

LEGITIMACY OF THE NONACADEMIC STAFF IN THE
GOVERNANCE PROCESS OF COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES

By

HAROLD RUE MYERS

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1958

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1966

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1980

Thesis
1980D
M9955L
cop. 2



LEGITIMACY OF THE NONACADEMIC STAFF IN THE
GOVERNANCE PROCESS OF COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES

Thesis Approved:

Carl R. Anderson

Thesis Adviser

William B. Adams

Robert Stone

John H. Henson

Norman D. Burken

Dean of the Graduate College

1064675

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Carl R. Anderson, who served as chairman of his advisory committee; to Dr. John F. Stone, a special expression of appreciation and indebtedness is acknowledged for his assistance throughout the study; to Dr. Deke Johnson and Dr. William B. Adrian, appreciation is also expressed.

A note of special thanks is given to my associates of the Royal and Beneficent Order of the P.P.O. for their counsel and advice during the three years of doctoral study.

Appreciation is also expressed to the administration of Oklahoma State University for their permission and encouragement in the pursuit of the degree.

Finally, special gratitude is expressed to my wife, Connie. Without her understanding and help throughout the entire program, nothing would or could have been accomplished. Deepest affection is also expressed to my children who were a constant support for my educational endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	4
Importance of Study	5
Definition of Terms	5
Null Hypotheses	6
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	7
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	11
Data Collection	12
Population	14
Sample Size Calculations	15
Questionnaire Validity	16
Assumptions	16
Limitations	16
Data Analysis Procedure	17
Definitions	18
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	20
Section One	21
Analysis	28
Section Two	28
Types of Institutions	28
Size	29
Ownership	29
Code	30
Analysis	31
Section Three	31
Analysis	33
V. FINDINGS	35
Concluding Statements	40
Recommendation for Further Study	44
VI. SUMMARY	46
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	48

Chapter	Page
APPENDIXES	50
APPENDIX A - PRELIMINARY CORRESPONDENCE	51
APPENDIX B - PRINCIPLES	54
APPENDIX C - QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACCOMPANYING CORRESPONDENCE .	58
APPENDIX D - TABLES	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Stratified Population, Required Sample Size, and Return Rates for the Principal Questionnaire	13
II. Tabulation of Responses Indicating the Principles are Valid as Expressed in Percentages	64
III. Confidence Table of Institutional Variables by Principles as Expressed by Z Values	66
IV. Validity of Principle 1 by Type of Institution	70
V. Administrative Level for Lateral Communication as Associated with Principle 1	71
VI. Means of Staff Representation by Institutional Ownership as Associated with Principle 3	72
VII. Means of Staff Representation by Institutional Code as Associated with Principle 3	73
VIII. Methods of Administrative Approach to the Classified Nonacademic Staff Represented by Labor Unions as Associated with Principle 4	75
IX. Means of Administrative Staff Planning by Institutional Code as Associated with Principle 3	76
X. Validity of Principle 6 by Type of Institution	78
XI. Means of Administrative Staff Planning by Institutional Ownership as Associated with Principle 7	79
XII. Administrative Accountability Through Mechanisms of Governance to the Administrative and Professional Staff Represented by Labor Unions as Associated with Principle 7	80
XIII. Labor Union Affiliation by the Classified Staff by Type of Institution	81
XIV. Labor Union Affiliation by the Administrative and Professional Staff by Institution Type	82

Table	Page
XV. Labor Union Affiliation of the Classified Staff by Size of the Institutional Labor Force	83
XVI. Labor Union Affiliation of the Administrative and Professional Staff by Size of the Institutional Labor Force	84
XVII. Labor Union Affiliation of the Classified Staff by Institutional Ownership	85
XVIII. Labor Union Affiliation of the Administrative and Professional Staff by Institutional Ownership	86
XIX. Labor Union Affiliation by the Classified Staff by Institutional Code	87
XX. Labor Union Affiliation by the Administrative and Professional Staff by Institutional Code	89
XXI. Institutions that have Formal Constituted Nonacademic Staff Councils Integrated into the Governance System as Taken from the Preliminary Survey	91
XXII. Administrative Accountability Through Mechanisms of Governance to the Nonacademic Staff by Institutional Code	92
XXIII. Legal or Governing Board Policies Toward Nonacademic Staff Labor Union Affiliation by Institutional Ownership	94
XXIV. Legal or Governing Board Policies Toward Classified Staff by Classified Staff Labor Union Affiliation	95
XXV. Legal or Governing Board Policies Toward Administrative and Professional Staff by Administrative and Professional Staff Labor Union Affiliation	96

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Within the concept of collegial governance in higher education there lies certain parameters about the legitimacy of decision-making as it affects various constituencies. These parameters deal primarily with the rights of participation and are viewed as a lateral means of communication which reflect the degree of involvement granted by the governing boards of the institution.

