratified by the institution’s board of trustees, and faculty lamented that the recommendations of grievance and appeals panels were regularly ignored.

The California State University, a system of 23 campuses, reported (2001) its suggestions after a series of interviews concerning shared governance with experts nationwide and in California. Their suggestions are as follows: 1) Make governance important by making personal recognitions of faculty members and administrators’ efforts at the campus and system levels; 2) Provide a shared governance orientation for new administrators, new senate members, and new
board members; 3) Define what makes good shared governance at the system level that satisfies the needs of all groups of stakeholders; 4) Involve faculty, administration, and the governing board in collaborative systemwide planning and issue identification; 5) Institutionalize governance and raise the level of transparency; 6) Use professional staff to assist in communication and research of issues; 7) Develop a system of timely interaction and response on all sides of shared governance; 8) Revise strategic planning annually and jointly; 9) Develop an efficient and interactive process of communication to faculty concerning current issues being dealt with through shared governance; and 10) Give campuses freedom to choose and practice different operating definitions of shared governance as long as the respective campuses meet the needs of the system (California State University, 2001, Appendix A).

The California State University recommendations (2001) pointed to institutional endeavors in implementing shared governance effectively in the new era: 1) Form a faculty that is largely tenured or tenure track who have a long-term commitment to the institution. Make sure that they are rewarded for participation and provided with the resources to support effective participation; 2) Evaluate administrators on how effectively they implement shared governance and provide faculty with an important role in this evaluation; 3) Develop educational programs to help faculty, staff, new trustees, and new administrators become familiar with roles in shared governance; 4) Avoid unilateral administrative decisions by consulting widely, frequently, and authentically; 5) Rather than limit faculty involvement to simply reacting to administrative proposals provide early Senate involvement; 6) Increase and expand links, formal or informal, between faculty and administrative bodies at different levels; 7) Make all processes open and transparent, and provide adequate time for full faculty consultation; and 8) Make informal
interactions take place among all groups of stakeholders including student and alumni representatives (California State University, 2001).

The implementation of shared governance in American institutions is faced with many challenges. Criticism has never stopped since the emergence of shared governance. Administrators might regard shared governance more as a concept than as feasible practice. In pursuit of efficiency, easy and short process, and tangible outcomes administrators and trustees may embrace corporate values (Birnbaum, 2004). Even in an institution like the California State University (2001) where survey showed a positive attitude towards the importance of shared governance the level of implementation was lower than expected. Ninety-five percent of the faculty representatives investigated thought it is very important to have shared governance on their campus but when it came to how well informed they were about the activities and roles of their local campus administration the number of faculty who thought they were well informed dropped to 51%. The number of faculty who were well informed about the activities and roles of the Chancellor’s office and the Board of Trustees shrank to 7%. It is not uncommon that some administrators get tired of implementing shared governance after years of practicing it. Having worked in the system of shared governance for 14 years Haynsworth (2005), retiring president and dean of the William Mitchell College of Law, reported that in recent years he had consciously tried to avoid placing issues in front of the entire faculty for its approval.

Despite the challenges that the implementation of shared governance is faced with statistics also revealed a positive and promising result in its implementation. Over 56% of the 1,191 respondents in Drummond and Reitsch’s (1995) survey reported a fairly vibrant and effective system of shared governance (Levels 3 and 4). The response of the 882 institutions in Kaplan’s (2001) survey concentrated on the levels of Joint Action and Consultation. Helms and
Price’s (2005) survey found that 90% of faculty respondents at the Boston College said that they view participation in shared governance as a worthwhile faculty responsibility. According to the California State University report (2001) shared governance structures are recognized and valued because they play their important role in gaining and disseminating information. These structures function to make sure that open and transparent procedures are implemented to help build trust and provide the necessary information to make good decisions. Major formal shared governance vehicles that have been developed to fulfill communication among different groups of stakeholders and implement shared governance include collective bargaining, ad hoc committees or special task forces, the academic council, the faculty or academic senate, the student government association, the staff senate, and polls.

Drummond and Reitsch (1995) stated that collective bargaining, with the rules legally rather than collegially established, serves as an extreme form of shared governance although some institutions like the California State University distinguished it from shared governance (2001). Kemerer and Baldridge (1975) identified two predominant reasons for faculty collective bargaining: preserving power and involvement in decision making, and establishing a role in the decision-making process. For those stakeholders who work in institutions that do not have a record of strong or successful shared governance, collective bargaining offers a legal promise that the voices of other stakeholders can be articulated and heard.

Ad hoc committees or special task forces are regarded as a useful vehicle through which faculty advice on administrative matters can be procured. Considering faculty members as being great analysts, first-rate thinkers, and knowledgeable experts who do not have adequate time and patience for the tedious process of administrative decision making, they should be involved in the solution of major problems and then dissolve (Keller, 2004). At East Tennessee State
University, for example, ad hoc committees are constructed and meant to address matters of special concern to the faculty and/or community. Such committees are required to last no longer than one academic year (East Tennessee State University, 2012c).

Beedle et al. (1999) identified the Academic Council as the coordinating committee of the faculty. The Academic Committee promotes shared governance by communicating closely with chairs of standing committees and working actively with standing committees to resolve differences between faculty and administrators.

The Faculty or Academic Senate, which is often charged with working too slowly, being cumbersome, and obstructive to respond to changes in the external environment in a timely fashion (Shattock, 2002), is considered necessary by Birnbaum (2004), who argued that although it may slow down the decision-making process it brings more thorough discussion and a sense of order and stability for the institution. Faculty senates, which exist on approximately three quarters of all college campuses (Birnbaum, 1989), are varied in their structure and authority (Mortimer & Sathre, 2007; Tierney & Minor, 2003). Focusing on the issue of underperforming faculty senates Tierney and Minor’s (2003) survey documented widespread dissatisfaction with faculty senates among faculty and administrators. There have been calls for faculty senates having genuine influence on institutional governance because effective shared governance requires faculty to have sufficient voice and influence to participate meaningfully in policy matters (Duderstadt, 2000; Lascher, 2000; Leach, 2008).

The Student Government Association, according to the American Student Government Association (ASGA) (2013), is indispensable to all higher education institutions. In the context of shared governance it is required that the SGA of an institution have a student representative and vote on campuswide governing and academic committees, including the institution’s board
of trustees. The SGA is meant to encourage students to get involved in the institutional community and represent the interests of students and the student viewpoint on administration and faculty committees.

The Staff Senate, as the University of Baltimore (2012) described, provides a role in shared governance by communicating with the president and Executive Committee on staff matters, recommending and reviewing institutional policies concerning staff, keeping staff informed, and providing channels for discussion and recommendations on matters pertaining to staff.

Polls are considered an effective means of communication in shared governance. Curley (2007) reported that the Student Shared Governance Re-Evaluation Committee (SSGRC) at Central Michigan University held nine meetings to develop polling questions for the students, faculty and focus groups. Each student and faculty poll was composed of five different qualitative questions. Room monitors were assigned to answer questions on shared governance and the poll questions on 14 separate occasions. Email, WebCT, the UH-Clear Lake Web site and hard copies were used to poll students and faculty. For the purpose of confidentiality polls and emails were kept anonymous or assigned a reference number. SSGRC based its report on the recent poll and the comments made by faculty and students, suggesting that to help improve students' knowledge of shared governance more adequate advertising was needed. The SSGRC concluded that student participation and voting rights shouldn’t be terminated in the current shared governance system, and that communication must be emphasized for the purposes of achieving a balance of student participation and fulfilling effective implementation of policy.

In addition to the formal structures and processes reviewed above the California State University (2001) reported the importance of informal structures and processes of shared
governance. It was found that informal structures of shared decision making and communication are as powerful, if not more powerful, than the formal ones. They provided opportunities to build trust, respect, and the relationships that are necessary to make shared governance work. When senior administrators came to sit in a very informal way with subordinates and discussed issues everyone felt that ideas and concerns were shared. It was a common belief among faculty members and administrators that barriers dissolve when groups of stakeholders get together and communicate in person in an informal way. Therefore, on some campuses face-to-face communication in an informal setting is used as a key (The California State University, 2001).

**Chinese Scholars’ Introduction of Shared Governance and Recommendations for Chinese Institutions**

Chinese scholars’ introduction of American institutional shared governance to Chinese higher education began in 2006 with Qu’s (2006) The Review and Inspiration of the Managing Concept of Shared Governance in the Colleges and Universities of U. S. A. She argued that shared governance, which is more than faculty governance or institutional autonomy, means that all institutional stakeholders participate in institutional governance. Considering the Chinese context of higher education in which there is overwhelming external pressure and a lack of institutional autonomy Qu proposed two approaches to democratic governance: involving all internal stakeholders in institutional governance to some extent and constructing an external environment that facilitates internal shared governance.

Chinese scholars’ contribution to introducing the concept of shared governance is represented in two aspects: introduction of shared governance at American colleges and universities (Gan, 2008; Liu, 2011; Liu & Gu, 2012; Wang, 2011; Wei, 2008) and its implications in Chinese higher education (Li, 2011; Qu, 2006; Ma & Hu, 2010; Yu, 2010; Yu et
al., 2008). Gan was one of the first scholars introducing the concept of shared governance to higher education in China. Gan (2008a) viewed the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) as a significant agent for constructing and developing the concept and implementation of shared governance. It served multiple roles of initiator, facilitator, and leader of shared governance. Gan (2009) also recognized three turning points in the evolution of shared governance: 1) AAUP and AGB enacted their Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities in 1966; 2) Governor George Deukmejian of California signed Assembly Bill 1725, legalizing shared governance; 3) The AGB released The AGB Statement on Board Responsibility for Institutional Governance in 1998, recommending eight principles of good practice related to institutional governance. Gan (2008b) included legislators, community leaders, trustees, administrators, faculty, students, parents, and others as the participating stakeholders in the processes of sharing and decision making. He stressed the fluid relationship between control and collaboration in the implementation of shared governance.

Liu (2011), using the experience of shared governance at the University of Minnesota, described shared governance as the most popular governance model in American colleges and universities. Grounded on the principles of democracy, negotiation, and collaboration governance and representation of the University is distributed to Academic Professionals and Administrators Senate, Civil Service Senate, Council of Graduate Students, Faculty Senate, Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, Student Association, Student Senate, and University Senate. By encouraging all stakeholders to participate in institutional governance the University fulfills its mission and engages its own governance in efforts to satisfy public interests to the full. Wang (2011) argued that UC Berkeley developed rapidly into a world-class university partly because it has a strong academic senate. The system of shared governance deeply rooted in
its development helps Berkeley dissolve conflicts, overcome crises, and protect academic freedom. The system of shared governance guarantees the institution a continuous development in a correct orientation. Liu and Gu (2012) believed that the concept of shared governance is rooted in the democratic tradition of America. They argued that technically shared governance fails to clearly identify individual groups’ rights and responsibilities, thereby causing ambiguity which in turn leads to different understandings or misunderstandings. They discussed that true shared governance attempts to balance maximum participation in decision making with clear accountability for individual groups of stakeholders. On the basis of mutual trust extensive and continuous communication needs to be maintained.

