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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore differences in the perceptions among executive college leaders regarding the importance of shared governance and to investigate whether these perceptions effect their job satisfaction. This quantitative study explored these factors in order to provide insight into this relationship and provide college leaders with information with which to inform their own development and that of other leaders in their institutions. This study used extant data collected in 2012 using the National Survey of Community College Leaders (NSCCL) instrument, which surveyed 212 senior community college leaders regarding their perceptions of shared governance and job satisfaction. The analytic procedure used in this study employed a four-stage design, to include (a) exploratory data analysis, (b) factor analysis, (c) ANOVA, and (d) correlation and regression, to explore whether there were differences in perceptions among leadership rank and whether these perceptions effect job satisfaction among college leaders. When exploring the relationship between perceptions and job satisfaction, the findings in this study concluded the most recurrent determinant of a leaders’ job satisfaction was building stakeholder relations. The perception of the importance of building stakeholder relations was identified as a significant predictor of job satisfaction across all significant models, to include professional success, professional credibility, collegiality, and ability to facilitate institutional change. Additionally, perceptions about the importance of institutional strategic planning was found to be predictive of a leaders’ satisfaction with their ability to facilitate institutional change, while perceptions about personnel issues were predictive of their satisfaction with collegiality.
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CHAPTER 1—OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Introduction

“Shared governance is somewhat like a piece of porcelain. It is beautiful to look at. It can give the owner a sense of accomplishment. But, its practicality is severely limited” (Guffey & Rampp, 1997, p. 12). This view of shared governance has been widely held for college governance since its adoption and implementation. According to Crellin (2010), “Although issues in academe are changing, the structures have remained relatively static, calling into question both the relevancy of shared governance and its feasibility in modern times” (p. 71).

There is much debate about shared governance as a concept and how it impacts learning institutions. Many institutions are being required to rethink shared governance and what it means for them in today’s models. As a concept, shared governance can be somewhat elusive. The benefits are often overanticipated, while the involvement and understanding required to be successful are often undercommitted to the process (Guffey & Rampp, 1997).

Shared governance is often complex, leaving many participants confused and frustrated as they seek to find their roles and contribution to the process (White, 1998). Despite the many challenges facing shared governance in community colleges, there appears to be a continued desire by stakeholders to find a modern model that can realize the goals of participatory leadership (Langland, 2011). The goal of a participatory governance structure that is both efficient and effective and provides the accountability needed in today’s colleges is one on which all stakeholders can agree. This study explored the relationship between the perceptions by executive leaders in community
colleges of shared governance and their resultant job satisfaction. Given the complexity and challenges facing shared governance, these perceptions may arguably play a significant role in how leaders view their effectiveness and impact as a leader.

A review of the literature related to shared governance in community colleges suggests that there are varying degrees of understanding of the concept and its perceived impact on learning institutions. The term *shared governance* itself is used interchangeably in the literature with terms such as *participatory decision-making*, *collaborative governance*, *collegial governance*, *consultative decision-making*, and numerous variations of these key terms (Grasmick, Davies, & Harbour, 2012). For the purpose of this paper, the term *shared governance* is used to capture the intent of these terms as a collective concept. However, the use of these varied terms, what they mean to various participants, and the expectations they invoke are arguably of major significance to the issues facing shared governance in community colleges, and may lead to the inability of college leaders to feel both satisfied and effective in their roles.

**Statement of the Problem**

Participants in shared governance are expected to represent the interests of their respective constituents, but at the same time must represent the best interests of the institution as a whole. Arguably, the interests of their respective groups must come secondary to those of the institution for shared governance to succeed. This tension of placing the interests of the institution ahead of their own requires participants to “engage in discourse that weaves those interests into the larger tapestry of the overall interests of the college” (Heaney, 2010, p. 72). It is this discourse that forms perceptions of the process, which may also have an effect on executive leader job satisfaction.
Understanding this relationship between perceptions of shared governance by executive leaders and their job satisfaction is important to explore for a variety of reasons, such as effectiveness in the position, turnover in leadership, and implementation of professional development models for community college leaders.

Given the mandate for shared governance in higher education, community college leaders must learn to successfully navigate the decision-making process in their institutions. The roles of presidents, vice presidents, and deans may have varying perceptions and attitudes toward shared governance that may affect their job satisfaction. A review of the literature presents little research into this relationship between perceptions of shared governance by these college leaders and their reported job satisfaction. Additionally, the role of administrators in the shared governance process is often omitted in the literature. This appears to be an indication that most efforts to understand shared governance focus on how groups other than administration can or should participate in the process, suggesting that the role of the administrator is clearly defined and understood.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore differences in the perceptions among executive college leaders regarding the importance of shared governance and to investigate whether these perceptions effect their job satisfaction. This quantitative study explored these factors in order to provide insight into this relationship and provide college leaders with information with which to inform their own development and that of other leaders in their institutions.
Significance of the Study

The perceptions of executive college leaders regarding shared governance, and the resultant effect on job satisfaction, is important to understand, yet is not well documented. In order to develop training and support programs for college leaders that must work in various shared governance environments, it is imperative to understand their perceptions of its importance and any differences in these perceptions that might exist among various ranks in leadership. Additionally, and most significant, it is important to understand the relationship between these perceptions by senior college leaders and their job satisfaction if we are to develop and maintain leaders for the future. Our understanding of the relationship between these perceptions and job satisfaction will influence leadership development programs and professional opportunities for our college leaders, and will pave the way toward efficient, effective institutions that embrace the spirit and intent of a participatory, collegial, and shared governance culture in our colleges. Accordingly, this study examined the following research questions and hypotheses.

Research Questions

Research Question 1 (R1): Do presidents, vice presidents, and deans have differences in their perceptions regarding the importance of participatory governance?

Research Question 2 (R2): What effect, if any, do perceptions of participatory governance have on job satisfaction of senior community college leaders?

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 (H1): There are no significant differences in the perceptions between presidents, vice presidents, and deans regarding the importance of participatory governance in their institutions.
Hypothesis 2 (H2): Perceptions of participatory governance will have no effect on job satisfaction of senior community college leaders.

Methodology

This study used extant data collected in 2012 from the National Survey of Community College Leaders (NSCCL) instrument developed at the California State University, Sacramento. The NSCCL was designed to examine community college leaders perceptions in several areas: (a) current trends on most essential elements of leadership (e.g., assessment and accountability, strategic planning, fundraising, shared governance); (b) top priorities within the institutions mission (e.g., transfer, workforce development, terminal degrees); (c) satisfaction with their work (e.g., job security, sphere of influence, credibility, professional progress); and (d) ethical leadership orientations (e.g., ethic of justice, ethic of critique, ethic of care, ethic of local community). Data were collected using a population distribution from the member database of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the largest professional association of community college administrators in the nation. The survey was distributed online to 2,324 AACC members across the country, with 212 responses from presidents, vice presidents, and deans used in this study. The sample size for each category was as follows: president/superintendent/CEO, n = 94; vice president/vice chancellor, n = 62; dean, n = 56.

This study compared responses to selected survey questions from the NSCCL in order to examine the perceptions and job satisfaction of senior leaders in community colleges as it relates to participatory governance. Two constructs derived from NSCCL
data were developed by the researcher, which investigated *Perceptions* and *Satisfaction* across three senior administrator levels, to include president, vice president, and dean.

**Assumptions**

Several assumptions existed that relate to the participants and their responses in this study. First, the study assumed that all participants had a general understanding of the concepts being explored within the context of their own institution, organization, or system. Specifically, the concepts of shared governance, stakeholders, relationships, and general leadership and job satisfaction are all assumed to have been consistently understood by all participants. Second, the study assumed that perceptions, attitudes, and levels of satisfaction occurred in a consistent and measurable manner across all participants. And finally, the study assumed that the instrument selected to collect perceptions from participants adequately measured these attitudes and perspectives. The research design did not lead to assessment of causal relationships among the variables, but rather the associations among them.

**Limitations of the Study**

Several methodological or other limitations may apply to this study.

1. The study utilized extant data from a survey which relied on self-reported data as the method of collection. Factors such as misunderstanding of survey questions, variations in interpretations of meanings, or intentional deception could have contributed to inaccuracies in the data.

2. The survey assumed that participants had a general understanding of the concept of shared governance and other factors as they relate to their own role as a college leader.
3. Participation in the survey sample was limited to a response rate of 12%, which could have compromised the generalizability of the data to the larger population of senior college administrators.

The original intent of the survey questions used in this study was not specifically targeted at gaining an understanding of participatory governance, leadership, or organizational empowerment.

**Delimitations of the Study**

As with all studies, this study has delimitations to be noted.

1. The findings were limited to responses from within the United States, and from respondents who were members of the AACC.

2. Due to the areas not explored in the NSCCL survey design, this study did not investigate the contextual elements (e.g., institutional size, location) that may have contributed to perceptions and attitudes of the study respondents.

**Definitions and Related Concepts**

The following is a list of terms defined by the researcher for the purpose of this dissertation.

*Shared governance*: Shared governance is defined as a process of decision-making within a college, which includes representative views and participation from various stakeholders who have vested interest in the affairs of the institution (M. T. Miller & Miles, 2008). According to Alfred (1998), the act of decision-making constitutes governance. Therefore, *shared governance* represents the process of distributing authority, power, and influence for making decisions among the college stakeholders or constituencies. For the purpose of this study, *shared governance* is meant
to be a general term to be used synonymously for terms such as *participatory governance*, *shared leadership*, *consultative decision-making*, and other similar terms meant to capture the process described above.

*Structural empowerment:* Empowerment refers to the delegation or distribution of power in an organization to people across various levels of the organization (Malone, 1997). While it enables people at lower levels of an organization to make decisions, it more importantly emphasizes trust, motivation, and breaking the inner boundaries between management and employees. Structural empowerment refers to the promotion of employee effectiveness and satisfaction through the availability of social structure factors in the environment (Manojlovich, 2005).

*Job satisfaction:* Job satisfaction is a term that often refers to an employee’s sense of achievement and success. It is generally perceived to be linked to employee productivity and personal well-being (McEwen, 2001). According to Shobhna and Hartesh (2013), it is “a set of favorable or unfavorable feelings with which employees view their work” (p. 3).

**Organization of the Dissertation**

The organization of this dissertation proposal follows a common format for scholarly works, and is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 contains the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, methodology including limitations and delimitations of the study, and definitions and related concepts. Chapter 2 contains the review of the literature related to shared governance in community colleges. It also investigates the roles and perspectives of participants and provides a review of the literature regarding leadership development in
community colleges. Chapter 3 contains the research design and methodology that was utilized in this study. Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the data leading to the findings. Lastly, Chapter 5 includes a summary of the findings, along with implications for practice and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2—LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In order to understand the issues related to shared governance and how it may affect job satisfaction of leaders in community colleges, a variety of areas in the literature have been reviewed. First, a review of the literature related to empowerment theory is presented which serves as the conceptual framework for this study. In this review of the literature, Kanter’s (1993) Theory of Structural Empowerment is also explored. Then, the literature on shared governance in higher education is reviewed to gain an understanding of the structure and process, its complexities, and the varying attitudes related to its implementation. Next, a review of the mandates for participatory decision-making is explored to understand the landscape in which community colleges operate. Then, a review of the roles, perspectives, and responsibilities of the participants are explored to provide context for how individuals are likely to engage in shared governance. Lastly, literature related to developing contemporary community college leaders is reviewed.

Empowerment Theory

The conceptual framework underpinning this study is based on the body of work in Empowerment Theory, and most specifically Kanter’s (1993) Theory of Structural Empowerment. Conceptually, most empowerment theories share a common assumption that employees are a resource with knowledge and experience and an interest in becoming involved, which can be harnessed by employers in providing opportunities and structures for their meaningful involvement (Wilkinson, 1998). Additionally, it is assumed that participative decision making is likely to lead to improved job satisfaction and better quality decisions which benefit both the employee and the employer.
According to Malone (1997), *empowerment* refers to the delegation or distribution of power in an organization to people across various levels of the organization. While it enables people at lower levels of an organization to make decisions, it more importantly emphasizes trust, motivation, and breaking the inner boundaries between management and employees. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) further define empowerment by presenting a set of components that support the empowerment condition in an organization (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Components of Intrinsic Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Providing employees with genuine job enrichment and opportunities to have not only their voice heard, but giving them real power for control and influence over work processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Enabling people to be confident in their capacity to make these choices, while enhancing their self-efficacy as a precondition to make decisions and stand for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td>Valuing the work being done by the empowered people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Letting the people have actual influence over what is going on in the organization, ensuring their decisions make a difference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Structural empowerment refers to the promotion of employee effectiveness and satisfaction through the availability of social structure factors in the environment (Manojlovich, 2005). Kanter’s (1993) Theory of Structural Empowerment stresses that organizations are likely to benefit in both improved employee attitudes and increased
organizational effectiveness when empowering structures are in place. Kanter argues that the structures which are particularly important in supporting empowerment are: having access to information, receiving support, having access to resources necessary to perform the job, and having opportunity to learn and grow. Kanter further stresses the importance of both formal and informal job characteristics that affect structural empowerment.