Participatory decision-making in higher education institutions has been written about extensively and the concepts and various theories have been well documented. It is well established that faculties, and even more recently students, are a viable part of the collegial mode of governance in our colleges and universities.

The concept of shared authority is manifested within the development of the faculty senate which acts as the mode of lateral communication to administration. The rights of faculty to participate in the mutual understanding of governance within our colleges and universities is stated by the American Association of University Professors (A.A.U.P., 1973):

Understanding, based on community of interest, and producing joint effort, is essential for at least three reasons. First, the academic institution, public or private, often has become less autonomous; buildings, research, and student tuition are supported by funds over which the college or university exercises a diminishing control. Legislative and executive governmental authority, at all levels, plays a part in the

making of important decisions in academic policy. If these voices and forces are to be successfully heard and integrated, the academic institution must be in position to meet them with its own generally unified view. Second, regard for the welfare of the institution remains important despite the mobility and interchange of scholars. Third, a college or university in which all the components are aware of the interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems (p. 36).

The A.A.U.P. (1973, p. 49) likewise acknowledged the importance of student participation in college and university government as it stated, "Most importantly, joint effort among all groups in the institution--students, faculty, administration, and governing board--is a prerequisite of sound academic government." Muston (1969), Helsabeck (1972), Ikenberry (1970), and a host of other authors of recognized collegiate societies all point to the importance of including students within the framework of institutional governance. The involvement of students aids in fulfilling the A.A.U.P. call for mutual understanding by encouraging participation in a tricameral approach to decision-making.

Corson (1960) defined governance as:

. . . the process by which decisions are arrived at, who participates in these processes, the structure that relates these individuals, and the effort that is made (or should be made) to see to it that decisions once made are carried out, and to assess the results that are achieved (p. 12).

It is this means of decision-making effort in our colleges and universities that encourage faculty and students to join with administrators in forming a system of governance. The inclusion of students and faculty in the process of decision-making has been well established by Shaffer (1970), Corson (1973), Wilson (1969), and Sturner (1971). There is, however, one constituency of personnel that may be neglected by many governance styles. A thorough search of the literature shed little light

with regard to the involvement of the nonacademic staff in participatory governance at any level of communication within the hierarchy of decision-making.

In a report on the Campus Governance Program of the American Association of Higher Education, Keeton (1971) wrote:

The most neglected constituency is the nonfaculty staff. In confrontations that closed campuses, these staff have often been the ones whose economic interests suffered most. Unionization is a resort for them where it is not prohibited by law, but it is not as direct a route to influence upon non-economic issues as would be representation in the committees and councils that deal with employee interests. Moreover, the active cooperation of these staff, like that of students and faculty is essential to full effectiveness, and many of them bring competence and perspectives to campus policy problems that would compliment the resources otherwise available (p. 23).

The participation of the staff in university governance may depend upon uncontrolled factors such as staff size, certain legal considerations, existing union representation, or lack of staff interest. However, if certain basic principles of the collegial governance philosophy have been accepted for faculty or students, then it could be argued that those same principles within limits should be applicable to other constituencies. Thus, participation may be permitted or denied depending upon the validity of those principles.

With the exception of a structured vertical chain of communication, many colleges and universities provide no means for staff input. Employee unions or state merit board systems offer some means of communication, but for the most part the concerns are generally of a grievance or collective bargaining nature. These systems have a tendency to become vertical and restrictive and often minimize cooperative participation.

Nonacademic staff councils offer a means of lateral communication by allowing an input to the highest level of administration. However,

in order to have an effective overall representation in the collegial model of governance, all councils should be accorded the same level of participation in university decision-making within their assigned areas of responsibility. The shared authority concept within the collegial model of governance thus becomes a quadricameral advisory approach to administrative decision-makers.

Statement of the Problem

As the various staffs of colleges and universities work toward the common goal of the institution, there are differing needs and concerns which apply to the various employee constituencies. For those non-academic staffs who have no means of representation to the governance system of the institution, there may be feelings of decisional deprivation. The problem investigated in this study was the legitimacy of including an apparently neglected nonacademic staff in the higher education governance system.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of the study was to determine if there is a place for the nonacademic staff in higher education governance. The specific objectives of this study were:

1. to test the validity of a set of principles related to the philosophy of nonacademic staff involvement in higher education governance,
2. to determine if participatory decision-making in higher education governance might be influenced by labor union affiliation and if there is an association of unionization with the

various institutional variables tested,

3. to determine the extent of involvement of the nonacademic staff in higher education governance.

Importance of Study

There has been considerable research dealing with the role of faculty and students in university governance, but the role of the non-academic staff has been virtually neglected. It has been conservatively estimated that the ratio of staff to faculty is better than two to one, yet this vast constituency of personnel is often left out of the decision-making process which affects all employees of the institution.

The importance of the objectives of this study is that university administrators might be able to avoid many personnel problems related to the nonacademic staff if the legitimacy of participatory governance is accepted and practiced.