Other Chinese scholars not only introduced the concept of shared governance but also discussed its implications in Chinese higher education. They made recommendations for Chinese higher education institutions to learn and use the strengths of shared governance used in American institutions. Ma and Hu (2010), on the basis of describing the shared responsibilities and separate roles of the governing board, the president, and the faculty and examining practical issues and problems that exist in the implementation of shared governance in American institutions, believed that the experience of American institutions in shared governance can contribute greatly to constructing a new system of governance in contemporary Chinese higher education institutions. In the current context of Chinese higher education with the Party Committee, the president, the Academic Council, and the Faculty and Staff Congress being the major components the first priority is to elevate faculty position and involve them meaningfully in institutional and departmental governance. The process of empowering faculty is also a process of alleviating or eliminating bureaucratized administration characteristic of Chinese
higher education. The authority of the Academic Council has to be strengthened so that professors can play their role in making decisions.

Li (2011) reviewed the characteristics of shared governance in American institutions and found three messages applicable to the Chinese context. First, the principle of checks and balances can be used to regulate academic and administrative powers. The goal of checks and balances can be achieved by using legislation to control power, balancing power structure, and advocating governance ethics. Second, the structure of institutional governance should be reconstructed in such a way that authority is shared among the Party, administration, and faculty as the type of tasks requires. Third, the culture of governance needs to be enhanced so that the institution has core values, abides by the law, and values honesty, integrity, trust, and effective communication (Li, 2011).

Yu et al. (2008) related the three functions (legislative, advisory, and conflict resolution) of the Faculty Senate in American institutions to establishing a similar organization on Chinese campus. American experience indicates that to establish such an organization that functions effectively faculty sense of participating in institutional decision making, legislative support, and democratic environment are essential.

Yu (2010) examined the Staff Senate, the last stakeholder organization for shared governance, and identified its important role, though often considered auxiliary, as motivating staff members to connect and communicate effectively with the president and senior administrators, and work efficiently for the president, senior administrators, faculty, and students. A staff organization like the Staff Senate on a Chinese campus would represent all staff members at an institution to work for the president, help and facilitate information sharing among staff members, promote unity and collaboration among staff members, get involved in making
policies concerning staff, help to produce professionalized staff members, and improve staff members’ enthusiasm in work.

Liu and Jin (2011) related shared governance to the current heated discussion in Chinese higher education: eliminating administerization. Yang and Wu (2009) defined administerization as extension and overuse of administrative structure, operational mechanism, behavioral modes, and perceptions in nonadministrative areas. Liu and Jin believed that Chinese colleges and universities are administered institutions where academic governance and student government are not available. At present administrative power dominates all institutional processes and procedures. But the Central Government has promised to increase and fulfill institutional autonomy by separating the institution from the government. In this revolutionary process shared governance would help to eliminate administerization and take over institutional governance. Chinese institutions may not copy the American shared governance but borrow its essential elements.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this nonexperimental quantitative study was to assess the status of institutional stakeholders’ perceptions of shared governance and application of shared governance on an American higher education campus and a counterpart in China and to determine if there were differences among the groups of stakeholders both at the same institution and between the institutions. This chapter describes the methodology used to collect and analyze the data.

The participants in the study were university administrators, faculty members, staff members, and students from one 4-year American public university and one 4-year Chinese public university. Data were collected on two dimensions (general acceptance and implementation) of shared governance with gender, age, number of years of service for administrators, faculty, and staff, and gender and age for students in consideration. This nonexperimental research design used an electronic survey on the American campus and on-ground survey on the Chinese campus with Likert-type questions. IBM-SPSS version 20.0 was used to conduct the analyses at an alpha level of .05.

Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

The following research questions and null hypotheses guided the study:

Research Question 1: Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university?

Ho1: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory among administrators,
faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university.

Ho1₂: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university.

**Research Question 2:** Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university?

Ho₂₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university.

Ho₂₂: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university.

**Research Question 3:** Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university?

Ho₃₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university.

Ho₃₂: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university.
Research Question 4: Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university?

Ho4₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university.

Ho4₂: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university.

Research Question 5: Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities?

Ho5₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities.

Ho5₂: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities.

Research Question 6: Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and
Implementation) between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities?

Ho61: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities.

Ho62: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities.

Research Question 7: Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities?

Ho71: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities.

Ho72: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities.
Research Question 8: Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities?

Ho8₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities.

Ho8₂: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities.

Research Question 9: Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities?

Ho9₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities.

Ho9₂: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities.
universities.

Research Question 10: Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities?

Ho101: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities.

Ho102: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities.

Research Question 11: Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities?

Ho111: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities.

Ho112: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American
university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities.

Research Question 12: Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities?

Ho121: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities.

Ho122: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities.

Research Question 13: At the participating American university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

Ho:131a: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:131b: At the participating American university, there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female
participants.

Ho:13$_{1c}$: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

Ho:13$_{2a}$: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:13$_{2b}$: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:13$_{2c}$: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

Research Question 14: At the participating American university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of *Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

Ho:14$_{1a}$: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in
the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:14_{1b}: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:14_{1c}: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

Ho:14_{2a}: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:14_{2b}: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:14_{2c}: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.
Research Question 15: At the participating Chinese university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

Ho:15_1a: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:15_1b: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:15_1c: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

Ho:15_2a: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:15_2b: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.
Ho:15c: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

*Research Question 16:* At the participating Chinese university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

Ho:16a: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:16b: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:16c: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

Ho:16d: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.
Ho:16\textsubscript{2b}: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:16\textsubscript{2c}: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

**Instrumentation**

The researcher-developed survey of shared governance (see Appendix A) was used to collect data for this study. To make sure that the items in the survey instrument reflect necessary conditions for sound shared governance Ramo’s (2001) AAUP indicators of sound governance and Kaplan’s (2001) survey tool for universities to assess governance on their campuses sponsored by the AAUP and the ACAD were consulted and referenced. The AAUP’s Committee on College and University Government approved Ramo’s instrument as a tool for assessing the extent to which implementation of shared governance at an institution comports with national standards for shared governance in higher education. Each of the items on the questionnaire, though the questionnaire is not intended to be exhaustive, is considered reflecting necessary conditions for sound shared governance.

The survey instrument for this study was designed to empirically measure American and Chinese institutional stakeholders’ perceptions of shared governance and the application of shared governance, and determine if there were differences among the groups of stakeholders both at the same institution and between the institutions. The instrument was a two-inventory (Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory and Application of Shared Governance Inventory) questionnaire. The Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory included 20 statements relative
to shared governance in general, and the Application of Shared Governance Inventory was composed of 20 statements relevant to shared governance specific to the respondent’s institution. Each inventory had 20 statements in two dimensions: general acceptance and implementation. The instrument consisted of 40 items using a Likert-type format. The survey instrument also included questions related to demographics of the respondents. The survey was delivered separately to administrators, faculty, staff, and students because of such different features in demographics as age, category, years of service, level of education, and grade level. The demographics in the Shared Governance Survey for Administrators, Faculty, and Staff were gender, age (21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61 or older), years of service (0-10 years, 11-20 years, 21-30 years, 31 years or more), level of education, and category. The demographics in the Shared Governance Survey for Students were gender, age (18-24, 25-32, 33-50, 51 or older), and category (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, and graduate student).

The 40 items of Likert format were designed using a scale from 6 to 1 as follows: 6 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Strongly Disagree. Each of these 40 items was related to and classified into one of the two dimensions (general acceptance and implementation). The total score for each of these categories was derived by adding the assigned numeric values for each response from a survey.

To guarantee reliability of the survey two survey development activities were conducted using the survey instrument. The purpose of both studies was to identify wording, semantics, or items on the instrument that could be misinterpreted or misunderstood. These studies were also intended to help determine the approximate amount of time that would be needed to complete the survey. As a result of the survey development activities modifications were made to the original 50-item survey instrument. The final survey format of 40 items in two inventories was adopted.
The participants in the survey development activities were not included in the population of stakeholders used in the actual research.

**Population and Sample**

The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (2010) was used as a guide to select the 4-year American public university as a sample that matched the Chinese sample in institutional size, classification, and mission. Their proximity and comparability were further enhanced by the partnership relationship between the two samples. The population of this study included all administrators, faculty members, staff members, and students with the online survey on the American campus and 50 administrators, 170 faculty members, 145 staff members, and 558 students randomly selected with the on-ground survey on the Chinese campus.

**Data Collection**

Prior to beginning of this research project, permission to conduct research was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the researcher’s home institution in America. Permission to perform this study on the American campus was obtained from the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at the participating university. SurveyMonkey, an online survey instrument, generated electronic hyper-links to the two surveys (one for students and the other for administrators, faculty, and staff). Potential participants received the survey through the university’s listserv. Permission to perform this study on the Chinese campus was obtained from the School of Graduate Studies at the Chinese university. The surveys were distributed with permission to participants at administrator, faculty, or staff meetings, and students’ classes. All responses were confidential and the demographic information collected did not identify the participants in the study at either participating university.
Data Analysis

Data from the two participating universities were compiled into an IBM-SPSS Version 20.0 data file. SPSS was used for all statistical analyses in this study.

Research question 1 was analyzed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The total score of each of the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) was compared with each other among the four grouping variables (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) at the participating American university.

Research question 2 was analyzed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The total score of each of the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) was compared with each other among the four grouping variables (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) at the participating Chinese university.

Research question 3 was analyzed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The total score of each of the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) was compared with each other among the four grouping variables (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) at the participating American university.

Research question 4 was analyzed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The total score of each of the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) was compared with each other among the four grouping variables (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) at the participating Chinese university.

Research question 5 was analyzed using an independent sample t-test. The grouping variable was American university administrators and Chinese university administrators. The total scores for the two dimensions (General Acceptance and Implementation) of the *Perceptions
of Shared Governance Inventory of the American university administrators were compared to the total scores of the Chinese university administrators.

Research question 6 was analyzed using an independent sample t-test. The grouping variable was American university administrators and Chinese university administrators. The total scores for the two dimensions (General Acceptance and Implementation) of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory of the American university administrators were compared to the total scores of the Chinese university administrators.

Research question 7 was analyzed using an independent sample t-test. The grouping variable was American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members. The total scores for the two dimensions (General Acceptance and Implementation) of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory of the American university faculty members were compared to the total scores of the Chinese university faculty members.