Formal power, according to Kanter, results from jobs that are visible and central to the purpose of the organization, and that allow for discretion in decision making. Formal power is often derived from job titles or classifications or other recognized positions of authority. Individuals also derive power from the alliances they form in an organization, which Kanter refers to as informal power. These alliances enable individuals to get the cooperation they need to get things done, and is grounded in the individual’s relationships with superiors, peers, and subordinates. Individuals with access to high levels of both formal and informal power are structurally empowered, thus providing increased access to opportunity and power through the organizational structure. Further, these individuals are more likely to be highly motivated and able to contribute to the development of an empowering environment (Kanter, 1993).

An important mandate for management in an organization is to create conditions for work effectiveness that ensure employees have access to information, support, and resources needed to accomplish their work. Further, they must provide ongoing opportunities for employee development. Kanter (1993) argues these environments are empowering, which will have positive impact on their feelings about their work and the role they serve in meeting organizational goals. In essence, individuals with power and opportunity feel empowered and are happy and productive at work (Kanter, 1993).
According to Degner (2005), employees who are empowered are more committed to the organization, more accountable for their work, and better able to fulfill job demands in an effective manner.

In reviewing Kanter’s (1993) model in the literature, it is widely applied to the practice of professional nursing. This is consistent with the literature on shared governance, which is also heavily grounded in the nursing field. However, there is literature to support the model being applied outside of the nursing profession. P. A. Miller, Goddard, and Laschinger (2001) applied the model to the field of physical therapy and found evidence of its validity to provide physical therapists and their managers with a useful framework to examine the critical factors that contribute to employee perceptions and empowerment.

Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, and Wilk (2001) extend Kanter’s model to link psychological empowerment, job strain, and job satisfaction to structural empowerment. The basis for their work was to demonstrate that the strategies proposed in Kanter’s (1993) empowerment theory have the potential to reduce job strain and improve job satisfaction in employees. Figure 1 illustrates their hypothesized model.

A predictive, nonexperimental design was used to test the model. The study employed a random sample of 404 staff nurses who worked in urban tertiary care hospitals in Ontario, Canada (Laschinger et al., 2001). A series of questionnaires were administered to measure the major study variables, which included the elements illustrated in the model above. The final sample consisted of responses from 194 males and 210 females, for a 72% overall return rate. The findings of the study supported the hypothesis that empowerment has an impact on job strain in the workplace. The findings
also suggested that nurses felt a direct connection between structural empowerment and their feeling of greater psychological empowerment. Additionally, heightened feelings of psychological empowerment strongly influenced the degree of job strain reported by the nurses in the study. Laschinger et al. (2001) went on to identify relationships between job strain and job satisfaction that is consistent with past research. Further, they concluded that job satisfaction was predicted directly by psychological and structural empowerment. By increasing access to workplace empowerment structures, employees experience feelings of personal empowerment that, in turn, reduce job strain and increase job satisfaction. Their conclusion is informative to this dissertation study.
Structural empowerment has also been linked in the literature to innovative behavior. Hebenstreit (2012) conducted a study using Kanter’s (1993) Theory of Structural Empowerment to explore whether the degree of structural empowerment as perceived by nurse educators influences the degree of their innovative behavior. The research method included a random sample of nurse educators from 150 accredited baccalaureate nursing programs who were invited to complete an online survey. Results demonstrated significant and positive correlations between structural empowerment and innovative behavior, which further reinforce Kanter’s theory that workplace environment structures can positively influence workers’ behavior and attitudes. Hebenstreit’s findings further suggest that an increase in feelings of empowerment may lead to greater innovative behavior. Full-time faculty perceived a higher level of structural empowerment than did part-time faculty, especially in regard to both access to information and informal power. Working full-time also had a significant affect on the degree of perceived innovative behavior. Nurse educators employed in private institutions perceived greater structural empowerment than those employed in public institutions. These findings warrant further research and study to understand the influences that impact the perceptions of structural empowerment.

In conclusion, Wilkinson (1998) provides the following perspective on empowerment theory that strengthens the connection between shared governance, empowerment, and job satisfaction:

All these theories share a common assumption that workers are an untapped resource with knowledge and experience and an interest in becoming involved which can be released by employers providing opportunities and structures for
their involvement. It is also assumed that participative decision making is likely to lead to job satisfaction and better quality decisions and that gains are available both to employers (increased efficiency) and workers (job satisfaction), in short an everyone wins scenario. (p. 45)

**Shared Governance as Structural Empowerment**

In 1966, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), working jointly with the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Board of Universities, adopted a jointly formulated Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities that set the tone for shared governance in American postsecondary education. Included in their statement, was the following:

> The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing boards, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort. (AAUP, 1966, p. 136)

While there is much internal debate amongst college stakeholders on the merits and effectiveness of shared governance, public perception of the inefficiencies and negative consequences of shared governance in community colleges has now become an issue worthy of careful review. On December 12, 2012, the nonprofit education policy group California Competes filed a legal challenge with the California Community College Board of Governors to restore the diminished power within local elected boards of the system’s colleges. According to the petition, the group contends that the regulations requiring shared governance in California Community Colleges create a
tangled, dysfunctional bureaucracy that does not respond to the needs of students (“Group Seeks Changes,” 2012).

Reporting on the financial and programmatic troubles of the City College of San Francisco, Shireman (2012) reports:

CCSF has been part of a grand experiment in democratic management forced upon community colleges by an obscure rule adopted 22 years ago. While the original motivation for the shared governance requirement was understandable, even laudable, in hindsight we can see that empowering everyone leaves no one in charge. California’s community colleges are capsizing as a result. (p. 1)

The issue of diminishing financial resources facing colleges over the last several years has added to the call for reform. Langland (2011) raises the issue of whether the shared governance processes developed in eras of greater funding for public education can survive leaner times. Others agree and argue that regardless of the state of funding for colleges, reform must be a priority. Authors of The Road Ahead report in June 2012 go on to state, “While some assert that reforms should await more financial resources, we believe the opposite is the case. Resource challenges underscore the need to improve management so that every penny in the system now is used well” (California Competes, 2012, p. 8). While their position is specific to the system of community colleges in California, they go on to suggest that the governance and management structures of community colleges must be reconfigured to provide colleges with the structure and flexibility they need to be responsive to current conditions facing them.
According to M. T. Miller and Miles (2008), governance should be considered a process of decision-making within the college, rather than an end unto itself. However, this view is challenged by Crellin (2010), who states:

Shared governance is both a means to an end and an end to be maintained and valued; it is a collaborative process while also an outcome of collegiality; it is steeped in tradition yet concerns itself with change and innovation in the academy, and most of all, it seeks to bridge difference and yet curiously exacerbates it. This model is likely not going to be changed radically; there are aspects of this governance structure that work well and promote positive outcomes. There are many ways to proceed, and those in leadership should work to re-endow the term shared governance with new meaning and definition to actively prepare higher education to navigate the challenges yet to come. (p. 80)

A review of the literature suggests three generally accepted major models that provide context for governance in community colleges. These models, derived initially from studies of university governance and later applied to community colleges, include a bureaucratic model, a political model, and a collegial model (A. M. Cohen & Brawer, 2008). A brief summary of these models is important in order to frame the discussion moving forward.

In the bureaucratic model, authority is formal and structured by clear policy and legal context that specifies responsibilities, competencies, and privileges in governance and decision-making. Authority is delegated from the top down, such as illustrated by a pyramid, with those individuals at the top having greatest authority and privilege and those stakeholders at the bottom with the least influence.
In the political model, a state of conflict exists among various stakeholder groups, such as students, faculty, administrators, and trustees, which are each attempting to promote their self-interests. These political forces drive each group’s participation in shared decision-making in the college.

Lastly, the collegial model inverts the pyramid to place stakeholder groups at the top of the authority structure by sharing authority across groups. “The model is based on group process, the concept of community, the sharing of authority, and the making of decisions within a framework of participation and consensus” (A. M. Cohen & Brawer, 2008, p. 115).

A. M. Cohen and Brawer (2008) go on to point out that the bureaucratic and political models are the most applicable to community colleges, going on to reference the collegial model as a “delusion” (p. 115). However, community colleges are expected to operate in a much more collegial model of governance and decision-making. This environment and its relationship to community college executive leader job satisfaction will be explored further throughout this study.

Tierney (2001) argues that genuine shared governance is necessary for sustained, successful reform in colleges, and that colleges can create decision-making structures that are more creative, flexible, and responsive to the times in order to achieve such reform. Tierney points to Weick’s (1976) organizational theory in describing college systems as “loosely coupled” (p. 26) with no clear or systematic process for reaching decisions.

Crellin (2010) suggests that although the issues in academe are changing, the governance structures have remained relatively static. Crellin questions both the relevancy of shared governance and its feasibility in modern times and lists four changing
realities that prompt the need to re-endow shared governance while preserving collegiality. These four realities include:

1. Based on work by Eckel and Kezar (2006), increased scrutiny and accountability measures by state lawmakers with regard to student learning and levels of research is changing the relationship between state agencies and public institutions.

2. Decline in public support means that institutions must look toward other means to generate revenue (Bok, 2003).


4. The changing academic workforce, namely the decrease of full-time faculty and an increased use of adjuncts, has significant implications for governance.

Heaney (2010) argues that shared governance acknowledges the complex interweaving roles of faculty, administration, staff, and students in fulfilling the mission of the institution, and that it is not the structures themselves that give voice to stakeholders but rather the commitment of boards and administrators to listen. Working with the Higher Learning Commission, Heaney studied three universities and one community college using a conceptual framework on building democracy in early adult education (Brookfield, 1987; Cunningham, 1993; Heaney, 1992; Horton, 1973). All of the institutions were from the Midwest, with each being accredited by the Higher Learning Commission through the Academic Quality Improvement Program. Each institution had adopted as a part of their planning process to involve all constituencies in their local decision making. Heaney examined the strengths and weaknesses of their various approaches to shared governance through observation, interviews, and focus
groups with representative stakeholders. The study was premised on “an assumption that
today’s universities and community colleges are adult education institutions—learning
organizations in which all stakeholders are engaged in the production and the critical
assessment of knowledge” (Heaney, 2010, p. 70).

Four broad themes emerged from Heaney’s (2010) study:

1. There were varied interpretations of “shared governance” and its effectiveness,
   both between and within institutions.

2. There were common dispositions that are part of the core culture in
   institutions striving to involve all stakeholders.

3. There was general agreement on several structural components of shared
   governance.

4. Authority and responsibility continue to be a source of tension, even in
   well-functioning systems.

Morphew (1999) argues that shared governance is a distinct aspect of the
American college that defines the institution, yet it is not a static condition and will
respond to environmental and other changes in the institution in order to remain effective.
Birnbaum’s (1988) collegiate model of the two cores of the American college is used by
Morphew to describe how current and future changes in the ways in which colleges work
will likely affect shared governance in higher education, as well as our notion of college.

White (1998) describes much of the difficulty experienced with shared
governance as stemming from the political nature of all shared governance participants.
His findings suggest that shared governance is simultaneously bilateral, legislative, and
collegial. As a result of such a complex and contradictory model, many participants in
the process become confused and frustrated, unlikely to participate effectively until a new, more satisfactory model is conceived.

G. Davis (2012) points to the common committee structure in shared governance as a leading cause of its potential ineffectiveness. Because committee membership and structures change frequently, the committee that makes a decision is often not around to take responsibility for the effects of the decision. Additionally, critics of shared governance in colleges point to its slowness in adapting to the needs of the college and its slowness to facilitate decisions that need to be made (Crellin, 2010). Tension between the need to respond quickly to circumstances and the need to encourage deliberative involvement of stakeholders raises concerns for those who desire speed and agility as important characteristics of an efficient institution. Arguably, these are all characteristics that are important to college leaders and could therefore directly affect their attitudes and ability to be satisfied in their respective job roles.

In addition to serving on participatory committees, participants in shared governance require a significant level of information and understanding of complex systems and procedures in order to effectively participate in the decision making process. Understanding the complexities of budgets, human resources, facilities management, and other critical college operations is outside the field of expertise of many stakeholders who are primarily involved with issues of academic standards and curricula (Heaney, 2010).

Lachs (2011) presents his personal views on shared governance. He argues that shared governance in higher education is an illusion. He points to realists that understand decision-making about the future of colleges and universities is vested with chancellors and presidents, who then hire professional managers to administer the affairs of the
institution. He argues that faculty have no special competence in running organizations, and many have little to no interest in the details of administration. He goes on to describe shared governance as a charade of faculty committees and participation.