Definition of Terms

Governance: A system in which scholars, students, teachers, administrators, and trustees associated together in a college or university, establish and carry out the rules and regulations that minimize conflict, facilitate their collaboration, and preserve essential individual freedom (Corson, 1960).

Constituency: A group of individuals who have like concerns and are set apart from other groups by some defined reason. For the purpose of this investigation, the term will apply to faculty, nonacademic staff, and students.

Nonacademic staff: Those employees of an institution of higher education who have not been granted academic status.

1. Classified staff: Those nonacademic staff members who are not exempt from overtime pay as mandated by federal guidelines.
2. Administrative and professional staff: Those nonacademic staff members who are exempt from the overtime pay provisions and who do not hold academic status.

Lateral communication: Direct communication to any level of the hierarchy of administration (Koehler, Anatol, and Applebaum, 1976).

Vertical communication: Either in an upward or downward flow of communication through the chain of administrative hierarchy (Koehler, Anatol, and Applebaum, 1976).

Participative decision-making: Direct participation in a formal role of the decision-making process.

Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: A set of principles dealing with university governance does not apply to the nonacademic staff.

Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between the various types, sizes, or ownership of institutions of higher education and unionization of classified or administrative and professional nonacademic staff employees.

Hypothesis 3: There are presently no formal means of participation for the nonacademic staff in the university governance system.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An extensive search of the ERIC system revealed abundant information concerning faculty and university governance but revealed little about the role of the nonacademic staff in the decision-making process of higher education. Although there existed a number of nonacademic advisory councils, there was little evidence of research having been conducted which dealt with this particular university constituency.

The sole research article found which yielded any data dealt with a study of attitudes and opinions of staff personnel regarding their participation in the governance of the university. Sutherland's (1973) research was conducted in 1971 and led to the conclusion that staff members are interested in participating in university governance. Among other concerns Sutherland also concluded that:

1. Staff members want to be represented by other staff members and not by faculty members.
2. Staff members are concerned about university goals and purposes and are aware of a lack of communication on these and other matters.
3. There was no strong desire to establish labor union dominance among staff personnel.

Sutherland (1973) noted that:

. . . there was ample evidence that universities, in efforts to assure equitable, democratic, and more egalitarian representation in their policy-making bodies, could best meet the desires of staff personnel by giving serious consideration to the recommended quadri-cameral system which has the potential to be also more agreeable than present forms to the four campus constituencies who would be parts of such a governance structure (p. 81).

These four constituencies are made up of the faculty, administration, students, and the nonacademic staff.

Sanders (1977) noted that the unpublicized individuals lost in the shuffle, all too often are known as the staff. They are a part of the community not always recognized, a fact that underlies efforts at staff unionization on many campuses.

Sanders further noted that one indication of the breakdown of the traditional community and the broadening of the functional community, was the effort by a group of employees to seek a new identity and an increased voice in university affairs.

The concern of the university staff turning to labor unions as a relief for communication to administrators, is mentioned by both Sutherland (1973) and Sanders (1973). Tenboer's (1970) research concluded that unionization and collective bargaining may be substitutes for other forms of participation by staff services employees in campus governance now increasingly available to faculty and students. Tenboer recommended that "democracy in the administration of higher education demands that staff services employees participate in campus governance along with faculty and students" (pp. 63-64).

The staff or the nonacademic community to which Sutherland, Sanders, and Tenboer refer is often considered to be made up of secretaries, clerks, custodians, and other classified personnel. There is, however,

another constituency of staff personnel to which Mix (1972) refers as the "other professionals" and includes staff members who might be referred to as "faculty without rank or tenure," "unclassified," "non-teaching professional," and "noninstructional professional." Mix contended that the inclusion of the professional staff members into university governance should be guided by the following three broad purposes of the Staff Senate:

Seek to provide the administration with advice and counsel regarding university concerns. . . . Assist in the development of administrative policies and procedures. . . . Provide a mechanism for joint action with other major university constituencies by providing a forum for the expression of professional staff concerns (pp. 335-336).

Mix further contended that two advantages were gained immediately by entry into governance:

First, as individuals, professional staff members have the skill and knowledge vital to the continuance of the institution. Second, the effect of silent service is not only the loss of informed opinion, but also the concomitant loss of allegiance which occurs when those who only work here can say or do anything in performing their functions and not be accountable (p. 336).

Patchen (1970) studied the relationship between decisional participation and job satisfaction among TVA employees and suggested that interested participation in institutional decision-making leads to greater job satisfaction and work achievement, as well as greater individual integration into the organization. Alutto and Belasco (1973, p. 124) agreed and further pointed out that "the extent of involvement in decision-making is particularly important for situations of decisional deprivation." The results of their research verified that conditions of decisional deprivation constitute a basis for the increased militancy among members of many professional occupations.

Chaney (1969) researched the industrial climate for participative decision-making and reported a positive correlation between both job attitudes and performance and the degree of participation in decision-making. His data showed a zero improvement for individuals in the no-participation while the low-participation groups exhibited an attitude and production improvement of 80 percent and 50 percent, respectively.