Research question 8 was analyzed using an independent sample t-test. The grouping variable was American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members. The total scores for the two dimensions (General Acceptance and Implementation) of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory of the American university faculty members were compared to the total scores of the Chinese university faculty members.

Research question 9 was analyzed using an independent sample t-test. The grouping variable was American university staff members and Chinese university staff members. The total scores for the two dimensions (General Acceptance and Implementation) of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory of the American university staff members were compared to the total scores of the Chinese university staff members.
Research question 10 was analyzed using an independent sample t-test. The grouping variable was American university staff members and Chinese university staff members. The total scores for the two dimensions (General Acceptance and Implementation) of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* of the American university staff members were compared to the total scores of the Chinese university staff members.

Research question 11 was analyzed using an independent sample t-test. The grouping variable was American university students and Chinese university students. The total scores for the two dimensions (General Acceptance and Implementation) of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* of the American university students were compared to the total scores of the Chinese university students.

Research question 12 was analyzed using an independent sample t-test. The grouping variable was American university students and Chinese university students. The total scores for the two dimensions (General Acceptance and Implementation) of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* of the American university students were compared to the total scores of the Chinese university students.

Research question 13 was analyzed using Two-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The grouping variable was American university administrators, faculty members, and staff members. To determine whether gender or years of service is significantly related to the scores for each of the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) gender and years of service were the other two fixed factors for this question.

Research question 14 was analyzed using Two-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The grouping variable was American university administrators, faculty members, and staff members.
members. To determine whether gender or years of service is significantly related to the scores for each of the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) gender and years of service were the other two fixed factors for this question.

Research question 15 was analyzed using Two-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The grouping variable was Chinese university administrators, faculty members, and staff members. To determine whether gender or years of service is significantly related to the scores for each of the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) gender and years of service were the other two fixed factors for this question.

Research question 16 was analyzed using Two-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The grouping variable was Chinese university administrators, faculty members, and staff members. To determine whether gender or years of service is significantly related to the scores for each of the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) gender and years of service were the other two fixed factors for this question.

Summary

Chapter 3 reported the methodology and procedures for conducting this study, which included a brief introduction, a description of the research design, selection of the population, research questions and null hypotheses, the data collection procedures, survey instrumentation, and the data analysis procedures. Chapter 4 presents the results of the analyses.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The type of governance determines how decisions are made at institutions of higher education and the effectiveness of decisions. According to Kezar et al. (2006) for the last 75 years American universities have practiced shared governance as their overriding principle that guides decision making. The purpose of this study was to assess the status of institutional stakeholders’ perceptions of shared governance and application of shared governance on an American higher education campus and a counterpart in China and determine if there were differences among the groups of stakeholders both at the same institution and between the institutions.

In this chapter data were presented and analyzed to answer 16 research questions and 48 null hypotheses. To capture data an electronic survey with three sections was used for the American participants. However, because of lack of access to technology a paper survey was used for the Chinese participants. A six-point Likert-type scale was used on the first two sections to assess American and Chinese institutional stakeholders’ perceptions of shared governance and the application of shared governance, and determine any differences among the groups of stakeholders (See Appendixes A and B). The survey for students and the survey for administrators, faculty and staff were distributed separately because the third section, demographic questions, was different. The survey for administrators, faculty, and staff included five demographic questions and the student survey had three questions. Data were retrieved after one initial survey and one follow-up survey for the American campus and paper surveys were distributed among the four Chinese categories of participants. All administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university were invited to respond. The numbers of
administrators, faculty, staff, and students who actually responded were 48, 165, 138, and 546 respectively. At the participating Chinese university the survey was distributed to 50 administrators, 170 faculty members, 145 staff members, and 558 students. Fifty administrator responses, 165 faculty responses, 140 staff responses, and 550 student responses were collected and used in the study.

At the participating American university administrators, faculty, and staff members were distributed in all the age groups and years of service in higher education. At the participating Chinese university, however, the 61-or-more age group was missing because all people are required to retire at the age of 60. At the participating American university among those students who provided demographic information 276 female students accounted for 64% and 153 male students 36% of the participants. The students fell into all the four age groups. The 18-24 age group consisted of 177 students or 41% of the American students who provided age information, the 25-32 age group 20%, the 33-50 age group 28%, and the 51-or-more age group 11%. At the participating Chinese university, however, the 253 female or 46% and 297 male students or 54% stayed within the 18-24 and 25-32 age groups because almost all university students are traditional young learners between the age of 18 and 30. The 18-24 age group consisted of 217 students or 40% of the Chinese student respondents and the 25-32 age group 333 students or 60%. See Table 1 and Table 2.
Table 1

Administrator, Faculty, and Staff Respondents’ Demographic Information by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>American Institution</th>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese Institution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses with Complete Information</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Male Responses</td>
<td>32/16</td>
<td>74/90</td>
<td>102/34</td>
<td>20/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group/Number</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>1/24</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=20-30, 2=31-40, 3=41-50, 4=51-60, 5=61 or more)</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>2/25</td>
<td>2/26</td>
<td>2/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/15</td>
<td>5/44</td>
<td>5/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service in Higher Education Group/Number</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>1/51</td>
<td>1/75</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=0-10, 2=11-20, 3=21-30, 4=31 or more)</td>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>2/52</td>
<td>2/34</td>
<td>2/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/12</td>
<td>4/30</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>4/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Student Respondents’ Demographic Information by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Responses with Complete Information</th>
<th>Female/Male Responses</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Institution</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>276/153</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Institution</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>253/297</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Questions and Analysis

Research Question 1

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university?

Ho1: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the four groups of participants at the participating American university and their general acceptance of shared governance. The factor variable, category, included four groups: administrator, faculty, staff, and student. The dependent variable was the total score on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory. The ANOVA was significant,
\[ F(3, 891) = 3.03, \ p = .029. \] Therefore, Ho1 was rejected. The strength of the relationship between the groups of participants, administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university and their general acceptance of shared governance as assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was small (.01).

Because the overall F test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the four groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between the category of administrator and the category of student \((p = .016)\). However, there was no significant difference between the category of faculty and the category of student \((p = .540)\), between the category of staff and the category of student \((p = .167)\), between the category of administrator and the category of faculty \((p = .482)\), between the category of administrator and the category of staff \((p = .784)\), and between the category of faculty and the category of staff \((p = .907)\). It appears that at the participating American university students had a significantly different level of general acceptance in the perceptions of shared governance from the levels of administrators and scored significantly higher than administrators. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the four categories of participants, are reported in Table 3.
Table 3

*Means and Standard Deviations with 95% Confidence Intervals of Pairwise Differences for Ho1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>-1.02 to 3.57</td>
<td>-1.49 to 3.20</td>
<td>-2.02 to 1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>-1.02 to 3.57</td>
<td>-1.49 to 3.20</td>
<td>-2.02 to 1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>46.22</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>-1.49 to 3.20</td>
<td>-2.02 to 1.18</td>
<td>-2.02 to 1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>47.28</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>-1.49 to 3.20</td>
<td>-2.02 to 1.18</td>
<td>-2.02 to 1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho1: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the four groups of participants at the participating American university and their perceptions of the implementation of shared governance. The factor variable, category, included four groups: administrator, faculty, staff, and student. The dependent variable was the total score on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory*. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(3, 888) = 2.14$, $p = .093$. Therefore, Ho1 was retained. The strength of the relationship between the groups of participants, administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university and their perceptions of the implementation of shared governance as assessed by $\eta^2$ was small (.01). The results indicate that the different categories of participants’ perceptions of the implementation of shared governance tended to be similar. The means and standard deviations for the four categories of participants are reported in Table 4.
Table 4

*Means and Standard Deviations of Participating Categories for Ho12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>43.95</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>44.95</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university?

Ho2: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the four groups of participants at the participating Chinese university and their general acceptance of shared governance. The factor variable, category, included four groups: administrator, faculty, staff, and student. The dependent variable was the total score on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory*. The ANOVA was significant, $F(3, 901) = 13.28, p < .001$. Therefore, Ho2 was rejected. The strength of the relationship
between the groups of participants, administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university and their general acceptance of shared governance as assessed by $\eta^2$ was medium (.04).

Because the overall F test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the four groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between the category of staff and the category of administrator ($p < .001$), between the category of staff and the category of faculty ($p < .001$), and between the category of staff and the category of student ($p < .001$). However, there was no significant difference between the category of administrator and the category of faculty ($p = .817$), between the category of administrator and the category of student ($p = .479$), and between the category of faculty and the category of student ($p = .859$). It appears that at the participating Chinese university staff members had a significantly different level of general acceptance in the perceptions of shared governance from the levels of administrators, faculty members, and students and scored significantly higher than the other three categories. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the four categories of participants, are reported in Table 5.
Table 5

**Means and Standard Deviations with 95% Confidence Intervals of Pairwise Differences for Ho2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47.36</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>-0.78 to 1.59</td>
<td>.88 to 2.57</td>
<td>0.92 to 3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>47.76</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>49.49</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.48 to 1.69</td>
<td>-.48 to 1.69</td>
<td>.88 to 2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>47.96</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.45 to .85</td>
<td>-2.22 to -.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho2: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the four groups of participants at the participating Chinese university and their perceptions of the implementation of shared governance. The factor variable, category, included four groups: administrator, faculty, staff, and student. The dependent variable was the total score on the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory. The ANOVA was significant, $F(3, 901) = 14.39$, $p < .001$. Therefore, Ho2 was rejected. The strength of the relationship between the groups of participants, administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university and their perceptions of the implementation of shared governance as assessed by $\eta^2$ was between small and medium (.05).

Because the overall F test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the four groups. A Tukey procedure was
selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between the category of administrator and the category of faculty \((p = .005)\), between the category of administrator and the category of staff \((p < .001)\), between the category of administrator and the category of student \((p < .001)\), between the category of faculty and the category of staff \((p = .002)\), and between the category of faculty and the category of student \((p = .012)\). However, there was no significant difference between the category of staff and the category of student \((p = .406)\). It appears that at the participating Chinese university administrators had a significantly different level of implementation in the perceptions of shared governance from the levels of faculty and staff members and students and scored significantly lower than the other three categories. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the four categories of participants, are reported in Table 6.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.84</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>45.65</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.40 to 3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>47.07</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.79 to 4.67</td>
<td>.42 to 2.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.44 to 4.02</td>
<td>.15 to 1.70</td>
<td>-1.32 to .33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation)
among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university?