In conclusion, there are varied views regarding the concept of shared governance as a structure and a process, its effectiveness, and its relevancy in today’s community colleges. This study seeks to understand the relationship between these varied views and the perceptions of college leaders, their attitudes regarding their roles and abilities to lead, and ultimately their feelings of job satisfaction.

**Mandates for Participatory Decision-Making in Community Colleges**

Community colleges across the nation have been asked to incorporate participatory decision-making into their governance models. Examining California’s environment provides an example of how these mandates have emerged and their role in college governance both within California and across the country, through regional accreditation, legislative action, and general interest in stakeholder participation in college affairs.

The California Community College System is the largest system of higher education in the nation, with 2.6 million students attending 112 colleges statewide. Seventy-two locally elected boards of trustees govern the individual college Districts within the system (California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office [CCCCO], 2012). California Community Colleges are accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The ACCJC operates under the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and is authorized to operate and serve as an accrediting body by the U.S. Department of Education through the Higher Education
Opportunity Act (HEOA) of 2008 (WASC, 2012). The ACCJC accreditation process provides assurance to the public that the accredited member colleges: (a) meet specific performance and quality standards; (b) the education earned at the institutions is of value to the student who earned it; and (c) employers, trade or profession-related licensing agencies, and other colleges and universities can accept a student’s credential or education record as legitimate.

Standard IV-A: Leadership and Governance of the accreditation process requires colleges to adhere to several standards related to decision-making roles and processes. It requires colleges to implement a written policy for participation of faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making (WASC & ACCJC, 2012). Specifically, it requires that:

Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.

Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions. (WASC & ACCJC, 2012, p. 16)

These structures and processes are required to be regularly evaluated to “assure their integrity and effectiveness” (WASC & ACCJC, 2012, p. 16). In addition to accreditation requirements, California Community Colleges have a legislative mandate to consult collegially with stakeholders, which was enacted in 1988 as Assembly Bill 1725. While the term shared governance does not appear in law or regulation, it is commonly used to refer to the process of involving faculty, staff, and students in decision-making (Community College League of California, 2012).
When AB 1725 (1988) was being developed, supporters of the legislation had at least three goals in mind for governance reform in California colleges, which were to create more collegial governance systems, increase the power and influence of local academic senates, and separate community colleges from their K-12 roots by placing them more clearly in a higher education model (White, 1998). However, there were divergent views as to the specific nature of these reforms. Boards and administrators were seeking a more traditional approach to “collegiality in higher education” (Nussbaum, 1995, p. 8), while others, such as state academic senate leaders and faculty supporters, were looking for stronger language and authority for their members. What resulted was a compromised model with emphasis on a “statutory empowerment model” which was well-beyond the traditional collegial approach to governance (Nussbaum, 1995; Trombley, 1997).

White (1998) points out that “it is unreasonably optimistic to believe that a single conceptual approach to governance, in this case the mandate of collegiality, can be grafted successfully onto 1, 10, or 106 community colleges” (p. 22). These mandates, both from accreditation and AB 1725, place tremendous pressure on California colleges to navigate the bureaucratic, political, and collegial landscape in pursuit of local models that achieve their desired outcomes, and those of the mandating entities. As leaders in California community colleges, finding successful ways to navigate this landscape is critical to success as a leader.

Alfred (1998) describes shared governance as “one of the most widely discussed and misunderstood topics in postsecondary education” (p. 1). He goes on to stress that the lack of common definition and the varied interpretations led to special interests
defining the process for their own audience. California is the only state with mandated shared governance (Alfred, 1998). Other states have made changes to their postsecondary governance models, yet these changes have not focused on the process of governance at the local level in the same manner in which California’s 1988 mandates from AB 1725. In other states, the processes of governance are determined at the local institution level and often are representative of the local culture and community of each institution.

Some of the more recent changes to postsecondary governance at the statewide level involve California, Connecticut, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington (Smith & Fulton, 2013). In California, the legislature disbanded the Postsecondary Education Commission in November of 2011. This commission was originally charged with the development of a coordinated postsecondary plan for education. This function is now placed on the three state system boards, to include the California Community Colleges Board of Governors, the California State University Board of Trustees, and the University of California Board of Regents.

In Connecticut, the legislature enacted 2011 legislation to establish the Connecticut Board of Regents for Higher Education, which assumed financial and academic authority of the Connecticut State University System, the Connecticut Community Colleges, and the state’s online public institution known as Charter Oak State College. Before this statewide governing board was established, academic and financial matters were all addressed at the individual institution level.

Oregon approached statewide governance of their postsecondary systems by establishing an Education Investment Board in 2011 and a Higher Education Coordinating Commission in 2012. The Education Investment Board was charged with
improving learning outcomes for Oregonians by developing two accountability instruments focused on the attainment of state goals and the desired student outcomes. These instruments include achievement compacts between the Oregon University System, community college districts, and K-12 school districts, along with the establishment of a statewide student database. The Higher Education Coordinating Commission was established to (a) evaluate state goals and institutional achievement compacts, (b) collect postsecondary data for the Oregon State Longitudinal Data System, (c) approve academic programs, and (d) adopt rules governing the distribution of state appropriations. This split governance creates one body focused on funding and attainment of state goals across the K-20 systems, while another holds these institutions accountable to the new, increasingly ambitious postsecondary system goals (Smith & Fulton, 2013).

Rhode Island, in contrast to Oregon’s recent changes, disbanded their two governing bodies in 2012 to form the Rhode Island Board of Education. Replacing their Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education and the Board of Governors for Higher Education, the Rhode Island Board of Education oversees all education activities at the K-12 and postsecondary levels.

The state of Washington in 2012 eliminated its Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board, transferring many of its statewide authorities and functions to the newly created Washington Student Achievement Council. The council has members from each of Washington’s four education sectors, to include K-12 education, community and technical colleges, universities, and the independent colleges. The duty of the council is to “represent the broad public interest above the interests of the individual institutions” (Smith & Fulton, 2013, p. 4).
**Roles, Perspectives, and Responsibilities of Participants**

“The American college is a uniquely complex organization” (Morphew, 1999, p. 71). In order to begin to look at the complexities of college governance and the issues facing it today, we must first investigate the roles and perspectives of the participants. According to Morphew (1999), these relationships are a function of shared governance and play a vital role in understanding and achieving the collegiate ideal. He argues that the relationship between faculty and administrators and their respective roles within the college change over time, and so must the organization if it is to succeed.

A review of Birnbaum’s (1988) Collegiate Model helps illustrate Morphew’s position (see Figure 2). The model describes colleges as having both a Technical and Administrative core that is set in a local environment of norms and values. The Technical core is where faculty, academic freedom policies, research labs, and other academic service functions reside. The Administrative core is where budgets, regulations, deans, and other administrative functions operate. If drawn as circles within a box representing the environment of the college, the two cores will overlap forming a traditional Venn diagram. This area of overlap is where the model acknowledges the fluidity of singular versus shared areas of responsibilities. The singular versus dualistic roles played by some members of the institution, such as department heads or chairs, must straddle the area between the cores as they participate in shared decision-making (Morphew, 1999).

Birnbaum’s Model also illustrates the traditional lack of hierarchy in colleges. With each system and respective actors responsible for different elements of the college and some straddling the area between the two, the model suggests they exist on a horizontal, rather than vertical plane when it comes to governance (Morphew, 1999).
Both faculty and administration may move between the two cores at times, which often affects their role in governance.

Birnbaum’s model of the American college “suggests that at least two things must be considered in designing an effective administration—the environment and the technical [cores]” (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 42). The interdependence between the cores and the college environment influence the authority and working relationships that exist in the college, and provide a frame for the roles and relationships of the participants in shared governance.

According to M. T. Miller and Miles (2008), the participant roles in shared governance are distinct and varied, and include full- and part-time faculty, students, staff, college trustees, and other influences, such as bargaining unions, accrediting bodies, and special interest groups within the college. These classifications of stakeholder or
participant roles appear across the literature, despite some sources emphasizing some as being more influential than others. A brief review of each role is examined to better understand the relationships and perspectives between each role and the influence each has on shared governance. Interestingly enough, M. T. Miller and Miles do not address the role of administrators in shared governance, which is a common omission in much of the literature reviewed. This appears to be an indication that most efforts to understand shared governance focus on how groups other than administration can or should participate in the process, suggesting that the role of the administrator is assumed to be clearly defined and understood and/or perhaps the role of administrators in shared governance is not as valued as that of faculty or others. Further, beyond the role of faculty in shared governance, the remaining roles are much less broadly understood. All require further study to determine how they contribute to effective shared governance and participatory leadership.

The role of faculty in shared governance is clearly one of the most influential factors in determining the culture and effectiveness of decision-making and governance in the contemporary college. Today’s faculty have high expectations for involvement in governance matters. As more faculty have elected to intentionally pursue teaching at community colleges, as opposed to stumbling into the profession, they have come to expect a culture of inclusive decision making similar to that of 4-year universities (M. T. Miller & Miles, 2008). The quality of the participation often hinges on the individuals elected to leadership positions in formal shared governance roles, such as faculty senates. Considerable time is often spent on topics outside the purview of these
faculty senates, and while they do allow for input and act as sounding boards for administration, “their impact is questionable” (M. T. Miller & Miles, 2008, p. 37).

Jenkins and Jensen (2010) present what they define as “true shared governance at community colleges” (p. 25) as being based on four key principles: faculty authority, inclusiveness, a commitment to tenure, and a commitment to the process. Each of these is presented from a faculty-centric perspective and is indicative of the perspective shared by faculty groups across the literature. The principle of faculty authority is at the core of many issues presented by shared governance. The notion that faculty are to be recognized as the primary authority on a variety of academic and related issues creates tension when decisions are at odds with college administration (Jenkins & Jensen, 2010). The principles of inclusiveness and commitment to the process strive to reinforce the authority of faculty by ensuring their voice is heard at all levels and of governance.

The principle of a commitment to tenure is an interesting one in that a consistent argument is made across the literature that only full-time faculty with tenure track status are likely to effectively represent the position of faculty in shared governance. “Part-time faculty without the benefits of due process or tenure are vulnerable to institutional pressures and retaliation when they participate in governance work” (Collins, 2002, p. 38). Most community colleges employ a substantial number of part-time faculty members that are only marginally involved in localized decision-making. Jenkins and Jensen (2010) argue the political vulnerability of part-time faculty makes them open to manipulation by administrators to whom they owe their employment.

Hebert-Swartzer and McNair (2010) employed a case study methodology to examine how community college leaders in California use their skills to implement the
75/25 state mandate related to faculty hiring. The authors investigated the 1988 legislative mandate to reach and maintain a ratio of 75% full-time faculty to 25% part-time faculty across California’s colleges, and how it is requiring a set of skills be applied by administration and faculty as they work collegially toward this goal. The purpose of the study was to analyze how administrators and faculty leaders perceive the impact of AB 1725 on faculty hiring in the California’s community colleges. Four California community colleges were selected as cases for the qualitative study, to include two sites within the same multi-college district, one small, rural site, and one large, urban single-college site. The study interviewed the Chief Instruction Officer (CIO) and the Academic Senate President at each of the participant sites. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with each participant. In addition to interviews, key college documents were reviewed in order to obtain a broader understanding of each college and confirm information reported by participants. Four themes emerged from the study: (a) accountability, ambiguity, and leadership, (b) creativity, (c) collaborative strategic planning, and (d) building alliances. These themes stress the importance of today’s community college leader to develop a sophisticated set of skills in order to be effective in their work. Hebert-Swartzer and McNair (2010) emphasize that these skills “are often learned through on the job training, mentoring, and professional development activities” (p. 23). Their study further illustrates the skills needed by 21st Century community college leaders, which should drive training and mentorship programs, professional development efforts, and community college leadership frameworks and doctoral curricula.
While the argument is raised in the literature that part-time faculty are less capable of successfully participating in college governance, the review of literature did not provide any substantial evidence of this being the case or that part-time faculty were somehow prevented from participating effectively in the shared governance process. The argument that part-time faculty could not effectively participate in shared governance appears to be more attributable to preserving the status of full-time faculty and their authority in governance matters, but further study is needed in this area in order to better understand the role of part-time faculty in college governance.

Faculty certainly have a significant role in shared governance of a college and are often vying for positions of authority with college administration on governance issues. This occurs through formal structures such as senates, councils, or other associations and through less formal interactions with college leadership. Their influence with trustees and other power structures is often used to provide pressure to support faculty issues or to maintain faculty control over college business (Collins, 2002).