There is, however, a negative concern in participative decision-making which must not be overlooked. Katz and Kahn (1966) noted that meetings in which true participation was discouraged can actually have a negative effect on attitude and performance. They concluded that good decision-making is most likely to result from a heterogeneous group where free expression is encouraged.

Perhaps Tenboer (1970, p. 68) put it into proper perspective when he noted, "so as to diminish the application of autocratic paternalism as it affects campus staff services employees, boards and administrators should plan with their employees, not for them," and Baldrige (1976, p. 411), while speaking of the increase in union power at the expense of the faculty senates, concluded that "the senates and other mechanisms of governance are fragile, and if not protected and supported, they will be destroyed by the political winds sweeping the campus."

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

In order to ascertain if in fact there were means of inclusion of the nonacademic staff and to what extent it was present in the governance of higher education, a preliminary survey was made of 86 major colleges and universities (Appendix A) throughout the United States of which at least one sample was taken from each of the 50 states. The survey asked if that particular college or university did or did not have a non-academic organization as part of the governance system and, if there was such an organization, a copy of the constitution was requested. Of the 79 institutions which replied, 38 percent included the nonacademic staff in a formal method of recognition, 11 percent included the nonacademic staff in a very limited and informal manner, and 48 percent did not recognize staff contributions in the decision-making process.

This survey was evidently the first ever undertaken to attempt to determine the extent of style of participatory decision-making as it affects the nonacademic staff. Because of the significant number of positive replies, the principal study was developed to include a questionnaire which would be used to determine the acceptance and practice of participatory decision-making involving the nonacademic staff in colleges and universities.

The principal questionnaire was based on seven principles which tested for the collegial philosophy at each institution. The principles

were collected from various professional journals and for the most part were reported as applicable to governance by faculty and students. Although certain words were deleted or changed, the basic philosophy was left intact and used to test for applicability to the nonacademic staff. Secondary questions to each principle were used in order to determine how the principle was implemented. The basic writings, their authors, and the altered principles are found in Appendix B.

Names and addresses of institutions were obtained from the Education Directory and the first mailing of questionnaires took place on June 1, 1979. Depending upon the size of student enrollment, the questionnaire, along with the cover letter, was sent to either a director of personnel, vice president, or president. On July 2, 1979, a second mailing was sent to those who had not responded. The questionnaire and correspondence are found in Appendix C and the return rate is found in Table I.

The respondents were asked to answer the questionnaire in the context as the questions applied to the nonacademic staff at their college or university. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was included with each questionnaire. The respondents were assured of anonymity outside the collection of the raw data and at no place within this thesis is mentioned any specific administrator or institution other than those institutions responding to the preliminary questionnaire.

Data Collection

The description of the population and the techniques used to sample the population will be discussed first. The procedure used to solicit

TABLE I
STRATIFIED POPULATION, REQUIRED SAMPLE SIZE, AND RETURN RATES FOR
THE PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

	Population	Sample Size	Return Rate		Total Return Rate (%)
			June 1 Sending	July 2 Sending	
Private Research Universities	65	39	14	6	51%
Public Research Universities	108	51	26	15	80%
Private Comprehensive Colleges	143	58	23	10	57%
Public Comprehensive Colleges	304	73	41	11	71%
Private Liberal Arts Colleges	688	84	33	14	56%
Public Liberal Arts Colleges	28	22	12	3	68%

responses and the analysis of the data in detail conclude the chapter.

Population

The population for this study consisted of 1,336 colleges and universities throughout the United States. In order to separate any secondary effects due to type or style of institution, stratified random samples were taken from private and public doctoral granting research universities, private and public comprehensive and private and public liberal arts colleges. Samples were drawn from a classification of institution of higher education published by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education Report of 1973.

Statistical equations were used to determine sample size. Assuming infinite population, sample size $n = (z/e)^2(p)(1 - p)$ where z = the z score corresponding to a given confidence level, e = the proportion of sampling error, and p = the estimated proportion of largest possible selection of cases in the population. Using the 95 percent confidence level, the z equals 1.96 and the proportion of tolerance of error e acceptable was taken to be plus or minus .10. Thus, the formula used was $n = (1.96/.10)^2(.5)(1 - .5)$.

Because there was a finite population, a correction factor was used to adjust n to the finite population estimate. The formula selected was

$$n' = \frac{n \times N_1}{n + N_1 - 1}$$

where n' = the actual sample size, n = the sample size needed from an infinite population, and N_1 = the entire population of the stratified sample. Thus, the method for determining the sample size for each variable was as follows: First, determine the sample based on infinite

population, $n = (z/e)^2(p)(1 - p)$. Second, correct for the finite population

$$n' = \frac{n \times N_1}{n + N_1 - 1}.$$

The finite population of all colleges and universities tested was 1,336.