Ho3₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the four groups of participants at the participating American university and their general acceptance in the Application of Shared Governance Inventory. The factor variable, category, included four groups: administrator, faculty, staff, and student. The dependent variable was the total score on the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(3, 703) = 2.53, p = .056$. Therefore, Ho3₁ was retained. The strength of the relationship between the groups of participants, administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university and their general acceptance in the Application of Shared Governance Inventory as assessed by $\eta^2$ was small (.01). The results indicate that the different categories of participants’ general acceptance in the application of shared governance tended to be similar. The means and standard deviations for the four categories of participants are reported in Table 7.
Table 7

Mean and Standard Deviations of Participating Categories for Ho3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39.04</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>36.93</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35.84</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>38.04</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho3$_2$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the four groups of participants at the participating American university and their belief in the implementation of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory. The factor variable, category, included four groups: administrator, faculty, staff, and student. The dependent variable was the total score on the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(3, 702) = 1.95, p = .120$. Therefore, Ho3$_2$ was retained. The strength of the relationship between the groups of participants, administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating American university and their belief in the implementation of the application of shared governance as assessed by $\eta^2$ was small (.01). The results indicate that the different categories of participants’ perceptions of the implementation in
the application of shared governance tended to be similar. The means and standard deviations for the four categories of participants are reported in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37.24</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>35.94</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>37.30</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university?

Ho4: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the four groups of participants at the participating Chinese university and their general acceptance of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory*. The factor variable, category, included four groups: administrator, faculty, staff, and student. The dependent variable was the total score on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory*. The
ANOVA was significant, $F(3, 901) = 144.28, p < .001$ Therefore, $H_04_1$ was rejected. The strength of the relationship between the groups of participants, administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university and their general acceptance of the application of shared governance as assessed by $\eta^2$ was large (.33).

Because the overall F test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the four groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between the category of administrator and the category of faculty ($p < .001$), between the category of administrator and the category of staff ($p < .001$), between the category of administrator and the category of student ($p < .001$), between the category of faculty and the category of student ($p < .001$), and between the category of staff and the category of student ($p < .001$). However, there was no significant difference between the category of faculty and the category of staff ($p = 1.000$). It appears that at the participating Chinese university the administrators thought most highly of the general acceptance in the application of shared governance at their university, forming a significant difference from all the other three categories. The results indicate that with a mean of 36.68 the administrators scored highest, believing that their university embraced shared governance more than did the faculty members and the staff members, who scored lowest with respective means of 27.72 and 27.74. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the four categories of participants, are reported in Table 9.
Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations with 95% Confidence Intervals of Pairwise Differences for Ho4i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.68</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>-10.77 to -7.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>-10.79 to -7.10</td>
<td>-1.26 to 1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>-4.67 to -1.37</td>
<td>4.95 to 6.94</td>
<td>4.87 to 6.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>-4.67 to -1.37</td>
<td>4.95 to 6.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho4i: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory among administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the four groups of participants at the participating Chinese university and their belief in the implementation of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory. The factor variable, category, included four groups: administrator, faculty, staff, and student. The dependent variable was the total score on the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory. The ANOVA was significant, $F(3, 901) = 129.75$, $p < .001$. Therefore, Ho4i was rejected. The strength of the relationship between the groups of participants, administrators, faculty, staff, and students at the participating Chinese university and their belief in the implementation of the application of shared governance as assessed by $\eta^2$ was very large (.30).

Because the overall F test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the four groups. A Tukey procedure was
selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between the category of administrator and the category of faculty \((p < .001)\), between the category of administrator and the category of staff \((p < .001)\), between the category of administrator and the category of student \((p < .001)\), between the category of faculty and the category of staff \((p < .001)\), between the category of faculty and the category of student \((p < .001)\) and between the category of staff and the category of student \((p < .001)\). It appears that at the participating Chinese university each category of participants had a significantly different level of implementation in the application of shared governance from the levels of the other categories of participants. The results indicate that with a mean of 37.50 the administrators scored highest, believing that their university was implementing shared governance better than did the students who scored lowest with a mean of 29.45. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the four categories of participants, are reported in Table 10.

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations with 95% Confidence Intervals of Pairwise Differences for Ho4_2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>-5.05 to -2.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>-7.67 to -4.67</td>
<td>-3.64 to -1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>-9.40 to -6.71</td>
<td>-5.28 to -3.67</td>
<td>-2.74 to -1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 5

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities?

Ho5: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university administrators and Chinese university administrators. Their scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* were the test variable. The test was not significant, $t(95) = 1.66$, $p = .100$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .03, indicating an effect size between small and medium (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American administrators ($M = 45.36, SD = 5.78$) tended to report similar levels of general acceptance in their perceptions of shared governance as the Chinese administrators ($M = 47.36, SD = 6.07$). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (-4.39 to .39).

Ho5: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators.
administrators at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university administrators and Chinese university administrators. Their scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* were the test variable. The test was not significant, $t(95) = .37, p = .712$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .001, indicating a small effect size (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American administrators ($M = 43.40, SD = 5.27$) tended to report similar levels of implementation in their perceptions of shared governance as the Chinese administrators ($M = 43.84, SD = 6.23$). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (-2.77 to 1.90).

**Research Question 6**

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities?

Ho61: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory*
between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university administrators and Chinese university administrators. Their scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory were the test variable. The test was not significant, $t(95) = 1.70, p = .092$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .03, indicating an effect size between small and medium (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American administrators (M = 39.04, SD = 7.74) tended to report similar levels of general acceptance in the application of shared governance as the Chinese administrators (M = 36.68, SD = 5.85). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (-.39 to 5.12).

H06: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university administrators and Chinese university administrators at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university administrators and Chinese university administrators. Their scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory were the test variable. The test was not significant, $t(94) = .19, p = .851$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was less than .001, indicating a small effect size (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American administrators (M = 37.24, SD = 7.43) tended to report similar levels of implementation in the
application of shared governance as the Chinese administrators (M = 37.50, SD = 6.09). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (-3.00 to 2.48).

Research Question 7

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities?

Ho7: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members. Their scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* were the test variable. The test was significant, \( t(328) = 2.64, p = .009 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .02, which indicated a small effect size (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American faculty members (M = 46.64, SD = 4.85) tended to report lower levels of general acceptance in their perceptions of shared governance than the Chinese faculty members (M = 47.76, SD = 2.58). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (-1.97 to -0.29).

Ho7: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the
Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members. Their scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* were the test variable. The test was not significant, $t(327) = 1.75$, $p = .081$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American university faculty members ($M = 44.79$, $SD = 4.65$) tended to report similar levels of implementation in their perceptions of shared governance as the Chinese faculty members ($M = 45.65$, $SD = 4.27$). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (-1.83 to .11).

**Research Question 8**

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities?

$Ho8_1$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities.
An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members. Their scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* were the test variable. The test was significant, $t(305) = 11.21, p < .001$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The $\eta^2$ index was .29, which indicated a very large effect size (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American faculty members ($M = 36.93, SD = 7.99$) tended to report significantly higher levels of general acceptance in the application of shared governance than the Chinese faculty members ($M = 27.72, SD = 6.41$). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (7.60 to 10.83).

$H_{082}$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university faculty members and Chinese university faculty members. Their scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* were the test variable. The test was significant, $t(305) = 3.17, p = .002$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The $\eta^2$
index was .03, which indicated an effect size between small and medium (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American faculty members (M = 35.94, SD = 6.73) tended to report significantly higher levels of implementation in the application of shared governance than the Chinese faculty members (M = 33.92, SD = 4.29). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (.77 to 3.27).

**Research Question 9**

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities?

Ho91: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university staff members and Chinese university staff members. Their scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* were the test variable. The test was significant, t(276) = 5.35, p < .001. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The η² index was .09, which indicated an effect size between medium and large (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American staff members (M = 46.22, SD = 6.50) tended to report significantly
lower levels of general acceptance in the perceptions of shared governance than the Chinese staff members (M = 49.49, SD = 3.14). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (-4.47 to -2.07).

\[ H_{02}: \text{There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities.} \]

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university staff members and Chinese university staff members. Their scores for the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory were the test variable. The test was significant, \( t(275) = 4.79, p < .001 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .08, which indicated an effect size between medium and large (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American staff members (M = 43.95, SD = 6.62) tended to report significantly lower levels of implementation in the perceptions of shared governance than the Chinese staff members (M = 47.07, SD = 3.91). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (-4.41 to -1.84).

Research Question 10

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation)
between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities?

Ho10₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university staff members and Chinese university staff members. Their scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory were the test variable. The test was significant, \( t(250) = 8.21, p < .001 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .21, which indicated a large effect size (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American staff members (\( M = 35.84, SD = 9.63 \)) tended to report significantly higher levels of general acceptance in the application of shared governance than the Chinese staff members (\( M = 27.74, SD = 5.93 \)). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (6.16 to 10.05).

Ho10₂: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory
between American university staff members and Chinese university staff members at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university staff members and Chinese university staff members. Their scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* were the test variable. The test was significant, $t(249) = 5.83, p < .001$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The $\eta^2$ index was .12, which indicated an effect size between medium and large (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American staff members ($M = 35.70, SD = 7.69$) tended to report significantly higher levels of implementation in the application of shared governance than the Chinese staff members ($M = 31.33, SD = 3.95$). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (2.90 to 5.85).

**Research Question 11**

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities?

*Ho11*: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university students and
Chinese university students. Their scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory were the test variable. The test was significant, \( t(1093) = 2.81, p = .005 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American university students (M = 47.28, SD = 5.21) tended to report significantly lower levels of general acceptance in the perceptions of shared governance than the Chinese university students (M = 47.96, SD = 2.37). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (-1.17 to -0.21).

\[ H_{112}: \text{There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the} \]

Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university students and Chinese university students. Their scores for the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory were the test variable. The test was significant, \( t(1092) = 6.45, p < .001 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .04, which indicated an effect size between small and medium (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American university students (M = 44.95, SD = 5.36) tended to report significantly lower levels of implementation in the perceptions of shared governance than the Chinese university students (M = 46.57, SD = 2.47). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (-2.12 to -1.13).
Research Question 12

Are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities?

Ho121: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university students and Chinese university students. Their scores for the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory were the test variable. The test was significant, \( t(954) = 10.92, \ p < .001 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .11, which indicated an effect size between medium and large (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American university students (M = 38.04, SD = 8.91) tended to report significantly higher levels of general acceptance in the application of shared governance than the Chinese university students (M = 33.66, SD = 2.59). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (3.59 to 5.17).

Ho122: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory.
between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* between American university students and Chinese university students at the participating universities differ. The grouping variable was American university students and Chinese university students. Their scores for the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* were the test variable. The test was significant, \( t(955) = 21.15, p < .001 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .32, which indicated a very large effect (Green & Salkind, 2008). The American university students (\( M = 37.30, SD = 8.09 \)) tended to report significantly higher levels of implementation in the application of shared governance than the Chinese university students (\( M = 29.45, SD = 2.78 \)). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was (7.12 to 8.58).