The role of students in shared governance has been problematic for a variety of reasons. The types of students served today by community colleges represent a wide spectrum of individuals with varied needs, interests, and educational and career objectives. According to M. T. Miller and Miles (2008), the ability of these students to effectively participate is impacted by their willingness to commit to the process, their preparation to deal with issues before them, and extreme peer pressure and special interest group dominance common among student life. While colleges arguably exist primarily to serve the needs of students, finding an effective method of incorporating their
participation in shared governance when there is “little vestment of real power with student groups” (M. T. Miller & Miles, 2008, p. 39) is a major challenge for colleges. According to Evans (1999), sharing authority with staff provides substantial benefits to include a greater acceptance of decisions, a more central approach to decision making that includes input from individuals closest to the problem, cross-functioning teams that can support each other, an increased feeling of value by staff members, and a greater number of responses potentially developed to resolve problems or challenges. However, colleges have found it difficult to effectively include staff in governance. While most colleges make use of cross-functional committees and other representative groups to include staff, a review of the literature did not suggest that these efforts are meaningful when dealing with significant governance issues within the college. While further study is warranted, M. T. Miller and Miles (2008) suggest that the blurred lines of the bureaucratic model, with specific authority, reporting channels, and limited span of control of staff positions, makes it difficult for these staff to effectively contribute in the process. They may feel either unable to contribute on par with groups such as administrators or faculty, or they may limit their participation for fear of retribution or negative personal consequences.

The trustee role in shared governance is significant, yet is often ignored or otherwise neglected in the process. As H. Davis (2002) points out, all 50 states have some form of state oversight for higher education, commonly referred to as a state board of trustees, governors, or overseers. In addition, and most important to shared governance in a college, is the role of locally elected boards of trustees. According to M. T. Miller and Miles (2008), “these community-based boards can provide immediate
input and response to any number of college issues, regardless of whether the campus administration welcomes input” (p. 41). However, their feedback can often be isolated and politically motivated, and they can easily blur their role as a policy body as they attempt to participate in shared governance as it relates to operational issues of the college. Further study is needed to explore the dynamics involved with trustee participation in shared governance.

Other influences on internal decision-making, according to M. T. Miller and Miles (2008), include pressures on college leaders from external accrediting bodies, bargaining unions, and special interest groups. These influences operate in both formal and informal structures and can exert an especially high level of power and influence on any given issue, depending on the importance and relevance of the issue to the particular group or interest.

In 2012, Bentley University established a shared governance task force to clarify their approach to shared governance and to explore opportunities for improving relationships between and among faculty, administration, and the Board. Figure 3 illustrates their work in identifying the roles and relationships across these three stakeholders.

Bentley University’s (2012) task force describes bilateral relationships between the stakeholders’ groups that are essential to good governance. In their model, they stress the importance of trustees and executive officers engaging in open dialogue for the development and implementation of a sustainable strategy for the institution. They also stress the important role of ensuring the needed financial, human, technological, and physical infrastructure is in place to deliver on the mission of the institution. They
reinforce the need for trustees and executive officers to confer regularly with faculty leadership to develop a shared understanding of the resources needed to deliver this mission. Because of this, faculty leadership will be able to make better decisions by having a better understanding of the constraints within which the institution has to operate and the varied interests and perspectives that need to be addressed. According to Bentley’s model, it is through “continual dialogue (bilateral and multilateral) that stakeholders can join around a shared vision for the institution” (Bentley University, 2012, p. 3).

Figure 3. Relationships across three primary stakeholders. Adapted from Report of the President’s Shared Governance Task Force, by Bentley University, 2012, Waltham, MA: Author, p. 3.
“While strong presidential leadership is a critical component to the long-term success of a college, the deans, vice president and other mid-level administrators are the ones who have the greatest impact on the actual operations, organizational priorities, and functioning of the college” (Riggs, 2009, p. 31). This position stresses the importance of understanding the perceptions of these leadership ranks when it comes to a critical operational and functional process, such as shared governance in our colleges. Opp and Gosetti (2014) examine these various roles across leadership ranks in their study focused on internationalizing the community college student experience. In their research, they conducted national surveys over a 3-year period with college chief executive officers (CEO or president), chief academic officers (CAO or vice president), and chief student affairs officers (CSAO or vice president) to understand their views about and roles in the process. They found distinct differences in how each perceived their role. While this study was focused on internationalizing the community college, it suggests these differences could apply to the leadership role of each rank in more general terms. In their findings, they point to the president as having a key role in educating board members about the value and importance of internationalizing, and having a significant role in working with their administrative team to develop a culture on campus that embraces the idea. The chief academic officer was found to focus more on tangible internal supports, such as the strategic plan and budget. They were also focused heavily on ensuring that communication systems were in place to keep faculty and students informed of opportunities. Lastly, the chief student affairs officer role was best positioned to understand the importance of students’ intrinsic interests. Their work suggests that various administrative ranks and roles have different interests and might therefore have
varying perceptions when it comes to how their work is carried out in a shared governance environment, such as community colleges. It is these differences in perceptions that are the focus of research question one of this study.

Hernandez and Hernandez (2014) explored the role of the executive-level student services officer within a community college structure. Through their examination of the literature and demographic characteristics of executive managerial staff available through the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), they found that “as integral members of the executive leadership team and stakeholders in the development of institutional policies, [vice presidents] are responsible for leading shared governance initiatives with various constituents” (Hernandez & Hernandez, 2014, p. 34). They further conclude that most community colleges place great importance on establishing and maintaining positive relationships with internal and external constituents, and that the vice president role is likely to be very active in this regard, as they see their involvement increasing in the number and scope of committees with which they participate or lead.

The role of dean in the community college is essential in dealing with faculty concerns and communicating directives from senior administrators. Because deans are oftentimes designated to lead and implement initiatives involving faculty, they play a significant role in the success or failure of these efforts (Sypawka, 2010). However, according to DeAngelis (2014), college deans straddle two sets of professional ethos. As both faculty and administrative members, the demands placed on deans require a great deal of diligence and loyalty to what can often be competing interests. DeAngelis points out they are “neither administrator nor faculty member, but also both at the same time” (p. 209). Arguably, this duality of professional duty impacts both their perceptions of the
role they play, as well as the perceptions of others with whom they interact, especially in the context of shared governance.

Because the roles and perspectives are so varied when it comes to participants in the shared governance process, no single model or classification of structures can bring together the diverse needs and interests of all parties on every individual issue. M. T. Miller and Miles (2008) argue that a “wide variety of strategies, emphasizing different elements or pieces of the process at different times” (p. 42) are required and result in a quiltlike approach to decision making. While this provides a flexible and adaptive view of shared governance, it may make it difficult for college leaders to address similar issues with consistency and in accordance with various expectations of participants in the shared governance process.

A review of the literature suggests the roles and perspectives of administrators in the shared governance process is either assumed to be fully understood in the field or is somewhat lacking in the literature. As previously presented, this study explored the perceptions of shared governance by various leadership ranks of administrators in community colleges, specifically presidents, vice presidents, and deans. In reviewing the literature on leadership issues across these leadership ranks, we find differences that could play a role in their attitudes and perceptions toward shared governance.

**Developing Contemporary Community College Leaders**

The role of college presidents and senior administrative leaders to support a positive model of shared governance in colleges is profound. According to Grasmick and colleagues (2012), participative leadership is a developmental process for building environments for broad participation and is highly interactive and dynamic. In their study
of participative leadership, they recognize there is considerable debate concerning the meaning and characteristics of shared governance. However, they set out to understand how model community college presidents understand and explain their individual role in promoting and implementing an environment of effective shared governance. “Our findings reveal that when practiced by model community college presidents, participative leadership is a highly interactive, dynamic process fundamentally linked to the visioning process” (Grasmick et al., 2012, p. 68). The study led to the identification of four cornerstones and 10 corresponding practices that contribute to greater success for effective shared governance (see Table 2).

As evidenced by their work, the role of the college president to envision the organization and support the realization of this vision is critical and may be the single most significant factor leading to effective shared governance in a college. Additional research in this area is needed in order to determine the extent to which this leadership promotes, or in its absence discourages, the development of an effective culture of shared governance and its affect on other contributing factors. Additionally, further research is needed to explore the issues beyond college presidents to include leaders in other administrative roles and positions, such as vice presidents and deans.

Thompson, Cooper, and Ebbers (2012) conducted a qualitative case study to describe the experiences of two community college interim presidents, their characteristics, and how they led institutions following an abrupt presidential departure. The two fundamental research questions framing their study were:
Table 2

*The Four Cornerstones and Corresponding 10 Practices of Participative Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cornerstone</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Envision the participative organization</td>
<td>1. Envision the organization around the tenets of the participative philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Embrace the role of change agent to address the challenging external environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Negotiating the passages leading to the participative organization</td>
<td>3. Engage with the conflictive dynamics of the campus environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The emerging web of participation</td>
<td>4. Lay the groundwork for mutuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Construct agreements for participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Establish participative decision-making agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Re-visioning the participative organization</td>
<td>7. Strengthen the culture of commitment through critical institutional processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Face the challenges of the web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Shape the personal and institutional visions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Reaffirm commitment to the mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How do two interim community college presidents lead community colleges during a presidential transition?

2. How is an interim community college president’s leadership perceived by faculty and staff during a period of presidential transition?

A qualitative descriptive case study approach was used to explore the experiences of two interim presidents at two community colleges. Purposeful sampling was used to identify participants in the study. There were nine participants from Urban Community College and eight participants from Rural Community College, both of which are pseudonyms for participating colleges in the case study. Each college had a range of participants from various stakeholder groups in the college. Data collection consisted of in-depth interviews and a review of pertinent institutional documents. Additional strategies used included triangulation of data sources, peer review, systematic coding and recoding, use of an audit trail, and maximum variation.

The findings of this study suggested the interim presidents approached the presidency thoughtfully and strategically, offering leadership during a critical time in each institution’s history. Four shared themes emerged between the two institutions, pointing to some commonalities in the interim presidents’ leadership of the institution and their overall experiences. These four shared themes include the following:

1. Repairing Institutional Morale.

2. Establishing an Effective Relationship With the Board.


4. Dealing with Budget Challenges.
Each of the two colleges also had a unique theme emerge from the study. At Urban Community College, this was *Rebuilding External Relationships*. At Rural Community College, this was *Promoting Institutional Openness, Inclusiveness, and Transparency*.

The study concluded that the individual leadership style of the two interim presidents played an important role in their experience. They were successful due to personal and professional characteristics that enabled them to be effective in the interim role. The participants in the study viewed the following characteristics as critical to the interim’s effectiveness: *experience as senior administrators, effective communication skills, visible leadership, openness, intelligence, organization, vision, honesty and integrity, and strong work ethic*.

The study went on to list several recommendations for future interim presidents and college trustees involved in an abrupt presidential departure. What was unclear in the study was whether, or to what degree, these findings are unique to interim presidents or whether they would apply equally to all presidents or senior administrators in community colleges. Arguably, the characteristics listed in the study could apply to all college leaders and are likely to have significant implications for shared governance at any college.

Pope and Miller (2005) sought to explore areas of common thinking among community college presidents and faculty senate leaders about the importance of certain experiences and beliefs needed to be effective college leaders, and the extent that these can be learned through service on the faculty senate. The study was designed to explore the ability of faculty-senate experience to adequately prepare community college leaders.
Pope and Miller describe three key labor markets for contemporary community college leaders. These include the following:

1. Internal Labor Market—this market consists of internal faculty members that rise from teaching positions through the ranks of managerial and leadership positions, such as department chairs, deans, and ultimately as president. This model has particular strength in that leaders have experience with academic program management and issues related to faculty life, such as tenure and promotion.

2. External Private Bodies—this market is made up of business and industry leaders who often have a strong sense of community responsiveness, especially in the areas of career preparation and ability to develop skilled labor for the local market. With the ability to see the academic enterprise with fresh perspective, they are often capable of sweeping change with less regard to politics as they lead the institutions to become more business-like and efficient with resources.

3. Nonprofit Sector—this market consists of those with experience in secondary school administration, or other state-level education or public administration fields. These leaders tend to have a strong sense for how community colleges fit into an overall educational system. They often have exposure to various public administration models of management and compliance with state and civic reporting requirements.

Pope and Miller (2005) argue that the latter two markets lack an appreciation of the conception of academic governance. While the contemporary college has
substantially more attention placed on nonacademic issues, such as media relations, corporate sponsorships and collaborations, facilities and risk management, and assessment measures, a central component of college leadership remains an element of academic integrity and attention. It is this exposure to academic governance that can ensure academic integrity has a strong presence in an institution’s mission.

The study used extant data from a larger study of community college presidents and faculty senate leaders conducted in the spring of 2003. Data were taken from three sections of the more comprehensive survey: (a) perception of the experiences and beliefs important in community college leadership, (b) perception of the experiences and beliefs that can be learned by working on a faculty senate, and (c) the perception of desired leadership characteristics learned through faculty senate participation. Stratified random sampling methods were used to select 250 institutions from various regions across the country. A total of 288 usable responses were received with 61% return rate from faculty senate leaders and 54% from 2-year college presidents.