Sample Size Calculations

Private doctoral granting institutions population = 65

$$n = (1.96/.10)^2(.5)(1 - .5) = 96.04$$

$$n' = \frac{96.04 \times 65}{96.04 + 65 - 1} = 39 \text{ institutions to be sampled.}$$

Public doctoral granting institutions population = 108

$$n' = \frac{96.04 \times 108}{96.04 + 108 - 1} = 51 \text{ institutions to be sampled.}$$

Private comprehensive colleges population = 143

$$n' = \frac{96.04 \times 143}{96.04 + 143 - 1} = 58 \text{ institutions to be sampled.}$$

Public comprehensive colleges population = 304

$$n' = \frac{96.04 \times 304}{96.04 + 304 - 1} = 73 \text{ institutions to be sampled.}$$

Private liberal arts colleges population = 688

$$n' = \frac{96.04 \times 688}{96.04 + 688 - 1} = 84 \text{ institutions to be sampled.}$$

Public liberal arts colleges population = 28

$$n' = \frac{96.04 \times 28}{96.04 + 28 - 1} = 22 \text{ institutions to be sampled.}$$

Table I shows the number within the stratified population, the required sample size, and the return rates for the principal questionnaire.

Questionnaire Validity

The content validity of the questionnaire was established by the consensual or jury method. Copies of the questionnaire were distributed to all four members of the Doctoral Committee. Each member was asked to determine whether the questions being asked would, in fact, solicit the kind of information needed in the study. Committee suggestions and changes in format or items were incorporated in the final instrument.

Assumptions

This study collected information through a questionnaire and several assumptions were made.

1. It was assumed that administrators would in fact return a seemingly meaningful questionnaire if they had an opportunity to complete it.
2. It was assumed that an administrator's work load would be less just after spring commencement and prior to summer sessions and, therefore, would allow more time for consideration of the questionnaire.
3. It was assumed that the promise of anonymity would increase the probability of a factual return.

Limitations

The study took into account several limitations which might affect the research data. Although the knowledge of the participants was assumed, certain limitations were placed on their personal biases.

Data Analysis Procedures

As the instruments were returned, they were dated and sorted according to type of college or university. Each instrument was examined for items not answered and comments which were written by the respondent.

In order to recognize the data for analysis, they were arranged by code as follows:

1. 1-1 . . . Private doctoral granting research universities.
2. 1-2 . . . Public doctoral granting research universities.
3. 2-1 . . . Private comprehensive colleges.
4. 2-2 . . . Public comprehensive colleges.
5. 3-1 . . . Private liberal arts colleges.
6. 3-2 . . . Public liberal arts colleges.

These data are hereafter referred to by code, and those questions concerning the legality of participatory decision making, size of nonacademic staff, and union representation were determined to be the independent variables.

The principles were designated as P_1 , P_2 , P_3 , P_4 , P_5 , P_6 , and P_7 . Questions concerning implementation followed each principle. These items were determined to yield independent variables.

The Chi-square statistic was used to test for differences among or between groups of the independent variables. This test is most appropriate for nominal level data.

The statistical package used at the Oklahoma State University Computer Center to generate percentage and Chi-square analysis was the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). The level of statistical significance was set at .05.

In order to determine the level of significance between independent means and, thus, establish level of confidence of the answers on the principles, the Z-test was applied. Those items having a level of .10 or more were rejected, therefore, accepting the alternate hypothesis of $M_1 = M_2$. The results of these analysis procedures are reported in Chapter IV.

The data presented are the result of the test on a set of seven principles, between types, size, code, union or nonunion affiliation of both classified and nonclassified employees, and institutional ownership. Secondary comparisons were made in order to attempt to determine by what manner the institutions might implement their shared authority.

Definitions

In order to organize the data for analysis, the following definitions are summarized for clarity:

Code:

Private doctoral granting research universities

Public doctoral granting research universities

Private comprehensive colleges

Public comprehensive colleges

Private liberal arts colleges

Public liberal arts colleges

Types:

Doctoral granting research universities

Comprehensive colleges

Liberal arts colleges

Size:

Size of the full-time nonacademic staff of

100 or less

100 to 500

500 to 1,500

1,500 or more

Ownership:

Private college or university

Public college or university

Unionization:

Colleges or universities which have unions representing those employees who are not exempt from overtime pay as mandated by federal guidelines (Classified Employees).

Colleges or universities which have unions representing those nonacademic employees who are exempt from the overtime pay provisions as mandated by federal guidelines (Administrative and Professional Employees).

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

An analysis of the data collected is presented in three sections in this chapter. The data presented in Section One pertains to Hypothesis 1: A set of principles dealing with university governance does not apply to the nonacademic staffs of institutions of higher education. The generated data were an indication of how the principles were perceived by a member of the administrative staff at each institution.

The principles were analyzed individually for their acceptance or rejection. The statistic used to determine the confidence of the valid response of each principle was the Z-test with a confidence level set at the .10 level. The Chi-square statistical analysis was used to determine significant differences between the institutional variables and the specific principle. The level of significance of the Chi-square was set at the .05 level.