**Research Question 13**

At the participating American university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

Ho:13a: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.
Ho:13b: At the participating American university, there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:13c: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

A 3 X 2 ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship of gender and years of service with the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory. The means and standard deviations for the General Acceptance scores as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 11. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between gender and years of service, $F(3, 340) = 1.43, p = .233$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, and no significant main effects for gender $F(1, 340) = 1.33, p = .250$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, and for years of service, $F(3, 340) = 1.75, p = .156$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. The results indicate that gender and years of service had no effect on the mean scores of the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory.
Table 11

*Means and Standard Deviations for General Acceptance Scores of the PSGI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Service Years</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>46.07</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>46.62</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td>8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>47.55</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>48.10</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$Ho:13_{2a}$: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

$Ho:13_{2b}$: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

$Ho:13_{2c}$: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.
Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

A 3 X 2 ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship of gender and years of service with the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory. The means and standard deviations for the Implementation scores as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 12. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between gender and years of service, $F(3, 338) = .23, p = .873$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, and no significant main effects for gender $F(1, 338) = .95, p = .331$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, and for years of service, $F(3, 338) = .21, p = .892$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$. The results indicate that gender and years of service had no effect on the mean scores of the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory.

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations for Implementation Scores of the PSGI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Service Years</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>43.70</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>44.53</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>43.94</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>43.85</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>44.27</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>44.42</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>44.56</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>45.39</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 14

At the participating American university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

Ho:14: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:14b: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:14c: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

A 3 X 2 ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship of gender and years of service with the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory. The means and standard deviations for the General Acceptance scores as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 13. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between gender and years of service, $F(3, 292) = 1.50, p = .216$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, and no significant main effects for gender $F(1, 292) = .06, p = .813$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, and for years of service.
service, $F(3, 292) = .87, p = .459$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. The results indicate that gender and years of service had no effect on the mean scores of the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory*.

Table 13

**Means and Standard Deviations for General Acceptance Scores of the ASGI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Service Years</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>36.80</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>36.97</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>34.06</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>37.62</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>37.81</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho:14\textsubscript{a}: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:14\textsubscript{b}: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.
Ho:14c: At the participating American university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

A 3 X 2 ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship of gender and years of service with the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory. The means and standard deviations for the Implementation scores as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 14. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between gender and years of service, $F(3, 290) = 1.50, p = .215$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, and no significant main effects for gender $F(1, 290) = .16, p = .694$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, and for years of service, $F(3, 290) = 1.54, p = .204$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. The results indicate that gender and years of service had no effect on the mean scores of the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory.
Table 14

*Means and Standard Deviations for Implementation Scores of the ASGI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Service Years</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>36.37</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>35.87</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>34.83</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>36.57</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>37.51</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>38.42</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 15

At the participating Chinese university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

Ho:15$_{1a}$: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:15$_{1b}$: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the
Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:15c: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

A 3 X 2 ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship of gender and years of service with the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory. The means and standard deviations for the General Acceptance scores as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 15. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between gender and years of service, $F(3, 347) = .60, p = .614$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, and no significant main effects for gender $F(1, 347) = .68, p = .410$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, but significant main effects for years of service, $F(3, 347) = 4.29, p = .005$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. The results indicate that years of service had some effect on the mean scores of the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory.

Because the overall F test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the four groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between the 31-or-more group and the 0-to-10 group ($p = .001$), between the 31-or-more group and the 11-to-20 group ($p = .007$), and between the 31-or-more group and the 21-to-30 group ($p = .038$). The results of this analysis indicate that the 31-or-more group scored significantly lower than each of the other three groups. It appears that the participants of the 31-or-more group tended to consider the General Acceptance
dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* less important than the participants of the other three groups. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the four service year groups are reported in Table 16.

Table 15

*Years of Service by Gender Means and Standard Deviations for General Acceptance Scores of the PSGI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Service Years</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>48.46</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>48.23</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>49.36</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>48.54</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

*Years of Service Means and Standard Deviations with 95% Confidence Intervals of Pairwise Differences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49.14</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>-1.96 to .67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48.18</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-2.47 to .56</td>
<td>-1.52 to .90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.86</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>-5.58 to -.99</td>
<td>-4.74 to .54</td>
<td>-4.56 to -.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 17

*Gender Means and Standard Deviations for Gender and Years of Service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.46</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.28</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho:15_{2a}: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:15_{2b}: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.
At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

A 3 X 2 ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship of gender and years of service with the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory*. The means and standard deviations for the Implementation scores as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 18. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between gender and years of service, $F(3, 347) = .36, p = .785$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, and no significant main effects for gender $F(1, 347) = .01, p = .928$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, but significant main effects for years of service, $F(3, 347) = 3.79, p = .011$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. The results indicate that years of service had some effect on the mean scores of the Implementation dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory*.

Because the overall F test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the four groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between the 31-or-more group and the 11-to-20 group ($p = .022$). The results of this analysis indicate that the 31-or-more group scored significantly higher than the 11-to-20 group. It appears that the participants of the 31-or-more group tended to consider the Implementation dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory more important than the participants of the 11-to-20 group. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the four service year groups are reported in Table 19.
Table 18

*Years of Service by Gender Means and Standard Deviations for Implementation Scores of the PSGI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Service Years</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>46.21</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>48.56</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>45.86</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>45.22</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>47.09</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>48.17</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

*Years of Service Means and Standard Deviations with 95% Confidence Intervals of Pairwise Differences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46.22</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>45.33</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level*
Table 20

*Gender Means and Standard Deviations for Gender and Years of Service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.95</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 16

At the participating Chinese university are there significant differences in the mean scores on the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (General Acceptance and Implementation) for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service?

Ho:$16_{1a}$: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:$16_{1b}$: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:$16_{1c}$: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.
A 3 X 2 ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship of gender and years of service with the mean scores on the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory*. The means and standard deviations for the General Acceptance scores as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 21. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between gender and years of service, $F(3, 347) = .43, p = .729$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, and no significant main effects for gender $F(1, 347) = .11, p = .736$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, but significant main effects for years of service, $F(3, 347) = 4.85, p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. The results indicate that years of service had some effect on the mean scores of the General Acceptance dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory*.

Because the overall F test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the four groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between the 11-to-20 group and the 21-to-30 group ($p = .014$). The results of this analysis indicate that the 11-to-20 group scored significantly higher than the 21-to-30 group. It appears that the participants of the 11-to-20 group tended to consider the General Acceptance dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory at their university significantly higher than the participants of the 21-to-30 group. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the four service year groups are reported in Table 22.
**Table 21**

*Years of Service by Gender Means and Standard Deviations for General Acceptance Scores of the ASGI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Service Years</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>28.28</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>30.01</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>27.67</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>30.52</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 22**

*Years of Service Means and Standard Deviations with 95% Confidence Intervals of Pairwise Differences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27.89</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>-.19 to 4.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>27.51</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-3.30 to 2.54</td>
<td>-5.05 to -.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>-5.30 to 3.51</td>
<td>-7.28 to .81</td>
<td>-4.81 to 3.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level*
Table 23

*Gender Means and Standard Deviations for Gender and Years of Service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho:16\textsubscript{2a}: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants in regard to years of service.

Ho:16\textsubscript{2b}: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff between male and female participants.

Ho:16\textsubscript{2c}: At the participating Chinese university there are no significant differences in the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* for administrators, faculty, and staff among the years of service groups.

A 3 X 2 ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship of gender and years of service with the mean scores on the Implementation dimension of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory*. The means and standard deviations for the Implementation scores as a function of the two factors are presented in Table 24. The ANOVA indicated no significant interaction between gender and years of service, $F(3, 347) = .26$, $p = .853$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, and...
no significant main effects for gender $F(1, 347) = .02, p = .899$, partial $\eta^2 < .01$, but significant main effects for years of service, $F(3, 347) = 2.85, p = .037$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. The results indicate that years of service had some effect on the mean scores of the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory.

Because the overall F test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the four groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between the 11-to-20 group and the 0-to-10 group ($p = .018$). The results of this analysis indicate that the 11-to-20 group scored significantly higher than the 0-to-10 group. It appears that the participants of the 11-to-20 group tended to consider the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory at their university significantly higher than the participants of the 0-to-10 group. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the four service year groups are reported in Table 25.
Table 24

Years of Service by Gender Means and Standard Deviations for Implementation Scores of the ASGI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Service Years</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>33.84</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>33.42</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>32.32</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>34.07</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>32.71</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

Years of Service Means and Standard Deviations with 95% Confidence Intervals of Pairwise Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>33.94</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>.25 to 3.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>-.84 to 3.33</td>
<td>-2.48 to .85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.43</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>-.60 to 5.71</td>
<td>-2.41 to 3.38</td>
<td>-1.77 to 4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
### Table 26

*Gender Means and Standard Deviations for Gender and Years of Service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.54</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains the findings, conclusions, and recommendations that may serve as a resource for readers who want to review the status of institutional shared governance at an American institution of higher education or at a Chinese institution of higher education. Differences in shared governance between American and Chinese institutions were also studied. The purpose of the present study was to assess the status of institutional stakeholders’ perceptions of shared governance and application of shared governance on an American higher education campus and a counterpart in China and determine if there were differences among the groups of stakeholders at the same institution and between the institutions. The study was conducted using data collected through an online survey of administrators, faculty, staff, and students on an American campus and a paper survey of administrators, faculty, staff, and students on a Chinese campus.