The findings seem to indicate that there is some disparity between the views of faculty senate leaders and college presidents on what leadership skills can be learned through participation on faculty senate bodies. Pope and Miller (2005) suggest that this difference in perceptions is not surprising considering the trend in higher education to be more management and business centered. The data suggest that college presidents see the role of administration as largely distinct from democratic purposes. Despite the colleges’ link to democratic values, presidents seem to be more inclined to demonstrate autocratic behavior as they view the relegation of decision-making to executive privilege. The faculty senate experience certainly adds a dimension of institutional understanding and
commitment. However, in the eyes of presidents, it does not offer the strongest opportunity for administrative training. Based on the findings of this study, there seems to be a lack of consensus about the preparedness of faculty senate leaders for presidential leadership. There is also debate about the value of the skills that these individuals possess derived from their role as faculty leaders.

Kater and Levin (2004) examined the traditional view of shared governance through a review of 238 collective-bargaining agreements representing full- and part-time faculty in 301 public community colleges across 22 states. They attempted to answer this question: In what areas do faculty participate in institutional governance as reflected in collective-bargaining agreements? Their findings suggest that faculty are expected to take a participatory role in decision-making in a number of defined areas within their institution.

The study draws primarily from scholarly works in organizational theory, with constructs developed by Weber (as cited in Morgan, 1997) and further developed by Mintzberg (1979) to describe bureaucratic organizational structures. The bureaucratic model is described as having emerged as a “professional bureaucracy” in the university, where professional faculty within an organization define the bureaucratic nature of the structure. They draw upon work by Hardy (1990) to explain how institutions may adopt different decision-making frameworks depending on the issues, constituents, environmental, and social conditions.

Kater and Levin (2004) describe the political model of governance as being well suited to describe community college governance. The political model incorporates issues of power, conflict, and politics to conceptualize academic decision-making, and
provides an accurate account of the influence of external environment and constituents.

The study adopted an analytical framework developed by Levin (2000), which categorizes authority for decision-making in contractual language as follows:

- Joint action—shared decision-making by faculty and administration.
- Faculty participation—faculty having an advisory role.
- Management—sole decision-making by management.
- Silent—issues not addressed or not clearly delineated.

The study consisted of document analysis of collective-bargaining agreements in 22 states utilizing two primary data sources from the National Educational Association (NEA). Sixteen governance areas were identified for coding in the quantitative analysis to include: (a) budget, (b) calendar, (c) curriculum, (d) discipline, (e) evaluation, (f) faculty hiring, (g) general problems, (h) grievance, (i) harassment, (j) management hiring, (k) new positions, (l) professional development, (m) program changes, (n) retrenchment, (o) sabbatical, and (p) tenure. According to Levin (2000), these were the major content areas of collective bargaining that pertain to decision-making in community colleges.

While the historical conception of the community college as a bureaucratic, and often autocratic, institution (Birnbaum, 1988) places faculty in a position of limited power in institutional decision-making, this study indicates that centralization of decision-making through collective bargaining does not limit faculty in their participation in governance. Bargaining as a political form of governance has enshrined faculty rights and responsibilities in collective agreements that are binding on both the faculty and management. The findings reveal that community college faculty are contractually bound
to participate in governance, not only in the traditional academic areas, but also in the areas of the institution traditionally reserved for management. Organizational work in public community colleges is shared between faculty and administration, with the role of faculty going above and beyond their traditional teaching roles.

An interesting implication for practice that Kater and Levin (2004) present is the formation of a new variable in describing shared governance. By viewing shared governance not only as an academic tradition but also as an exchange of goods and services, the research suggests a perspective indicative of the commodification of cooperation. In other words, management may be increasingly willing to share operational decision-making with faculty in return for faculty productivity. This reconceptualization of shared governance from a historical right to a commodity has significant implications for both faculty and management.

Strom, Sanchez, and Downey-Schilling (2011) present a review of the literature and issues related to finding and developing future community college leaders. They point to concerns about the pipeline not producing new leaders rapidly enough to fill the projected vacancies in the near future. Citing McNair, Duree, and Ebbers (2011), three reasons for the shortage are presented. First, fewer advanced degrees focused on community college leadership are being awarded than in the past. Secondly, as the institution expanded its missions and the diversity of the students attending the institution increased, the complexity of leading a community college increased. Finally, many typical barriers to advancement remain, which include lack of doctorate, reluctance to relocate, and limited local opportunities. Another challenge facing the preparation of future community college leaders is the fact that despite a variety of professional
development models, there is no one set of experiences that lead to the acquisition of skills required for today’s community college president. Strom and associates argue there is no clear process for internally developing leaders within the community colleges. Additionally, no one sector (community college, business and industry, or nonprofit sectors) is capable of producing the perfect leader for today’s community colleges. With the many issues being faced by today’s colleges, consideration should be given to a more integrative approach in finding and developing future leaders.

What is absent from the literature is discussion and analysis on the opportunity to find quality leaders for community colleges from within other sectors of higher education. This potential area warrants further analysis and review. The literature has begun slowly to recognize the leadership potential of business, industry, and nonprofit professionals to the community college. Promoting only from within the internal academic ranks into critical senior leadership positions may become self-destructive. Given the projected gap in future college leaders, this is an important area of action.

Eddy (2005) conducted a qualitative study concerning how community college presidents cognitively frame their leadership roles. The study involved interviews with nine community college presidents and resulted in the uncovering of three primary themes. The conceptual framework for this research was based on the seven properties of Weick’s (1995) model for sensemaking. The factors for the intentional selection of the nine community colleges in the study included new presidents leading these institutions, geographic and institutional diversity, the occurrence of organizational change, and gender balance. An analysis of themes derived from transcribed interviews served to highlight intersections of leadership construction with Weick’s sensemaking model. The
three themes that emerged are: (a) Constructing a Leader, (b) Reflective Leadership, and (c) Road Map in the Presidency. The findings from the research reported that college presidents are constantly learning and adjusting their conceptions of leadership, and that there is no one way for leaders to learn about leadership, just as there is no one way of leading. The research reported by Eddy identifies several components that community college presidents utilize in constructing their conception of leadership. Individual cognitive orientation, past experience, mentoring, situated cognition, feedback loops, and social interaction were all critical components to the learning experience.

In conclusion, the review of the literature related to leadership development in community colleges places significant importance on the need for effective shared governance, along with leaders who can navigate the environment to support it. The role of leaders to understand both the institutional structures and their own leadership practices to shape its success is clear, which will continue to define effective leadership and successful leaders into the future.

Summary of the Literature

The literature review for this study examined several areas that influence our understanding of shared governance and job satisfaction. The literature suggests that a core management responsibility in any organization is to create conditions for work effectiveness that ensure employees have access to information, support, and resources needed to accomplish their work. Further, they must provide ongoing opportunities for employee development. Kanter (1993) argues these environments are empowering, which will have positive impact on their feelings about their work and the role they serve
in meeting organizational goals. In essence, individuals with power and opportunity feel empowered and are happy and productive at work (Kanter, 1993).

Empowerment and participation in organizational decision-making, or shared governance, are tightly coupled. The literature presents varied views regarding the concept of shared governance as a structure and a process, its effectiveness, and its relevancy in today’s community colleges. This study seeks to understand the relationship between these varied views and the perceptions of college leaders, their attitudes regarding their roles and abilities to lead, and ultimately their feelings of job satisfaction.

As leaders in California community colleges, it is critical to find successful ways to implement and manage the shared governance process. Because the roles and perspectives are so varied when it comes to participants in the shared governance process, many leaders may find difficulty navigating the environment, forming perceptions that could impact their feelings of satisfaction in the workplace. This satisfaction, or lack thereof, has significant implications for leadership development. As previously stated, the literature stresses significant importance on the need for effective shared governance, along with leaders who can navigate the environment to support it. The president of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, in response to recent events at the University of Virginia, expresses the following view: “While the times have established new and expanded obligations for governing boards, an appropriate governance process coupled with respect for a shared-governance process should remain a fundamental tenet on any campus” (Legon, 2012, p. 8).
CHAPTER 3—METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology and procedures used to conduct this study. As previously mentioned, the purpose of this study was to examine differences in perceptions of shared governance among senior community college leaders and the effect these perceptions have on their job satisfaction. The goal of the study was to quantify the extent to which these perceptions vary among senior administrative positions in community colleges and how this information can help inform institutions in various areas of leadership development.

This chapter defines the community college leader population and sample data, methods used for data collection, and information related to the data analysis procedures used to address the research questions in this study. The review of the literature in Chapter 2 explored participatory governance, leadership development and satisfaction, and the relationship among and between where it existed in the literature. While much of the literature addresses the perceptions and satisfaction of faculty and the President/CEO, there is little literature to address the perceptions of senior community college leaders and, in particular, those of deans and vice presidents. This study used quantitative data analysis to determine whether there is a difference in the perceptions and job satisfaction among presidents, vice presidents, and deans as it relates to participatory governance. The perceptions and job satisfaction among college leadership is important to understand as it helps colleges better implement effective participatory governance structures and informs the use of professional development and other leadership and support programs for these important senior leadership roles.
Restatement of the Research Questions

Research Question 1 (R1): Do presidents, vice presidents, and deans have differences in their perceptions regarding the importance of participatory governance?

Research Question 2 (R2): What effect, if any, do perceptions of participatory governance have on job satisfaction of senior community college leaders?

Restatement of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 (H1): There are no significant differences in the perceptions between presidents, vice presidents, and deans regarding the importance of participatory governance in their institutions.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Perceptions of participatory governance will have no effect on job satisfaction of senior community college leaders.

Conceptual Framework

As discussed in Chapter 2, Kanter’s (1993) Theory of Structural Empowerment stresses that when people have access to information, support, resources, and opportunity, they are much more likely to feel empowered. Those who are empowered are more motivated and able to contribute to the development of an empowering environment by sharing their sources of power (P. A. Miller et al., 2001). Figure 4 illustrates Kanter’s Theory of Structural Empowerment and identifies the importance of perceptions of participatory governance and job satisfaction, which are the constructs that form the basis for this study.

Using Kanter’s (1993) model as a conceptual framework, Figure 5 illustrates the theoretical underpinnings of this study and how it relates to the research questions. This study utilized Kanter’s model to investigate perceptions of shared governance using
Figure 4. Relationships of concepts in Kanter’s Theory of Structural Empowerment. Adapted from “Staff Nurse Empowerment and Perceived Control Over Nursing Practice,” by H. K. S. Laschinger & D. S. Havens, 1996, Journal of Nursing Administration, 26(9), p. 28.
Figure 5. Theoretical underpinnings based on Kanter’s model.
the outlined construct (R1). The study then investigated the effects of these perceptions on community college leader job satisfaction (R2).

**Research Design**

This study used extant data collected in 2012 using the National Survey of Community College Leaders (NSCCL) instrument developed at the California State University, Sacramento. The NSCCL was designed to examine community college leaders perceptions in several areas: (a) current trends on most essential elements of leadership (e.g., assessment and accountability, strategic planning, fundraising, shared governance); (b) top priorities within the institutions mission (e.g., transfer, workforce development, terminal degrees); (c) satisfaction with their work (e.g., job security, sphere of influence, credibility, professional progress); and (d) ethical leadership orientations (e.g., ethic of justice, ethic of critique, ethic of care, ethic of local community). The instrument was sent to community college administrators across the country based upon publically available information.

This study compared responses to selected survey questions from the NSCCL in order to examine the perceptions and job satisfaction of senior leaders in community colleges as it relates to participatory governance. The researcher developed two constructs based upon items which investigated *Perceptions* and *Satisfaction* across three senior administrator levels, to include president, vice president, and dean. Though the items represented reliable constructs, the researcher was interested in how individual items across each construct related to one another (R2). Questions related to each of these constructs were grouped based upon exploratory factor analysis described in Chapter 4.
Sample

As previously stated, extant data from the National Survey of Community College Leaders (NSCCL) was used for the study. These data were collected using a population distribution from the member database of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the largest professional association of community college administrators in the nation, and a primary advocacy organization for the nation’s community colleges. The association represents nearly 1,200 two-year, associate degree-granting institutions and more than 13 million students (AACC, 2012). The survey was distributed online to 2,324 AACC members, with a 12% response rate. This response rate is lower than the average response rate (39.6%) for online surveys reported by Cook, Heath, and Thompson (2000). However, low response rates are typical of surveys of community college leaders given their leadership and management responsibilities. Shih and Fan (2009) conducted a meta-analysis comparing response rates in e-mail and paper surveys in 35 studies over a 10-year period. They concluded that e-mail surveys generally have lower response rates, and, in particular, they noted especially low response rates for university administrative staff and other professionals (see Table 3).