The data presented in Section Two pertains to Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between the various types, sizes, or ownership of institutions of higher education and union affiliation of classified or administrative and professional nonacademic staff employees. The question of unionization of personnel relates to the collegial concept of participatory decision-making, thus those institutions which have union representation have a built-in mechanism for means of communication while those institutions which have no union affiliation have lines of

communication only by invitation. The data presented in this section is not perceived information from an administrator, but is factual data taken from the questionnaire.

Section Three pertains to Hypothesis 3: There are presently no formal means of participation for the nonacademic staff in the university governance system. The data presented is not perceived information but resulted from a factual response taken from the questionnaire.

Section One

Principle 1: The system of governance should provide for open lateral communication to the highest level in the administrative hierarchical chain where the particular concern would receive final disposition.

Table II (Appendix D) shows that Principle 1 was accepted by all of the institutional variables as valid at the 90 percent confidence interval. The range in acceptance was from a high of 96.8 percent which represented private comprehensive colleges to a low of 73.2 percent representing the public doctoral granting research universities.

The data presented in Table IV (Appendix D) indicates that there is a significant difference between types of institutions in their acceptance of Principle 1. Comprehensive colleges tend to accept the principle more so than liberal arts colleges or doctoral granting research universities. The data from Table IV affirms the data from Table II in indicating that although all of the instructional variables agree to the validity of Principle 1, there may be differences among types of institutions in how well Principle 1 is accepted.

The subquestion of Principle 1, dealing with the highest level of authority permitted by administrators for lateral communications, is

presented in Table V (Appendix D) and notes that there may be a slight trend for doctoral granting research universities to limit the lines of communication to the vice president level. However, the data might be misleading because of the sparse data limiting the validity of the test. The total percentage column in Table V indicates that 85.12 percent of the respondents have lines of communication at the president level. There was no significant difference in the subquestion of Principle 1 among types of institutions and the means of communication through either an independent nonacademic council or a faculty senate. All three types of institutions favor an independent council as the preferred means of communication.

Principle 2: The system of governance should provide separate but equal means of representation for its various constituencies.

The data presented in Table II (Appendix D) shows that a majority of all respondents believed in the validity of Principle 2. The public liberal arts colleges tend to accept the validity of the principle with a 78.6 percent agreement while the private doctoral granting research university had a validity factor of 55.6 percent. Although the principle was accepted by all institutions tested, the private doctoral granting research university and the private comprehensive college variables did fall outside the 90 percent confidence interval set by the Z-test as noted in Table III (Appendix D).

There were no significant differences between any of the institutional variables tested in their acceptance of Principle 2, nor of the subquestion dealing with constituency representation. There was strong agreement that all campus constituencies should have equal means of representation in the governance system.

Principle 3: The system of governance should provide a means to unify a staff representation in order to insure accountability of staff as well as to utilize their knowledge and skills.

Table II (Appendix D) shows that Principle 3 was accepted by all of the institutional variables tested. According to Table III (Appendix D), public liberal arts colleges believed the strongest in the validity of the principle with 86.7 percent agreeing while public doctoral granting research universities agreed with the validity 70.0 percent.

According to Table III, those institutions which have union affiliation of their administrative and professional employees fell outside the 90 percent confidence interval. Thus, although this particular variable shows that better than 90 percent of those questioned agreed that the principle will be accepted as valid, a less than 90 percent chance indicates that the answers possibly would not be the same on another sampling.

The subquestion of Principle 3 deals with the either elected or appointed representation to councils or committees in order to avail the nonacademic staff in utilizing their knowledge and skills in the governance system and Table VI (Appendix D) reports that there was a significant difference between institutional ownership and the means of representation. The data indicates that public institutions have more of a tendency to allow elected representation rather than by appointment. Private institutions have a tendency to have the administration appoint representatives to the governance system.

According to Table VII (Appendix D), there is a significant difference between the coded institutions in the means of representation. Both public and private comprehensive colleges and public liberal arts

colleges tend to allow for representation by means of election while both the private and public doctoral granting research universities and the private liberal arts colleges tend to allow representation by administrative appointment.

All other institutional variables tested yielded no significant differences to the subquestion of Principle 3.

Principle 4: The system of governance should provide a democratic and equitable approach to the concerns of tokenism, paternalism, unequal representation, snobbery, and welfare politics.

This principle had less support for validity than any other of the seven principles. Although it was supported by better than 50 percent of all institutions queried, it failed to gain support by institutions whose administrative and professional staff had union affiliation. The data presented in Table II (Appendix D) notes that the doctoral granting research universities had less of a tendency to accept the principle while the comprehensive colleges accepted the validity at a higher percentage. Private institutions accepted the validity more so than public institutions and this was reflected in the institutional coded data where the private comprehensive colleges accepted the validity more so than any other institutional variable.