Summary

The statistical analyses reported in this study were based on 16 research questions presented in Chapters 1 and 3. All data were collected through an online survey distributed via an internal listserv at the participating American university and a paper survey distributed face to face at the participating Chinese university. Research questions 1 to 4 were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA), research questions 5 to 12 were analyzed using an independent samples t-test, and research questions 13 to 16 were analyzed using two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The level of significance used in the statistical analysis was .05. At the participating American university the responses of 48 administrators, 165 faculty members, 138 staff members,
and 546 students were collected and used in the study. At the participating Chinese university 50 administrator responses, 165 faculty responses, 140 staff responses, and 550 student responses were collected and used in the study. The data analysis found significant differences among the four categories of participants at the Chinese institution. For the General Acceptance dimension of the *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory* (PSGI) the Chinese staff members reported significantly higher scores than all the other three categories. For the Implementation dimension of the same inventory the staff members and the students scored significantly higher than the administrators and the faculty members. For the two dimensions of the *Application of Shared Governance Inventory* (ASGI) the administrators reported significantly higher scores than the other categories. At the participating American university except the significant difference found between the category of students and the category of administrators in the General Acceptance dimension of the PSGI no other significant differences were found among the four categories of participants in either of the two inventories. The finding that the students at the participating American university scored significantly higher than the administrators may mean that the students, not as well or as often exposed to the environment of shared governance, considered shared governance more important than the administrators. Comparisons between the American institution and the Chinese institution found that the Chinese faculty members scored significantly higher than their American counterparts in the General Acceptance dimension of the PSGI, but the American faculty members scored significantly higher in both the General Acceptance dimension and the Implementation dimension of the ASGI than the Chinese faculty members. The Chinese staff members and the Chinese students scored significantly higher than their American counterparts in both the General Acceptance dimension and the Implementation dimension of the PSGI, but the American staff members and the American students scored
significantly higher in both the General Acceptance dimension and the Implementation dimension of the ASGI than the Chinese staff members and the Chinese students. Results of this study also indicate that gender differences play no significant role in the reported scores of either the general acceptance dimension or the implementation dimension of the two inventories, and that years of service differences play a significant role only in two Chinese groups. First the Chinese 31-or-more group reported significantly lower scores in the General Acceptance dimension of the PSGI than the other three Chinese groups, but scored significantly higher than the 11-to-20 group in the Implementation dimension of the PSGI. Then for the two dimensions of the ASGI the Chinese 11-to-20 group reported significantly higher scores than the 21-to-30 group in the General Acceptance dimension, and scored significantly higher than the 0-to-10 group in the Implementation dimension.

In summary, 20 of the 48 null hypotheses were rejected for this research study. Overall, it appears that there were more significant differences among the different groups of Chinese participants than the groups of American participants. Comparatively speaking the Chinese participants, with the administrators excluded, regarded shared governance as being more important while the American participants reported higher levels of shared governance application in their university. Gender plays no significant role in the reported scores, and years of service differences play a significant role only in two Chinese groups: the 31-or-more group in the PSGI and the 11-to-20 group in the ASGI.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the status of American and Chinese institutional stakeholders’ perceptions of shared governance and application of shared governance. The study was designed to determine if significant differences exist among the four
groups of stakeholders both at the same institution and between the institutions. To achieve this purpose this research assessed administrators, faculty members, staff members, and students on a university campus in the United States and administrators, faculty members, staff members, and students on a university campus in China. It is important to note that although this population may represent other populations at similar institutions of higher education in the two countries the results may not be generalizable to other populations because of the complexity that institutions of higher education display. The type of governance at different institutions may also vary. The following conclusions were based upon the findings from the data of this study:

1. At the participating American university except the significant difference found between the category of students and the category of administrators in the General Acceptance dimension of the PSGI no other significant differences were found among the four categories of participants in either of the two inventories. The finding that the students at the participating American university scored significantly higher than the administrators may mean that the students value the concept of shared governance very highly. The finding that there were no other differences among the four categories can be interpreted in two ways. First, it may mean that in American institutions shared governance has developed into an accepted and popular practice, so that a consistent knowledge of shared governance and its implementation is present among all the four groups of stakeholders. Second, it is important to note that the staff members and the students scored as high, if not higher, than the administrators and the faculty members. In both shared governance and institutional practice of shared governance administrators and faculty members are customarily regarded as the major stakeholders engaged in shared governance. They usually are empowered most in the process of decision making and are also expected to
value and know more about shared governance. The other groups of stakeholders, such as staff and students, were believed to be at the circumference of shared governance. The AAUP Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (1966) excluded staff members and included students only where appropriate. This finding indicates a long history of more than 75 years of shared governance in American institutions (Kezar et al., 2006). This long history may have raised staff members’ and students’ awareness of shared governance and raised their expectation of applying shared governance to institutional affairs. According to the American Student Government Association (2013), the Student Government Association (SGA) is indispensable to all higher education institutions. In the context of shared governance the SGA of an institution must have a student representative and vote on campus wide governing and academic committees, including the institution's board of trustees. The SGA is meant to encourage students to get involved in the institutional community and represent the interests of students and the student viewpoint on administration and faculty committees. Curley (2007) reported that the Student Shared Governance Re-Evaluation Committee at Central Michigan University suggested that to help improve students' knowledge of shared governance more adequate advertising was needed. The committee also emphasized student participation, voting rights, and communication. The result of this research that the American students’ mean total scores on the general acceptance and implementation dimensions of the PSGI were the highest among the four categories indicates that students may care and know as much about shared governance as the other categories of participants.
2. The results also indicated significant differences among the four categories of
participants at the Chinese institution. First, for the General Acceptance dimension of the
PSGI the Chinese staff members reported significantly higher scores than all the other
three categories and for the Implementation dimension of the same inventory the staff
members and the students scored significantly higher than the administrators and the
faculty members. In the Chinese context this finding may mean that because staff
members and students have historically been denied a role in institutional management
they wanted to express their wish to be involved in the process of decision making. They
wished to make it known that they also know and care about shared governance. Even in
American institutions the Staff Senate, as Yu (2010) explained, was the last stakeholder
organization for shared governance. Then it is understandable why Chinese staff
members play a very minor and inconsistent role in institutional decision making. But the
finding of this study indicates that they, as well as the students, have a strong wish for
opportunities in shared governance. Their enthusiasm for shared governance supports
Yu’s expectation of creating a staff organization like the American Staff Senate on a
Chinese campus. This organization would represent all staff members at an institution to
work for the president, help and facilitate information sharing among staff members,
promote unity and collaboration among staff members, get involved in making policies
concerning staff, help to produce professionalized staff members, and improve staff
members’ enthusiasm in work. Second, for the two dimensions of the ASGI the
administrators reported significantly higher scores than the other categories. This finding
and the finding that the Chinese administrators scored as high as the American
administrators on the two dimensions of the ASGI indicate that the Chinese
administrators believed that their university considered the concept of shared governance important and practiced a high level of shared governance as well. But in Chinese institutions of higher education where administerization (top-down administration) prevails in almost all units this is obviously not true. Administrative power, just as Liu and Jin (2011) stated, dominates all institutional processes and procedures in China. They believed that Chinese colleges and universities are administered institutions where academic governance and student government are not available. Despite a low level of shared governance at their university the administrators reported a high level of applying shared governance may be due to their tendency, as explained by Drummond and Reitsch (1995), to report high involvement of the other groups of stakeholders. It is also interesting to note that while scoring highest among the four categories of stakeholders on the application dimensions the Chinese administrators scored lowest on the perception dimensions. This finding may mean that on the one hand the administrators had a weaker aspiration for shared governance but on the other hand they wanted to argue that they were giving many opportunities in institutional governance to the other groups of stakeholders.

3. Comparisons between the American institution and the Chinese institution found that the Chinese faculty members scored significantly higher than their American counterparts in the General Acceptance dimension of the Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory (PSGI), but the American faculty members scored significantly higher in both the General Acceptance dimension and the Implementation dimension of the Application of Shared Governance Inventory (ASGI) than the Chinese faculty members. The Chinese staff members and the Chinese students scored significantly higher than their American
countersparts in both the General Acceptance dimension and the Implementation
dimension of the PSGI, but the American staff members and the American students
scored significantly higher in both the General Acceptance dimension and the
Implementation dimension of the ASGI than the Chinese staff members and the Chinese
students. These findings indicate that in the context of administerization the Chinese
faculty members, staff members, and students supported shared governance and had a
strong aspiration for opportunities in shared governance. Previous research conducted by
Ma and Hu (2010) and Li (2011) supports this conclusion. The significant differences in
the dimensions of the ASGI between the American institution and the Chinese institution
reveal the American institution had a significantly higher level of applying shared
governance that the Chinese institution was expected to reach. In the course of reaching
the goal Chinese institutions, as Liu and Jin (2011) hoped, may not copy the American
shared governance but borrow its essential elements.

4. There were no significant differences between the American and the Chinese
administrators in either the PSGI or the ASGI. This finding reveals two things that the
American administrators and the Chinese administrators had in common. First, they
reported the lowest mean total scores on the two dimensions of the PSGI. It indicates that
the administrators may have a weaker aspiration for shared governance because they
regard shared governance more as a concept than as feasible practice (Birnbaum, 2004).
According to Birnbaum (2004) administrators and trustees may embrace corporate values
in pursuit of efficiency, easy and short processes, and tangible outcomes. It is not
uncommon that some administrators get less enthusiastic for implementing shared
governance after years of practicing it. Having worked in the system of shared governance
for 14 years Haynsworth (2005), retiring president and dean of the William Mitchell College of Law, reported that in recent years he had consciously tried to avoid placing issues in front of the entire faculty for approval. Second, the administrators reported the highest mean total scores on the two dimensions of the ASGI. This finding, however, should not be used as evidence to conclude that shared governance was practiced at their university as much as the administrators reported or that the Chinese institution applied shared governance as much as the American institution. This finding only indicates that the administrators were well aware that they were expected to pursue shared governance. Drummond and Reitsch (1995) explained that administrators tend to report higher involvement of other groups of stakeholders than they are really democratically involved. Therefore, responses from other groups of stakeholders with regard to application of shared governance at their own institution may be more reliable. The results of a survey at California State University may serve as a good case in point. The 2001 survey showed a positive attitude towards the importance of shared governance, but the level of shared governance application was lower than expected. Ninety-five percent of the faculty representatives investigated thought it is very important to have shared governance on their campus but when it came to how well informed they were about the activities and roles of their local campus administration the number of faculty who thought they were well informed dropped to 51%. In the present research the results reported by the Chinese faculty, staff, and students rather than those by the administrators help to draw conclusions about the status of shared governance application at the Chinese institution and the significant differences that exist between the two institutions.  

5. Results of this study also indicate that gender differences play no significant role in the
reported scores of either the general acceptance dimension or the implementation dimension of the two inventories, but years of service differences play a significant role in two Chinese groups. Because years of service differences play no significant role in the reported scores of the American administrators, faculty, and staff, and no previous research was retrieved about the relationship between years of service and perceptions of shared governance the significant differences relevant to years of service in the two Chinese cases may be considered tentative. Interpretation of the data may also be tentative and goes as follows. First, the Chinese 31-or-more years of service group reported significantly lower scores in the General Acceptance dimension of the PSGI than the other three Chinese groups, but scored significantly higher than the 11-to-20 group in the Implementation dimension of the PSGI. This finding might mean that with the longest experience of service this group of administrators, faculty, and staff came to value the implementation of shared governance more than the concept of shared governance.