Data Collection

The survey instrument and questions were informed by the 21st Century Commission Report by the AACC (2012), entitled *Reclaiming the American Dream: Community Colleges and the Nation’s Future*. In this report, the authors argue the American Dream is at risk. In order to meet the needs of 21st-century students and the 21st-century economy, educational leaders must reimagine and redesign our community
Table 3

Survey Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Email survey response rate (%)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tse et al. (1995)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Administrative staff of a university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tse (1998)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Administrative staff of a university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachmann, Elfrink, &amp; Vazzana (2000)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Business school deans and chairpersons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al. (2000)</td>
<td>4,065</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Urologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smee &amp; Brenna (2000)</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>College faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchhod &amp; Zhou (2001)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marketing executives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


colleges as institutions. In order to accomplish such a feat, the perceptions, attitudes, and roles of college leaders in participatory governance are important to understand.

Data were collected using the Qualtrics Research Suite (Qualtrics, LLC, 2014), which is an enterprise survey software solution commonly used in research studies. Face validity and field testing was conducted with 12 college presidents. College leaders provided feedback on the interpretability, phraseology, and accessibility of the questions. The data collection began June 7, 2012 and was open for a 3-week period. There was an initial email solicitation, with two follow-up requests.

The researcher organized the questions into constructs for Perceptions and Satisfaction based on an operational definition that statistically held together using
Cronbach’s alpha, which examined the internal consistency of the scales within the survey instrument and questions retained for analysis. Responses related to the construct of *Perceptions* were collected using a 10-point Likert scale ranging from very unimportant to very important. Respondents were asked to *indicate the degree of importance the following areas are to the current and future success of their community college.* Table 4 presents the questions asked in the survey and those questions retained for analysis in this study for the construct of *Perceptions.*

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions asked in survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising and advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building stakeholder relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared governance and faculty affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing board relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational racial/ethnic diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses related to the construct of *Satisfaction* were collected using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from very unsatisfied to very satisfied. Respondents were asked to *rate their satisfaction with the following (as it relates to yourself).* Table 5 presents the questions asked in the survey and those questions retained by the researcher for analysis in this study.
Table 5

*Satisfaction Construct*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions asked in survey</th>
<th>Questions retained for analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The challenge of your work</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional success</td>
<td>Professional success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional credibility</td>
<td>Professional credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere of influence</td>
<td>Sphere of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community reputation</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial compensation</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence of your staff</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to facilitate institutional change</td>
<td>Ability to facilitate institutional change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiency of institutional resources</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for the items retained for analysis are presented in Table 6.

To ensure a sufficient size for analysis, the researcher combined job positions into three categories, as presented in Table 7. Based on this approach, the samples used for analysis are as follows: President/Superintendent/CEO, $n = 94$; Vice President/Vice Chancellor, $n = 62$; Dean, $n = 56$.

**Data Analyses**

Data from the National Survey of Community College Leaders (NSCCL) were provided to the researcher for analysis. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) format using version 21. The analytic procedure used in this study employed a four-stage design, to include: (a) exploratory data analysis (e.g.,
Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Items Retained for Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building stakeholder relationships (e.g., policymakers, local leaders)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared governance and faculty affairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing board relations (e.g., trustees, coordinating bodies)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel issues (e.g., hiring, firing, contracts)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional strategic planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational racial/ethnic diversity (e.g., administration, faculty, staff)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional credibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere of influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to facilitate institutional change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

*Combined Categories of Job Titles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSCCL question response</th>
<th>Combined category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President/CEO</td>
<td>President/CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/Exec, Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/Exec, External Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/Exec, Research or Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/Exec, Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/Exec, Finance or Admin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate VP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant VP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

means, standard deviations, normality, homogeneity), (b) factor analysis, (c) ANOVA (R1), and (d) correlation and regression (R2).

In stage one, exploratory data analyses were conducted. These analyses allowed the researcher to examine descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standard deviations, frequencies) and assumptions for ANOVA and regression models (e.g., normality, homogeneity). Holistically, these analyses allowed the researcher to understand patterns in the data and interrelationships among variables.

In stage two, the construct validity and reliability of the participatory governance scale was examined. Using a heuristic approach, items most reflective of the participatory governance and satisfaction definitions guiding this study were identified. Exploratory factor analyses was employed to ensure the validity of the factor structure.
Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients were employed to ensure that the factor structures identified would be reliable.

In stage three, individual analyses of variance (ANOVAS) were employed for the purpose of examining research question one. Analyses of variance is a statistical analysis technique that explores the differences between group means (Warner, 2008). The statistical significance of observable differences in the dependent variables were evaluated and reported. Using leadership rank as the grouping variable, the researcher examined the differences in participatory governance perceptions by rank. To protect against the potential of a Type One error, the researcher divided the alpha value of .05 by the total number of analyses (.05/6). As a result, the test level employed in stage three was .008. Effect sizes were interpreted using eta squared with small, medium, and large effects being interpreted at .01, .06, and .14, respectively (Green & Salkind, 2009). The null hypothesis expected no differences in the means and proportions. In the event of unequal variance, Welch’s omnibus test was employed. Post hoc analyses examined mean differences using the Bonferroni (for equal variance) and Dunnett’s C (for unequal variance).

In stage four, correlation and multiple regression analyses were utilized to examine research question two. First, Pearson Product Moment Correlations were used to examine associations between each individual item for the participatory governance and satisfaction scales. This provided the researcher with an initial understanding of interrelationships between the independent and outcome variables, and independent variables among themselves. The participatory governance items were employed as
individual predictor variables, and the individual satisfaction items as outcome variables in subsequent multiple regression models (see Table 8).

Table 8

*Predictor and Outcome Variables for Correlation and Regression Analyses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>Outcome variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building stakeholder relationships</td>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared governance and faculty affairs</td>
<td>Professional success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing board relations</td>
<td>Professional credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel issues</td>
<td>Sphere of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional strategic planning</td>
<td>Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational racial/ethnic diversity</td>
<td>Ability to facilitate institutional change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Backwards regression analyses were used to allow the researcher to isolate the most salient predictors for each type of satisfaction examined. As a result, six satisfaction models were generated. The model fit and variance accounted for by each model were examined using the ANOVA F, as well as the R-Squared ($R^2$) and adjusted R-Squared (Adj $R^2$). Standardized and unstandardized beta coefficients are presented to account for potential Type One errors. All models were tested at .008.

**Assumptions**

Several assumptions existed related to the participants and their responses in this study. First, the study assumed that all participants have a general understanding of the concepts being explored within the context of their own institution, organization, or system. Specifically, the concepts of shared governance, stakeholders, relationships, and general leadership and job satisfaction were all assumed to be consistently understood by all participants. Second, the study assumed that perceptions, attitudes, and levels of
satisfaction occur in a consistent and measurable manner across all participants. And finally, the study assumed that the instrument selected to collect perceptions from participants adequately measured these attitudes and perspectives. The research design did not lead to assessment of causal relationships among the variables, but rather the associations among them.

**Limitations**

Several methodological or other limitations may apply to this study.

1. The study utilized extant data from a survey which relies on self-reported data as the method of collection. Factors such as misunderstanding of survey questions, variations in interpretations of meanings, or intentional deception can contribute to inaccuracies in the data.

2. The survey assumed that participants have a general understanding of the concept of shared governance and other factors as they relate to their own role as a college leader.

3. Participation in the survey sample was limited to a response rate of 12%, which can compromise the generalizability of the data to the larger population of senior college administrators.

4. The original intent of the survey questions used in this study was not specifically targeted at gaining an understanding of participatory governance, leadership, or organizational empowerment.

5. This study does not claim to address or identify all of the independent variables that may influence the perceptions and satisfaction of executive leaders at community colleges.
Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the views of participatory governance by community college leaders, and how these perceptions might affect their respective job satisfaction. As previously stated, the goal was to quantify the extent to which these perceptions vary among senior administrative positions in community colleges and how this information can help inform institutions in various areas of leadership development. This chapter described the research design, study sample, data collection, and data analysis used in accomplishing this goal. Limitations of the methodology and process have been noted that may affect the study results. The results of this study based on the methodology and process of analysis is described in detail in the following chapter. These results may help community colleges better implement effective participatory governance structures and may inform the use of professional development and other leadership and support programs for senior leadership roles in today’s college setting.
CHAPTER 4—DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to examine differences in perceptions of shared governance among senior community college leaders and the effect these perceptions have on their job satisfaction. The first section of this chapter will describe the exploratory factor analysis used to examine the construct validity of the participatory governance and leader satisfaction scales. The second section will explore the analyses of variance employed to examine the first research question in this study. Lastly, the final section will present the results of multiple regressions used to identify participatory governance items that were predictive of senior community college leaders’ job satisfaction in support of research question two in this study.

The purpose of this chapter is to present the data from this study’s examination of participatory governance. As noted in Chapter 3, the analytic technique employed in this study utilized a four-stage research design. In stage one, descriptive data and test assumptions were evaluated. Holistically, these analyses allowed the researcher to understand patterns in the data and interrelationships among variables. Descriptive data for study variables were presented in Chapter 3. In stage two of the analysis, data were examined using exploratory factor analysis. This analysis is described in the following section.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis**

In preparation of this study design, a factor analysis was conducted assuming unidimensionality of the measures for participatory governance perceptions and satisfaction. Both analyses indicated that there was only one underlying construct, and no items were identified for removal. Reliability tests were conducted using Cronbach’s
alpha, which examined the internal consistency of the scales within the survey instrument. The reliability coefficients for both scales demonstrated an acceptable degree (perceptions, \( \alpha = .71 \); satisfaction, \( \alpha = .87 \)) of internal consistency.

Exploratory factor analysis was employed in this study to examine the construct validity of the participatory governance and leader satisfaction scales. Using a heuristic approach, items from the NSCCL that were most reflective of the participatory governance and satisfaction definitions employed in this study were identified. These logical groupings of items were then subjected to exploratory analysis. Factor analysis is an evaluative technique that enables researchers to identify groupings of variables (referred to as factors) that account for item variation and co-variation (Green & Salkind, 2009). Two analyses were conducted; one focused on participatory governance and the other on leader satisfaction. Both analyses assumed unidimensionality of the items from the NSCCL. The dimensionality of the items was assessed using a two-part process, including an analysis of the scree plots and the eigenvalues. The eigenvalues were evaluated using the one-criterion, while the scree tests provided a pictorial overview of the dimensionality.

For participatory governance, a total of six items were identified for initial inclusion in the construct. These items included senior community colleges leaders’ perceptions on the importance of building stakeholder relationships, shared governance and faculty affairs, governing board relations, personnel issues, institutional strategic planning, and organizational diversity. The dimensionality of these items were tested using principal components analysis. The test identified only one component that had an eigenvalue above the specified threshold. Additionally, only one component was in the
sharp descent path of the scree-plot with eigenvalues above one. Cronbach alpha coefficient for the six items was .71, indicating acceptable reliability. George and Mallery (2003) provide the following rules of thumb when interpreting Cronbach Alpha scores: “≥ .9 - Excellent, ≥ .8 - Good, ≥ .7 - Acceptable, ≥ .6 - Questionable, ≥ .5 - Poor, and ≤ .5 - Unacceptable” (p. 231).

For leader satisfaction, six additional items were examined. Similar to the participatory governance items, the questions identified for inclusion in the leader satisfaction construct were also identified via a heuristic approach. These items included senior community college leaders’ job security, professional success, professional credibility, sphere of influence, collegiality, and ability to facilitate institutional change. The principal components analysis indicated that only one factor (i.e., leadership satisfaction) was evident in the data. This determination was made based upon a review of the eigenvalues and scree plot. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for these six items demonstrated good reliability at .87 (George & Mallery, 2003).

While the researcher sought to determine the validity and reliability of each factor construct, the nuanced differences across items within each construct were of primary interest. As a result, individual items were employed in subsequent analyses using analysis of variance and multiple regression.

**Analyses of Variance**

In stage three, individual analyses of variance (ANOVAS) were employed to support examination of research question one. As previously noted, ANOVA is a statistical analysis technique that explores the differences between group means. In particular, the researcher was interested in how scores for perceptions of participatory
governance differed across leadership rank. Response categories for differing leadership capacities were aggregated into three groups of senior leaders, including presidents/superintendents/CEO’s \((n = 94)\); vice presidents and vice chancellors \((n = 62)\), and deans \((n = 56)\). Collectively, these leadership groupings represent similar categories of senior leadership that engage participatory governance in community colleges (see Table 9 for a breakdown of the descriptive characteristics of the data by the level of the independent variables).

Table 9

**Descriptive Overview of Outcomes Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building stakeholder relationships</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared governance and faculty affairs</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing board relations</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel issues</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional strategic planning</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational racial/ethnic diversity</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using leadership rank as the grouping variable, the researcher examined differences in participatory governance. As noted, all omnibus tests were evaluated at .008. Only two significant differences were identified. Levene’s Test for Equality of Error Variance indicated that homogeneity could not be assumed for three analyses, including: shared governance and faculty affairs, governing board relations, and personnel issues. As a result, the Welch procedure was employed with these outcomes to determine significance. Based on the results from the ANOVA, there were significant differences in the outcome (building stakeholder relationships) by leaders’ rank ($F = 5.002, MS = 10.121, p = .008$). The eta squared indicated that the difference between ranks represented an effect size that was approaching the medium range (.05).