The data from Table II also points out a critical analysis in the comparison of institutional staff size. The smaller the size of the staff then the higher the percentage of acceptance of validity. Likewise, if the staff is nonunion then the validity is more acceptable while if the staff is union it is less acceptable.

While the principle may be accepted by all of the institutional variables, the data in Table III (Appendix D) shows that the level of

confidence acceptable for responses at the 90 percent confidence interval reflect a tendency for several variables to fall outside the level of acceptance.

There were no significant differences between any of the institutional variables in the acceptance or rejection of Principle 4. However, in dealing with the method of implementing the principle, there was a significant difference in the subquestion as it relates to the democratic and equitable approach taken by institutions who have classified non-academic staff represented by union affiliation. Table VIII (Appendix D) shows a significant difference between institutions who are unionized and those who have no union affiliation in how they implement Principle 4. Institutions who have unions tend to have one area of representation controlling the actions of a council while institutions who have non-union affiliation tend to have a more collegial approach in having upper level administration acting only as a liason relationship to the non-academic council. The data in Table VIII also notes that nonunion institutions have a tendency for administrators to give equal consideration to all councils while unionized institutions are less prone to give equal considerations.

Principle 5: The system of governance should provide a means whereby boards or administrators should plan with their staff, not for them.

Table II (Appendix D) shows that Principle 5 was accepted by all institutions tested. Not only was it strongly accepted by high level administrators, but also the level of confidence shown in the responses were all above the 90 percent confidence level as noted in Table III (Appendix D). Likewise, there were no significant differences between

institutional variables in the acceptance of the validity of the principle nor any significant differences in the subquestion as to how the principle might be implemented.

Table IX (Appendix D) notes, however, that the principle might be well accepted but that either it is not implemented or it tends to be done by some informal means.

Principle 6: The system of governance should provide an openness of spirit to challenge and question the relativity of administration's stance.

According to Table II (Appendix D), the validity of Principle 6 was accepted by all institutions tested. All of the public liberal arts colleges which returned the questionnaire accepted the validity of the principle. According to Table III (Appendix D), the level of acceptance of the principles were all above the 90 percent confidence level.

Table X (Appendix D) does indicate a significant difference between institutions in the degree of validity acceptance. The data shows that liberal arts colleges tend to accept the validity more so than do the doctoral granting research universities. There were no significant differences between institutional variables and the subquestion which deals with the implementation of Principle 6 into the governance system. There was, however, a strong indication that most institutions of higher education tend to allow their administration's stance be questioned not by any formal constituted means but rather by some administrative gesture.

Principle 7: The system of governance should provide a means whereby a relative autonomous administration would be held accountable to its campus constituencies.

The data presented in Table II (Appendix D) shows that this principle was accepted as valid by all institutional variables. Comprehensive colleges tend to accept the principle more so than other types of institutions and private ownership has a very slight edge in percentage acceptance over public ownership. This is also shown in the institutional coded data in that private comprehensive colleges accept the validity over all other codes.

Table III (Appendix D) notes that responses to the administrative and professional staff union affiliation do not fall within the 90 percent confidence interval. Thus, all variables tested agreed upon the validity of the principle but care should be exercised in acceptance of the variable dealing with unionization of the administrative and professional nonacademic staff.

Table XI (Appendix D) shows that significant differences do exist between ownership of institutions in how they implement the means of incorporating the nonacademic staff in the governance system relative to Principle 7. The data showed that public institutions tend to show accountability through formal councils while private institutions prefer to utilize campus wide committees for showing accountability.

Institutions of higher education which have no union affiliation have a tendency to prefer campus wide committees as their means of showing accountability to the various campus constituencies. This data is found in Table XII (Appendix D) which dealt with the subquestion of Principle 7. Thus, public institutions and those institutions whose administrative and professional employees have no union affiliation tend to show administrative accountability by campus wide committees rather than by any formal council effort.

Analysis

All seven principles were accepted as valid by all of the institutions tested by the questionnaire. Table II (Appendix D) shows that when the principles were tested against all variables only those institutions of higher education whose administrative and professional nonacademic staff had union affiliation showed less support on only Principle 3. Although Table III (Appendix D) indicates that several of the variables had responses that were below the confidence level of 90 percent, by far the majority were well above the arbitrary confidence interval. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 (which states that principles dealing with university governance do not apply to the nonacademic staff) is rejected.

Section Two

Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between the various types, sizes, or ownership of institutions of higher education and unionization of classified or administrative and professional nonacademic staff employees.

The data from this section were analyzed according to the variables of type, size, and ownership of institutions of higher education. Institutional coding data was used when necessary to explain relationships between variables. The data in this section is factual information and the statistical analysis used was the Chi-square.