Second, for the two dimensions of the ASGI the Chinese 11-to-20 group reported significantly higher scores than the 21-to-30 group in the General Acceptance dimension, and scored significantly higher than the 0-to-10 group in the Implementation dimension. In China the 11-to-20 group of stakeholders is regarded as a group that is characterized by three positive qualities: young, capable, and experienced. Therefore, stakeholders that fall into this group are more likely to be empowered and, as a result, tend to believe that their institution practices a higher level of shared governance. It is important to note that because previous studies such as the 2001 national Survey on Higher Education Governance sponsored by the AAUP and the American Conference of Academic Deans (ACAD), the shared governance report made by the California State University (2001),
and Tierney’s national survey on shared governance (2003) seldom include demographic
information for supplementary purposes no relevant findings were retrieved to support the
findings in this current research. But these findings may contribute to the literature on
shared governance.

**Recommendations for Practice**

Shared governance is an important concept in Chinese and American institutions of
higher education. In China top-down management, as Liu and Jin (2011) explained, has
prevailed in higher education since its birth. Institutional leaders see their institutions as
comparable to business firms in their structure and authority patterns and believe that academic
decisions do not require faculty involvement. But as stated by Baldrige et al. (1978) traditional
management theories do not apply to academic institutions because academic institutions are so
different from other institutions. In America problems are not uncommon in the application of
shared governance. Some stakeholders object to the use of shared governance and some others
get bored with it. However, most thoughtful stakeholders believe that the need for effective
shared governance has never been greater than it is in today’s rapidly changing environment
(Leach, 2008). This suggests experimentation and innovation in shared governance and
searching for effective ways to improve the sharing of information and making decisions is
important.

**Recommendations for Chinese Administrators in Institutions of Higher Education**

In America administrators control the institution, and it is even more so in China. There
are, however, positive signs that China is starting to change academic institutional governance.
The government has promised to help to eliminate administerization. Major universities are
offered more authority and more opportunities for autonomy. But if administrators refuse to
share power with the other stakeholders, top-down management at the intermediate level will continue. When liberated from the bureaucratic control of the government Chinese administrators need to gain support of all the internal stakeholders to be successful. Therefore, knowing that hoarding power may lead to teacher and student dissatisfaction and alienation, Chinese administrators must be ready to share power. As stated in the Statement on the Reorganization of Public Higher Education in Tennessee, sharing power means supporting a high quality education, preserving available resources, entailing shared measures of accountability, encouraging institutional efficiencies, and developing a sense of institutional and system ownership among all stakeholders is crucial to strengthening the sense of community on which higher education thrives. It is recommended Chinese administrators base their leadership style and ethics on Hoy and Miskel’s (2001) four imperatives for effective administrators: extending their system of authority because leadership requires more than formal authority, making use of the system of ideology or the organization culture as another source of authority, using the system of expertise by sharing power with their teachers, and limiting the use of the system of politics based on knowing and understanding it. Administrators are responsible for creating a positive environment for shared governance in which all stakeholders follow the five basic principles for the implementation of shared governance: constructing a system of trust, open communication of information, information sharing, multiple opinions, and compromise with multiple opinions (Blase & Blase, 1999).

**Recommendations for Chinese Faculty Members in Institutions of Higher Education**

The AAUP defined shared governance as a shared responsibility among faculty, administrators, trustees, and, where appropriate, students (AAUP Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, 1966). At the California State University (2001) shared governance
was defined as the relationship between the administration and the faculty. Therefore, faculty members are a critical factor in shared governance. In the Chinese context, however, faculty members serve roles in the background of institutional governance and have long been limited to the role of teaching and research. While surveying the deterioration of faculty influence in higher education Burgan (2006) suggested that improving life on campus depends on faculty members’ engagement with their administrative colleagues as well as their students. To attract the voice of the faculty in Chinese institutional governance, two things have to be made to happen. Chinese faculty members’ awareness of participating in shared governance needs to be promoted. They need to know that they are not only professionals with expertise in their own field, but also entitled to participate in institutional governance. Administrators should make use of faculty members’ expert power to enhance committed participation in institutional affairs. Chinese faculty members should be encouraged to participate fully and actively in the process of sharing information and making decisions. They must learn to view participation in shared governance as a worthwhile faculty responsibility.

**Recommendations for Chinese Staff Members in Institutions of Higher Education**

A recent definition of shared governance by the Florida State University (2011) encourages the participation of faculty members, staff members, and students as applicable, administrators, the president, and trustees in the institutional decision and policy-making processes to promote the institutional vision and mission, academic integrity, and sustainability of the dynamic academic environment, and retain public accountability. In Chinese institutions staff members have historically not participated in making decisions on important institutional affairs. They have chances to share information, but the process is limited to listening without questioning and accepting whatever decisions made by administrators. If it is not practical for
staff members to discuss issues directly with administrators, the most important recommendation for helping staff members to be involved in shared governance is to create a Staff Senate. On a Chinese campus the Staff Senate, as stated by Yu (2010), would represent all staff members at an institution to work with the president. The Senate would facilitate information sharing among staff members, promote unity and collaboration among staff members, get involved in making policies concerning staff, help to produce professional staff members, and improve staff members’ enthusiasm in work. Constructing this platform of shared governance would motivate staff members to connect and communicate effectively with the president and senior administrators.

**Recommendations for Chinese University Students**

In most Chinese institutions students do not have opportunities to discuss issues with administrators, faculty, or staff. They are not allowed to participate in institutional decision making. In some institutions policies like the President Open Day are the only opportunity for students to meet the President and some senior administrators. But Chinese students, as revealed by this research, have a strong desire to participate in shared governance. More importantly, student involvement in governance, as stated by Cohen (1998), can train students for citizenship, give them experience in policy making, provide for student expression, develop leaders, and in general enhance the morale of the college community. Therefore, administrators and faculty members should take measures to let students know that they are welcome to participate in shared governance. In this regard it is advisable to borrow at least three practices that American institutions implement to ensure student involvement. The three principles are: 1) Put students on campuswide governing and academic committees and empower them with the right to vote; 2) Press student affairs to conceptualize its primary educator role to create empowering settings in
which staff, faculty, and students participate in meaningful campus decision making; and 3) Make best use of polls for effective communication between the institution and students on important issues.

**Recommendations for American Institutions**

After a long history of more than 80 years, shared governance still has not become obsolete. But instead, as Leach (2008) argued, the need for effective shared governance in American institutions has never been greater than it is in today’s rapidly changing environment. To improve shared governance and make it fit into the changing environment two recommendations are made. First, educate all stakeholders about shared governance with the following principles: 1) There is no one-fits-all solution for shared governance; 2) Rather than static shared governance is fluid over time; 3) Shared governance is also fluid in terms of types of tasks and areas of responsibility; and 4) Experimentation and innovation are always encouraged in the application of shared governance. In other words, if shared governance fails to work to the satisfaction of the institutional community, it may not be due to the concept or the implementation of shared governance but due to ways of practicing shared governance. In addition shared governance, as an ongoing process, requires continual assessment and reevaluation in order to be flexible and responsive to an ever-changing environment. Second, make sure that new groups of stakeholders are included in shared governance. As institutions become larger and more complex other groups of stakeholders such as alumni, donors, graduate and teaching assistants, and adjunct faculty want their voices heard in the governance process. These groups of stakeholders want to participate in shared governance and shared governance would not be complete without them.
Recommendations for Future Research

Further research is needed in institutional shared governance, which is considered as an ongoing and fluid process. On the basis of this research five recommendations for future research are made:

1. A population that includes more participants and more types of institutions is needed. Compared to the total number of stakeholders at either of the institutions for this research the number of participants was small. If more stakeholders had responded to the survey the results would be more reliable. Both universities are 4-year regional universities which cannot represent other types of institutions and limit the generalizability of the results.

2. Qualitative research such as interviews should be added to the research of shared governance. Quantitative research helps to find differences but factors that may contribute to the differences are difficult to understand without qualitative research.

3. Consider revising the statements in the inventories. Feedback from some respondents suggested that there should be fewer statements. The current inventories have 40 statements. That may be the reason why quite a few American respondents stopped after filling out the first inventory. Therefore, inventories with 20 statements may be more feasible.

4. Further research is needed into the relationship between perceptions of shared governance and application of shared governance. Research questions dealing with this topic could be added to the research. Judging directly from the data the mean total scores on the PSGI (45.79 for the American participants and 47.23 for the Chinese participants) were much higher than the mean total scores on the ASGI (37.15 for the American
participants and 31.42 for the Chinese participants). This result may indicate significant differences, but it is hard to report without standard statistical reference.

5. Future research is needed in conducting empirical studies on institutional governance at Chinese institutions. Research should be focused on four areas: 1. Design a study of perceptions of shared governance among presidents of regional Chinese universities and officials of the Ministry of Education; 2. Conduct research that represents Chinese characteristics such as eliminating administrationization and creating policies or strategies to substitute old ways of institutional management with shared governance that involves all institutional stakeholders; 3. Design research on a specific group of stakeholders in Chinese higher education institutions about their role in shared governance and ways and degrees of their participation in the process of sharing information and making decisions; and 4. Start practical research that is intended to be applied in endeavors to make shared governance happen on Chinese campuses. An example that pertains to this type of research may be promoting the sense of participation of stakeholders other than administrators by relating participation with satisfaction of stakeholders or with institutional success.

Conclusion

The image of American higher education institutions as the envy of the world is inseparable from how the institutions are governed. Shared governance has served American institutions as an overriding principle for more than 80 years, but instead of becoming obsolete shared governance is still greatly needed. During the process of reorganizing public higher education in Tennessee the AAUP strongly suggested that all efforts be based on shared governance (Tennessee AAUP Statement on the Reorganization of Public Higher Education in
Tennessee, 2009). But institutional stakeholders must know that shared governance is fluid over time and in terms of types of tasks and areas of responsibility. Therefore, experimentation and innovation are always necessary in the application of shared governance.

Administrators, as managers in the organizations of higher education, play a key role in the perceptions and application of shared governance. Administrators must embrace the idea and the practice of shared governance for it to work effectively. Their attitudes and decisions directly determine whether other stakeholders have opportunities to participate in sharing information and making decisions and the extent to which shared governance is implemented.

Stakeholders’ concerns over shared governance and willingness to participate also mean much to the implementation of shared governance. Instead of waiting to be asked to participate in the process of shared governance, stakeholders must press for opportunities, both formal and informal. Collective bargaining, a formal and legal measure that is not available in Chinese institutions, may guarantee faculty power and involvement in decision making, but informal communication between administrators and the other stakeholders may be more beneficial to improving trust and building an institutional culture of shared governance.