Posthoc tests were conducted using the Bonferroni procedure. One significant comparison was identified. Presidents had significantly higher mean scores for their perceptions of the importance of building stakeholder relationships than deans ($MD = .75, SE = .24, p = .007$). Figure 6 presents the means plot representing the differences on this score.

Governing board relations was examined using the Welch procedure given the violation of homogeneity. The omnibus test indicated that there were significant differences in perceptions of the importance of governing board relations based on leaders’ rank (asymptotic $F = 10.721, p < .001$). The effect size for the difference, according to eta squared, accounted for .16% of the variance in the outcome. This represents a large effect size. During posthoc tests, significant differences were identified. Comparisons were made between leadership ranks using Dunnett’s C. As shown in Figure 7, Presidents had higher scores for their perceptions of the importance of
Figure 6. Means plot for building stakeholder relationships.

Figure 7. Means plot for governing board relations.
governing board relations in comparison to Vice Presidents ($MD = .81, p < .05$) and Deans ($MD = 1.21, p < .05$).

**Multiple Regression Results**

Multiple regression analyses employed in this study were exploratory in nature. The purpose of these analyses was to identify participatory governance items that were predictive of senior community college leaders’ job satisfaction. Prior to regression analyses, the research examined correlations among study variables.

Pearson product moment correlations were employed to examine associations between each individual item for the participatory governance and satisfaction scales. The researcher examined correlations between the independent variables and dependent variables. Building stakeholder relationships was identified as having a positive correlation with job security ($r = .168, p < .05$). This was the only variable among the independent variables that had a detectable association with this outcome variable.

With respect to professional success, four independent variables were identified as having a positive association with this outcome. In particular, building stakeholder relationships ($r = .201, p < .01$), governing board relations ($r = .136, p < .05$), institutional strategic planning ($r = .134, p < .05$), and organizational racial/ethnic diversity ($r = .160, p < .05$) were all positively associated with leaders’ satisfaction with their professional success. Professional credibility was positively associated with two independent variables in this study. Specifically, building stakeholder relationships ($r = .182, p < .01$) and organizational racial/ethnic diversity ($r = .147, p < .05$) were both positively correlated with this outcome.
With respect to the outcome of leaders’ satisfaction with their sphere of influence, two significant associations were identified. Governing board relationships \((r = .137, p < .05)\), as well as organizational racial/ethnic diversity \((r = .136, p < .05)\) were both positively associated with this outcome. Five of the six independent variables were positively associated with outcome variable for collegiality. These variables included: building stakeholder relationships \((r = .175, p < .01)\), shared governance and faculty affairs \((r = .136, p < .05)\), governing board relations \((r = .158, p < .05)\), personnel issues \((r = .161, p < .05)\) and institutional strategic planning \((r = .174, p < .01)\).

Finally, the ability to facilitate institutional change was positively correlated with four independent variables. These variables included: building stakeholder relations \((r = .216, p < .01)\), governing board relations \((r = .161, p < .05)\), institutional strategic planning \((r = .193, p < .01)\), and organizational racial/ethnic diversity \((r = .174, p < .01)\). Correlations among independent and outcome variables are presented in Table 10. In general, the outcome variables correlated together moderately to strongly, while the independent variable had small to medium correlations using J. Cohen’s (1992) guidelines for the social sciences which define effect sizes as small (.10), medium (.30), and large (.50).

Regression analyses were employed in this study to examine the effects (if any) of the predictor variables for participatory governance on the six job satisfaction variables. As noted, to guard against Type 1 Error, all models were tested at .008. Four of the six models examined were significantly predictive of the outcome based on the ANOVA F. Backwards regression models were employed. Backwards regression is a type of
Table 10

*Correlations Among Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Building stakeholder relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sharing governance and faculty affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.219**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Governing board relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.396**</td>
<td>0.209**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personnel issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.320**</td>
<td>0.367**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional strategic planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.308**</td>
<td>0.301**</td>
<td>0.304**</td>
<td>0.238**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizational racial/ethnic diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.294**</td>
<td>0.396**</td>
<td>0.236**</td>
<td>0.294**</td>
<td>0.313**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.168*</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Professional success</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.136*</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.160*</td>
<td>0.553**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Professional credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.182**</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.147*</td>
<td>0.568**</td>
<td>0.748**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sphere of influence</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.137*</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.136*</td>
<td>0.449**</td>
<td>0.592**</td>
<td>0.687**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Collegiality</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.175**</td>
<td>0.136*</td>
<td>0.158*</td>
<td>0.161*</td>
<td>0.174**</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.438**</td>
<td>0.517**</td>
<td>0.489**</td>
<td>0.450**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ability to facilitate institutional change</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.216**</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.161*</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.193**</td>
<td>0.174**</td>
<td>0.435**</td>
<td>0.468**</td>
<td>0.434**</td>
<td>0.553**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at <.05.

**Significant at <.01.
elimination procedure in which all predictor variables are employed initially, and subsequent models are run, which test and delete variables for the purpose of model improvement. All models converged on six iterations, except for the models for collegiality and ability to facilitate institutional change which converged on five.

Building stakeholder relations (Std. B = .201, \( p \lt .01 \)) was a significant predictor for leaders’ satisfaction with their professional success. The model was significantly predictive \( (F = 9.360, p \lt .01) \) and accounted for 4% of the variance in the outcome \( (R^2 = .040, \text{adj } R^2 = .036) \). Building stakeholder relations (Std. B = .183, \( p \lt .01 \)) was also a significant predictor for leaders’ satisfaction with their professional credibility. The model was significantly predictive \( (F = 7.645, p \lt .01) \) and accounted for 3.3% of the variance in the outcome \( (R^2 = .033, \text{adj } R^2 = .029) \). Differing slightly from previous models, the model for collegiality included two significant predictors. The model was significantly predictive of the outcome for collegiality \( (F = 5.971, p \lt .01) \) and accounted for 5.1% of its variance \( (R^2 = .051, \text{adj } R^2 = .043) \). Specifically, personnel issues was identified as a significant predictor of collegiality (Std B = .146, \( p \lt .05 \)) as was the variable for building stakeholder relations (Std B = .155, \( p \lt .05 \)). Based on the standardized betas, building stakeholder relations was a slightly more powerful predictor of collegiality than personnel issues.

The final model examined the predictability of the participatory governance items on a leaders’ ability to facilitate institutional change. This significant model \( (F = 7.606, p \lt .001) \) accounted for 6.5% of the variance on the outcome \( (R^2 = .065, \text{adj } R^2 = .056) \). Two variables were identified as determinants of a leaders’ ability to facilitate change. These variables included institutional strategic planning (Std B = .139, \( p \lt .05 \)) and
building stakeholder relations (Std B = .175, p < .05). The interpretability of the standardized beta coefficients suggests that building stakeholder relations is a stronger contributor to a leaders’ satisfaction with respect to their ability to facilitate institutional change than is strategic planning. Overall, across the models, the most recurrent determinant of a leaders’ job satisfaction is building stakeholder relations. In fact, this type of participatory governance was identified as a significant predictor of job satisfaction across all significant models. An analysis of the regression coefficients for the outcome variables is presented in Table 11.

**Summary**

This chapter provides an examination of the differences in perceptions of shared governance among senior community college leaders and the effect these perceptions have on their job satisfaction. The first hypotheses in this study assumed there would be no significant differences in the perceptions of the importance of participatory governance by leadership rank. The data analyzed in this chapter suggests that in most cases this was confirmed. However, the rank of president did have some significant differences in perceptions when compared to other ranks. The second hypothesis in this study assumed that the perceptions of participatory governance by senior college leaders would have no effect on their job satisfaction. The data analyzed in this study did not confirm this hypothesis, with the data presenting significant findings to suggest that certain perceptions of participatory governance held by college leaders do, in fact, lead to greater job satisfaction. The findings of this examination in relation to the research questions in this study are explored in the following chapter, along with their implications for practice and further research.
### Table 11

**Regression Coefficients for Outcome Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Std. B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>Building Stakeholder Relations</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.162*</td>
<td>6.012*</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Success&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Building Stakeholder Relations</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>9.360**</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Credibility&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Building Stakeholder Relations</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>7.645**</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere of Influence</td>
<td>Governing Board Relations</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>1.40*</td>
<td>4.462*</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Personnel Issues</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.146*</td>
<td>5.971**</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Stakeholder Relations</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.155*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Facilitate Institutional Change&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Institutional Strategic Planning</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.139*</td>
<td>7.606***</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Stakeholder Relations</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant overall model.
*Significant at <.05.
**Significant at <.01.
***Significant at <.001.
CHAPTER 5—FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

Restatement of the Problem

Participants in shared governance are expected to represent the interests of their respective constituents, but at the same time must represent the best interests of the institution as a whole. It is this discourse that forms perceptions of the process, which may also have an effect on executive leader job satisfaction. Understanding this relationship between perceptions of shared governance by executive leaders and their job satisfaction is important to explore for a variety of reasons, such as effectiveness in the position, turnover in leadership, and implementation of professional development models for community college leaders.

Restatement of the Purpose of the Study

Given the mandate for shared governance in higher education, community college leaders must learn to successfully navigate the decision-making process in their institutions. The purpose of this study was to explore differences in the perceptions among executive college leaders regarding the importance of shared governance and to investigate whether these perceptions effect their job satisfaction. This quantitative study explored these factors in order to provide insight into this relationship and provide college leaders with information with which to inform their own development and that of other leaders in their institutions.

Review of the Study

In Chapter 1, the purpose and the problem that prompted this research were identified. Specifically, the first chapter documented the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, methodology including
limitations and delimitations of the study, along with definitions and related concepts. Chapter 2 provided a review of the literature related to shared governance in community colleges. It investigated the roles and perspectives of participants, and provided a review of the literature regarding empowerment theory and leadership development in community colleges. Chapter 3 described the research design and methodology that was utilized. It also presented the theoretical framework that guided this study. Chapter 4 presented a detailed analysis of the data that support the findings in this study.

This final chapter begins by addressing the findings of the study, along with a discussion of how the findings are contextualized in the conceptual framework that guided this study. Implications for practice are then discussed to explore how this study can provide value and contribution to the field. This chapter concludes with recommendations for future research.

Findings

This study sought to answer two important questions to assist in understanding executive college leader perceptions of shared governance, their job satisfaction, and any associations between them. Each question, along with the respective findings and discussion, are explored in this section.

Research Question 1 (R1)

Do presidents, vice presidents, and deans have differences in their perceptions regarding the importance of participatory governance?

Based on the results from the analysis of variances, there were significant differences identified in only two areas. These include the following:
1. *Presidents* had significantly higher mean scores for their perceptions of the importance of *building stakeholder relations* than did *deans*.

2. *Presidents* had significantly higher mean scores for their perceptions of the importance of *governing board relations* than did both *vice presidents* and *deans*.

**Research Question 2 (R2)**

What effect, if any, do perceptions of participatory governance have on job satisfaction of senior community college leaders?

As previously discussed in Chapter 4, this study examined associations between each individual item for the participatory governance and satisfaction scales. The researcher examined correlations between the independent and dependent variables. All analyses were based on combining the responses of the three levels of leadership among participants. Based on the results of this study, there are significant correlations between the perceptions of shared governance and job satisfaction of senior community college leaders. These positive associations are described below, and are illustrated in Figure 8.

1. *Building stakeholder relations* was identified as having a positive association with *job security*.

2. *Building stakeholder relations, governing board relations, institutional strategic planning,* and *organizational racial/ethnic diversity* were all positively associated with a leader’s satisfaction with their *professional success*.
Figure 8. Correlations between perceptions of shared governance and job satisfaction.

3. Governing board relations and organizational racial/ethnic diversity were both positively associated with a leader’s satisfaction with their sphere of influence.

4. Building stakeholders relations, shared governance and faculty affairs, governing board relations, personnel issues, and institutional strategic planning were all positively associated with a leader’s satisfaction with the outcome of collegiality.

5. Building stakeholder relations, governing board relations, institutional strategic planning, and organizational racial/ethnic diversity were positively
associated with a leader’s satisfaction with their *ability to facilitate institutional change*.

Regression analyses were employed in this study to examine the effects (if any) of the predictor variables for participatory governance on the six job satisfaction variables. All analyses were based on combining the responses of the three levels of leadership among participants. Regression analyses identified four models that were significantly predictive of the outcome. These predictive relationships are described below, and are illustrated in Figure 9.

*Figure 9. Predictive relationships among outcome variables.*
1. *Building stakeholder relations* was a significant predictor for a leader’s satisfaction with their *professional success*.

2. *Building stakeholder relations* was a significant predictor for a leader’s satisfaction with their *professional credibility*.

3. *Building stakeholder relations* and *personnel issues* were significant predictors for a leader’s satisfaction with *collegiality*.

4. *Building stakeholder relations* and *institutional strategic planning* were significant predictors for a leader’s satisfaction with their *ability to facilitate institutional change*.

**Discussion and Implications for Practice**

The findings related to Research Question 1 (R1) signal some areas of importance for college leadership. The findings appear to indicate a degree of homogeneity among the perceptions of senior community college leaders, with limited differences noted in the findings. The limited differences in perceptions that were found to be of significance involved those held by presidents.

It is likely not a surprise to many that college presidents place greater importance on governing board relations than do vice presidents and deans. While there could be many contributing factors to these views held by presidents, the most notable contributor is likely that the president serves at the discretion of the governing board and is personally accountable to the board in his or her employment. This relationship, unique to the role of president, would likely result in their perceptions that governing board relations are highly important and a leading priority for them to consider in their role as president.
More notable, however, are the findings in this study suggesting that deans do not view the importance of building stakeholder relations to the extent of those in the role of president. While this may seem reasonable on the surface, this researcher finds these results as significant when considering the roles of deans in supporting and encouraging campus culture. It can be argued that deans have an equally important, if not more important, role in building stakeholder relations in community colleges. Their interactions with various stakeholder groups, such as faculty, staff, and students, are typically at an operational level and far more frequent than those of a president. It can be argued that deans also have the most to gain from effective and collaborative stakeholder relations on campus, as these relations will directly impact their day-to-day work and the success of shared governance on campus. Recognizing that presidents may also place high priority on building stakeholder relations for similar reasons, the fact that deans in this study placed less importance on these relations is important. However, it is also important to recognize that the role of dean in this study was a grouping of titles to include dean, assistant dean, and associate dean. Depending on the college organization structure, there could be very different sets of job functions performed among these ranks. As a result, they may have different levels of concern for stakeholder relations, which could be a topic of further research.

The findings related to Research Question 2 (R2) are based on the examination of correlations between the independent (perceptions) and dependent (satisfaction) variables, as well as the regression analyses conducted in Chapter 4. Overall, across all of the models, the most recurrent determinant of a leaders’ job satisfaction is building stakeholder relations. As illustrated in Figure 9, the perception of the importance of
building stakeholder relations was identified as a significant predictor of job satisfaction across all significant models. Perceptions about the importance of institutional strategic planning is predictive of a leaders’ satisfaction with their ability to facilitate institutional change, while their perceptions about personnel issues are predictive of their satisfaction with collegiality. Figure 10 illustrates these findings in the context of the theoretical framework used in this study.

![Figure 10. Predictive relationships in the context of the theoretical framework.](image)

As illustrated, the findings in this study assimilate into the theoretical framework (Figure 10) and directly support the model of structural empowerment as presented in earlier chapters. The three factors representing perceptions of shared governance (building stakeholder relations, institutional strategic planning, and personnel issues) lead to the representative factors identified as having personal impact on college leader job satisfaction. As previously stated, but worth repeating, is the identification of the most recurrent determinant of a leaders’ job satisfaction as building stakeholder relations. This finding is paramount to the importance of this study, and its implications will be
explored further in this chapter. Figure 10 also illustrates the systemic power factors that influence the perceptions, as well as the resultant work effectiveness outputs. Both the systemic power factors and resultant work effectiveness phenomenon are included as areas of future research later in this chapter.

The findings in this study are supportive of the literature and previous research examined in Chapter 2. The findings have already been discussed in the context of the adapted theoretical framework utilized in this study, but also support the overall literature on empowerment theory explored in the literature review. As previously described, Kanter’s (1993) body of work in this area formed the foundation for this study. Recognizing that environments that utilize effective shared governance are empowering, Kanter and the findings in this study are congruent. Both posit that such environments will have positive impacts on feelings of job satisfaction and one’s ability to facilitate institutional change and/or be effective in their role. The findings in this study further support the research of Laschinger et al. (2001) by again reinforcing the link between structural empowerment and job satisfaction. This study expands upon the existing body of research by linking the perceptions of college leaders related to various areas of the structural empowerment model to their job satisfaction. These findings provide us with an important frame with which to begin to understand community college leader job satisfaction as it relates to shared governance and structural empowerment.

The findings in this study can serve to advance efforts to facilitate shared governance in community colleges by reinforcing the importance of the perceptions and attitudes that college leaders bring to the process. Arguably, all college leaders desire to be satisfied in their job. This study brings awareness to college leaders that perceptions
and attitudes toward three key areas (building stakeholder relations, institutional strategic planning, and personnel issues) are predictive of the personal impact on their job satisfaction. Understanding this relationship can help college leaders reflect on their actions, behaviors and attitudes in order to help create the conditions for this resultant job satisfaction. It can also help inform other participants in the process of shared governance, who also benefit from college leaders who are satisfied in their jobs, to emphasize positive experiences in the process that will help reinforce positive perceptions of the process for all participants.

In general, there are a number of implications for practice presented in this study. Most notable are the implications for leadership development programs and individual executive leader self-development in community colleges. These findings can help institutions, and individuals, focus their efforts on specific activities and programs that are most likely to influence job satisfaction amongst the leadership ranks. These findings can also assist with efforts to remediate or address deficiencies in leader job satisfaction should this be an identified area of development for an individual college president, vice president, or dean. Human Resource departments in community colleges can also use the findings in this study to help shape support systems and training programs for their institutions that focus efforts on both developing and retaining effective college leaders, where job satisfaction can play a significant role.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

While this study explored leader perceptions of shared governance in relation to their job satisfaction, there are several areas of further study that should be investigated
in order to better understand these areas and their impact on community college administration. Four areas of further study are presented below.

1. This study conducted regression analyses of community college leaders as a whole, without distinguishing between rank. Further study could be engaged to conduct regression analyses across the administrative ranks used in this study, to include president, vice president, and dean. These findings could prove useful in further understanding any differences in these college leadership ranks, such as the differences among deans, assistant deans, and associate deans that were discussed previously. Understanding these differences in perceptions and job satisfaction could influence an individual leader’s development and personal growth, as well as college programs to develop their leaders across the various ranks. These understandings could have significant impact on the college’s professional development and human resource efforts.

2. Further research could be explored to investigate both the systemic power factors (formal and informal power influences) and work effectiveness identified in Kanter’s (1993) adapted Structural Empowerment Model. These investigations would serve to better understand the environment and circumstances that influence the development of leader perceptions of shared governance, as well as any impacts on work effectiveness as measured by achievement and success, respect and cooperation in the organization, and student satisfaction in the college context. Understanding these influences
would help to further explore the model and enhance the application of the findings in this study.

3. In order to further explore perceptions, attitudes, and other factors related to senior community college leader job satisfaction, qualitative studies should be considered to support the findings in this study and increase their impact on the field. Individual interviews and focus groups would provide rich data to compliment these findings, allowing leaders to express in their own words their perceptions of shared governance and factors that influence their job satisfaction.

4. Alfred (1998) presented a series of advantages and disadvantages of shared governance in his policy paper to the Education Commission of the States (see Table 12).

Many of Alfred’s (1998) identified advantages and disadvantages are supported by the literature review and findings in this study, and may continue to be relevant today. Specifically, Alfred identifies advantages of shared governance that relate to a participant’s sense of empowerment, ability to influence decisions and change, and improve morale and collegial relationships. He points to disadvantages of shared governance as effecting institutional development and planning, role confusion, and adversarial relations among stakeholders. Each of these areas where explored in this study, through the literature review as well as the study findings themselves. Based on the findings of this study, as well as the researcher’s personal experience as both a participant in shared governance and senior college leader, these advantages and disadvantages are often promoted or discouraged based on the perceptions, attitudes, and
Table 12

Advantages and Disadvantages of Shared Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages of shared governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fosters a sense of empowerment as individuals gain the opportunity to participate in decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotes greater “buy-in” to decisions by all parties associated with the ability to influence the outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourages staff to accept responsibility for decisions; once a decision is endorsed by empowered staff, they will be more likely to seek to protect what has been collectively created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Results in improved morale and an improved college environment as opportunities for greater involvement in decision making can lead to the development of collegial relationships among trustees, administrators, faculty, and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increases the breadth of understanding related to issues; better decisions are made when a diversity of opinions are brought to the decision process and participants develop well-rounded perspectives on important issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improves communication by involving more people in the decision process; as participants report back to their constituents on issues addressed in governance, more people become aware of college-wide issues and decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fosters divergent points of view as a range of opinions are brought forward on different issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Improves the likelihood that the college will move forward in responding to critical issues; shared governance encourages compromise and helps to avert harmful stalemates among factions on important issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages of shared governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Slows decision making because it is difficult, lengthy, and sometimes a tedious process that is inherently more complex than simply issuing decisions in an authoritarian manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hampers effective management because it requires numerous iterations of the same information to achieve consensus among parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Limits efficiency because it lengthens the time required to complete critical processes such as planning and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Diminishes the quality of decisions by soliciting opinions from those who are not qualified to speak to the issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Slows progress in institutional development because faculty are not available during certain periods in the calendar year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adds to the responsibilities of administrators while reducing their authority because they must serve as mentors to faculty and staff who have no previous experience in decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Makes teaching and learning a secondary responsibility as some instructors become more interested and involved in their decision making than their instructional or course and curriculum assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Takes administrators away from strategic responsibilities such as implementing new programs and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Disguises the self-serving agendas and political maneuvering of faculty and staff, which undermine true collegiality and effective decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Has resulted in an unfavorable amount of power, control, and advantage to faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Leads to role confusion in decision-making as administrators are bypassed or undermined, especially in relationships among faculty with whom they must work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Encourages polarization and adversarial relations among faculty, staff, and administrators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

expectations of the people in the process. Efforts to address these perceptions by the stakeholders early in the process may contribute significantly to the effectiveness and cultural acceptance of shared governance in community colleges.

An area of further research, which would expand on the findings of this study, would be to use Alfred’s statements of shared governance to further explore the perceptions of, and the degree to which, community college leaders support or reject these statements. Understanding the perceptions of leaders in relation to these key areas of college administration and organizational leadership may help to further understand issues of job satisfaction, retention in the field, and overall community college leader effectiveness. These insights would contribute to leadership development programs and other efforts to ensure leaders are supported in their role. Additionally, colleges could use this research to develop strategies to promote the identified advantages of shared governance while impeding the emergence and impact of the disadvantages.

Many of Alfred’s (1998) identified advantages and disadvantages are supported by the literature review and findings in this study, and may continue to be relevant today. Specifically, Alfred identifies advantages of shared governance that relate to a participant’s sense of empowerment, ability to influence decisions and change, and improved morale and collegial relationships. He points to disadvantages of shared governance as effecting institutional development and planning, role confusion, and adversarial relations among stakeholders. Each of these areas were explored in this study. An area of further research, which would expand on the findings of this study, would be to use Alfred’s statements of shared governance to further explore the perceptions of, and the degree to which, community college leaders support or reject these statements.
Understanding the perceptions of leaders in relation to these key areas of college administration and organizational leadership may help to further understand issues of job satisfaction, retention in the field, and overall community college leader effectiveness. These insights would contribute to leadership development programs and other efforts to ensure leaders are supported in their role. Additionally, colleges could use this research to develop strategies to promote the identified advantages of shared governance while impeding the emergence and impact of the disadvantages.

While Alfred identified advantages and disadvantages of shared governance in 1998 in hopes of informing the field and promoting its effective implementation, the literature continues to support the position that colleges struggle with realizing its potential. In an effort to advance our understanding of and ability to successfully inform the field with strategies for effectively realizing this potential, the following questions are of continued interest to this researcher and could serve as the basis for further studies related to the findings in this study.

1. What kinds of organizational structures, leadership, and management are necessary in community colleges to effectively implement shared governance?
2. Are the results of decisions made under shared governance better? Do colleges perform better? Do student outcomes improve?

Having answers to these questions will help inform the perceptions, attitudes, and expectations of the shared governance process in community colleges. Participants are more likely to invest in the process and have concern over the outcomes if they believe there is reasonable return on the investment of time, effort, and discourse that is associated with shared governance. Given the findings in this study, these experiences by
participants who believe in the importance of the process are likely to lead to an environment where the participants are satisfied in their job. Arguably, this environment is good for all stakeholders, most notably students.

**Summary**

In summary, this study has added value to our understanding of perceptions of shared governance and job satisfaction among community college leadership. In order to lead today’s community college, administrators need to find ways to work collaboratively with faculty, staff, and other stakeholders in a environment where there are varying perceptions, attitudes, and understandings of the collegial model of governance and decision-making. This study has emphasized the importance of perceptions related to shared governance by college leaders and their resultant job satisfaction in hopes that it can help contribute to the goal of a collaborative, collegial, and effective model of college leadership.
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