A clear idea of the status of shared governance at Chinese institutions is indispensable. Despite the administrators’ positive response to the application level of shared governance at their institution, shared governance remains at a very low level in Chinese institutions. Findings of the present research indicate that Chinese stakeholders have a good knowledge and understanding of shared governance; therefore, the focus of education can be shifted from educating all stakeholders about shared governance to persuading administrators to share power with the other stakeholders and motivating faculty, staff, and students to actively participate in the process of shared governance.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Shared Governance Survey for Administrators, Faculty and Staff

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey on the topic of Shared Governance in Higher Education. Your feedback is important to my dissertation research and will help me assess the status of shared governance at higher education institutions. In this survey, shared governance refers to the process by which the institutional community respectfully shares responsibility for reaching collective decisions on matters of policy and procedure. This survey should only take about 5 minutes of your time. Your answers will be completely anonymous. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact me at zhangd@goldmail.etsu.edu. I really appreciate your participation in my research project. If you have questions, you can also contact Dr. James Lampley at lampley@mail.etsu.edu (423-439-7619) or ETSU’s Institutional Review Board at http://www.etsu.edu/irb/ (423-439-6053).

Dianyu Zhang

This survey includes two sections: Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory that represents information about perceptions and implementation of shared governance concerning colleges and universities in a **GENERAL** sense and Application of Shared Governance Inventory that reflects information about perceptions and implementation of shared governance that apply to **YOUR** College or University.

6 = Strongly Agree
5 = Agree
4 = Somewhat Agree
3 = Somewhat Disagree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

Section 1: *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory*

Indicate the degree that you agree or disagree with the following general statements about shared governance as it applies to a college or university.
1. Faculty members should have a role in shared governance at universities.
2. Staff members should have a role in shared governance at universities.
3. Students should have a role in shared governance at universities.
4. Shared governance is important at well-run universities.
5. For shared governance to work, it must be embraced by top administrators.
6. Shared governance is flexible and needs to be adjusted as situations require.
7. Mutual trust between the administration and the other groups of stakeholders is indispensable.
8. Shared governance can be applied in all university decisions.
9. All stakeholders should have an equal voice in shared governance.
10. The top administrators of the university should decide when shared governance can be used.
11. The principles of shared governance should be followed for all university decisions.
12. Shared governance is NOT a form of university governance, so it is not applicable.
13. Decision making using shared governance is slower than top-down decision making.
14. Decisions made using shared governance are more likely to be embraced by all stakeholders.
15. A greater level of shared governance leads to higher quality institutional governance.
16. The quality of faculty input into the shared governance process is generally high.
17. Open communication is essential to the implementation of shared governance.
18. Shared governance vehicles such as senates, councils, committees, associations, and polls play an important role in making shared governance work.
19. In shared governance input from all stakeholders should be actively sought.
20. Decisions should be made at the appropriate level in shared governance.

Section 2: Application of Shared Governance Inventory.

Indicate the degree that you agree or disagree with the following statements as they apply to YOUR College or University.
21. Faculty members have a role in shared governance at my university.
22. Staff members have a role in shared governance at my university.
23. Students have a role in shared governance at my university.
24. Shared governance is important at my university.
25. Shared governance is embraced by top administrators at my university.
26. Shared governance is flexible and is adjusted as situations require at my university.
27. Mutual trust between the administration and the other groups of stakeholders is indispensable at my university.
28. Shared governance is applied in all units at my university.
29. All stakeholders have an equal voice in shared governance at my university.
30. The top administrators at my university decide when shared governance can be used.
31. At my university the principles of shared governance are followed for all university decisions.
32. Shared governance is NOT a form of university governance at my university, so it is not applied.
33. Because of shared governance, decision making is slower than top-down decision making at my university.
34. Decisions made using shared governance are more likely to be embraced by all stakeholders at my university.
35. Because of shared governance at my university there is a high quality of institutional governance.
36. The quality of faculty input into the shared governance process is generally high at my university.
37. Open communication is essential to the implementation of shared governance at my university.
38. Shared governance vehicles such as senates, councils, committees, associations, and polls play an important role in making shared governance work at my university.
39. At my university input from all stakeholders is actively sought.
40. Decisions are made at the appropriate level at my university.

Demographic Information

1. What is your gender?  Male ______  Female ______

2. What is your age?
   20-30  31-40  41-50  51-60  61 or older

3. How many years of service do you have in higher education?
   0-10  11-20  21-30  31 or more

4. What is your highest degree or level of education?
   Less than Bachelor’s  Bachelor’s  Master’s  Doctorate

5. Which participant category do you belong to?
   Administrator  Faculty  Staff
APPENDIX B

Shared Governance Survey for Students

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey on the topic of Shared Governance in Higher Education. Your feedback is important to my dissertation research and will help me assess the status of shared governance at higher education institutions. In this survey, shared governance refers to the process by which the institutional community respectfully shares responsibility for reaching collective decisions on matters of policy and procedure. For example, in the search of a senior administrator, professors, staff members, students, and administrators all have an opportunity to participate in the process. You must be 18 or older to participate. This survey should only take about 5 minutes of your time. Your answers will be completely anonymous. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact me at zhangd@goldmail.etsu.edu. I really appreciate your participation in my research project. If you have questions, you can also contact Dr. James Lampley at lampley@mail.etsu.edu (423-439-7619) or ETSU’s Institutional Review Board at http://www.etsu.edu/irb/ (423-439-6053).

Dianyu Zhang

This survey includes two sections: Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory that represents information about perceptions and implementation of shared governance concerning colleges and universities in a **GENERAL** sense and Application of Shared Governance Inventory that reflects information about perceptions and implementation of shared governance that apply to **YOUR** College or University.

6 = Strongly Agree
5 = Agree
4 = Somewhat Agree
3 = Somewhat Disagree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

Section 1: *Perceptions of Shared Governance Inventory*

Indicate the degree that you agree or disagree with the following general statements about shared governance as it applies to a college or university.
1. Faculty members should have a role in shared governance at universities.

2. Staff members should have a role in shared governance at universities.

3. Students should have a role in shared governance at universities.

4. Shared governance is important at well-run universities.

5. For shared governance to work, it must be embraced by top administrators.

6. Shared governance is flexible and needs to be adjusted as situations require.

7. Mutual trust between the administration and the other groups of stakeholders is indispensable.

8. Shared governance can be applied in all university decisions.

9. All stakeholders should have an equal voice in shared governance.

10. The top administrators of the university should decide when shared governance can be used.

11. The principles of shared governance should be followed for all university decisions.

12. Shared governance is NOT a form of university governance, so it is not applicable.

13. Decision making using shared governance is slower than top-down decision making.

14. Decisions made using shared governance are more likely to be embraced by all stakeholders.

15. A greater level of shared governance leads to higher quality institutional governance.

16. The quality of faculty input into the shared governance process is generally high.

17. Open communication is essential to the implementation of shared governance.

18. Shared governance vehicles such as senates, councils, committees, associations, and polls play an important role in making shared governance work.

19. In shared governance input from all stakeholders should be actively sought.

20. Decisions should be made at the appropriate level in shared governance.

Section 2: Application of Shared Governance Inventory.

Indicate the degree that you agree or disagree with the following statements as they apply to YOUR College or University.
21. Faculty members have a role in shared governance at my university.

22. Staff members have a role in shared governance at my university.

23. Students have a role in shared governance at my university.

24. Shared governance is important at my university.

25. Shared governance is embraced by top administrators at my university.

26. Shared governance is flexible and is adjusted as situations require at my university.

27. Mutual trust between the administration and the other groups of stakeholders is indispensable at my university.

28. Shared governance is applied in all units at my university.

29. All stakeholders have an equal voice in shared governance at my university.

30. The top administrators at my university decide when shared governance can be used.

31. At my university the principles of shared governance are followed for all university decisions.

32. Shared governance is NOT a form of university governance at my university, so it is not applied.

33. Because of shared governance, decision making is slower than top-down decision making at my university.

34. Decisions made using shared governance are more likely to be embraced by all stakeholders at my university.

35. Because of shared governance at my university there is a high quality of institutional governance.

36. The quality of faculty input into the shared governance process is generally high at my university.

37. Open communication is essential to the implementation of shared governance at my university.

38. Shared governance vehicles such as senates, councils, committees, associations, and polls play an important role in making shared governance work at my university.
39. At my university input from all stakeholders is actively sought.

40. Decisions are made at the appropriate level at my university.

Demographic Information

1. What is your gender?  
   Male _____  Female _____

2. What is your age?
   18-24  25-32  33-50  51 or older

3. Which participant category do you belong to?
   Freshman  Sophomore  Junior  Senior  Graduate Student
APPENDIX C

Statements for Measuring Results for the Two Dimensions

*General Acceptance of Shared Governance*

1. Faculty members should have a role in shared governance at universities.
2. Staff members should have a role in shared governance at universities.
3. Students should have a role in shared governance at universities.
4. Shared governance is important at well-run universities.
5. For shared governance to work, it must be embraced by top administrators.
6. Mutual trust between the administration and the other groups of stakeholders is indispensable.
7. The top administrators of the university should decide when shared governance can be used.
8. The principles of shared governance should be followed for all university decisions.
9. In shared governance input from all stakeholders should be actively sought.
10. Decisions should be made at the appropriate level in shared governance.
11. Faculty members have a role in shared governance at my university.
12. Staff members have a role in shared governance at my university.
13. Students have a role in shared governance at my university.
14. Shared governance is important at my university.
15. Shared governance is embraced by top administrators at my university.
16. Mutual trust between the administration and the other groups of stakeholders is indispensable at my university.
17. The top administrators at my university decide when shared governance can be used.
18. At my university the principles of shared governance are followed for all university decisions.
39. At my university input from all stakeholders is actively sought.

40. Decisions are made at the appropriate level at my university.

**Implementation of Shared Governance**

6. Shared governance is flexible and needs to be adjusted as situations require.

8. Shared governance can be applied in all university decisions.

9. All stakeholders should have an equal voice in shared governance.

12. Shared governance is NOT a form of university governance, so it is not applicable.

13. Decision making using shared governance is slower than top-down decision making.

14. Decisions made using shared governance are more likely to be embraced by all stakeholders.

15. A greater level of shared governance leads to higher quality institutional governance.

16. The quality of faculty input into the shared governance process is generally high.

17. Open communication is essential to the implementation of shared governance.

18. Shared governance vehicles such as senates, councils, committees, associations, and polls play an important role in making shared governance work.

26. Shared governance is flexible and is adjusted as situations require at my university.

28. Shared governance is applied in all units at my university.

29. All stakeholders have an equal voice in shared governance at my university.

32. Shared governance is NOT a form of university governance at my university, so it is not applied.

33. Because of shared governance, decision making is slower than top-down decision making at my university.

34. Decisions made using shared governance are more likely to be embraced by all stakeholders at my university.

35. Because of shared governance at my university there is a high quality of institutional governance.
36. The quality of faculty input into the shared governance process is generally high at my university.

37. Open communication is essential to the implementation of shared governance at my university.

38. Shared governance vehicles such as senates, councils, committees, associations, and polls play an important role in making shared governance work at my university.
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