Types of Institutions

The data reported in Table XIII (Appendix D) showed that doctoral granting research universities had a strong tend toward affiliation

of the nonacademic classified staff with union representation. Over 48 percent of this type of institution reported that their classified staff were unionized. The comprehensive colleges had almost one-third of their classified staff unionized while the liberal arts colleges had less than seven percent under union representation. Table XIII points out the significant differences shown by types of institutions and the tendency for unionization of the classified staff.

There were no significant differences between types of institution and the union affiliation of the administrative and professional non-academic staff. In no case were there more than 13 percent of the institutions of higher education by type who had union representation of the administrative and professional nonacademic staff as shown in Table XIV (Appendix D).

Size

As shown in Table XV (Appendix D), there were significant differences in the size of the labor force of institutions of higher education and union affiliation of the classified nonacademic staff. The data indicated a trend of unionization paralleling increasing size.

Table XVI (Appendix D) shows the same trend for the administrative and professional nonacademic staff and union affiliation by size of institution labor force. The data showed a significant difference where the larger the size of the labor force then the higher the probability for unionization of the staff.

Ownership

Institutions of private ownership showed a significant difference in

relation to union affiliation of the classified nonacademic staff than those of public ownership. The data, which is taken from Table XVII (Appendix D), show public institutions tended to have union affiliation by the classified nonacademic staff more so than from private ownership.

Data taken from Table XVIII (Appendix D) show that the same trend also existed for the administrative and professional nonacademic staff. Although the percentage of union representation may not be as high as the classified staff, there was a significant difference between ownership and unionization. Public institutions had more union representation than private institutions of higher education.

Code

In order to show the relationship between type and ownership, the data were analyzed by institutional code. Table XIX (Appendix D) shows a significant difference among the various institutional codes and the unionization of the classified nonacademic staff. Public comprehensive colleges and both private and public doctoral granting research universities had a strong tendency to have the classified staff represented by unions while the private comprehensive colleges and both the private and public liberal arts colleges had a strong tendency to not have union representation by the classified staff. As shown in Table XX (Appendix D), most institutions did not have the administrative and professional nonacademic staff unionized. There is, however, a significant difference among institutions in union affiliation. Table XX notes a significant difference with public doctoral granting research universities and public comprehensive colleges showing a trend toward

union affiliation while all other institutional codes showed a trend toward nonunion affiliation.

Analysis

There were relationships between various types, sizes, and ownership of institutions of higher education and union affiliation of the non-academic staff personnel. Doctoral granting research universities, institutions which had larger sized labor forces, and institutions which had public ownership all tended to have labor union affiliation with the nonacademic classified staff.

Variables which affected unionization of the administrative and professional nonacademic staff were size and ownership. Institutions with large sized labor forces and institutions which were publicly owned had a tendency to have the administrative and professional nonacademic staff represented by unions. Thus, Hypothesis 2 (which states that there is no relationship between the various types, sizes, or ownership of institutions of higher education and unionization of classified or administrative and professional nonacademic staff employees) is rejected.

Section Three

Hypothesis 3: There are presently no formal means of participation for the nonacademic staff in the university governance system.

Data collected from the preliminary study indicated that there were in fact formally constituted nonacademic staff advisory councils which were incorporated into the institution governance system. Table XXI (Appendix D) represents the data collected from that preliminary study and shows that of the 79 institutions questioned, 38 percent indicated

that the nonacademic staff were included as a formal recognized council in the decision-making process of the institution.

Because the data taken from Table XXI might be questioned for its validity, several key questions were included in the principal questionnaire which indicated whether the tested institutions of higher education provided a means of planning systems of councils for the incorporation of the nonacademic staff into the decision-making process within the governance system of the institution.

As shown in Table XXII (Appendix D), 38 percent of all institutions tested had a formally constituted nonacademic council while 44 percent had some means of informal communication for staff planning.

Institutional variables were analyzed to determine if there were any legal or governing board policies which prohibited the nonacademic staff to have formal input to the decision-making process. Regardless of the type or size of institution, there were no significant differences and in no case were there more than 10 percent of institutional type or size which prohibited a formal staff organization.

However, Table XXIII (Appendix D) does show a significant difference in governing board or legal policies prohibiting staff involvement by ownership. Public institutions tended to restrict the nonacademic staff while private colleges and universities have less tendency to restrict staff involvement in the decision-making process. Even though there may be significant differences between the styles of ownership, the data clearly indicate that most institutions of higher education do not have any legal or governing board policies which might prohibit the inclusion of the nonacademic staff in the means of governance.

Table XXIV (Appendix D) also shows a significant difference in legal or governing board policies toward staff involvement. The table points out that if the classified nonacademic staff had labor union affiliation then institutions of higher education have a tendency to restrict their involvement in the governance process. Table XXV (Appendix D) deals with the administrative and professional nonacademic staff and it also points out that if labor union affiliation is present then a significant difference does take place in the role of permitting the administrative and professional staff in the college or university governance system.

Analysis

Based upon the findings of this study, most institutions of higher education do not have legal or governing board policies which would deny the nonacademic staff the opportunity to be included in the college or university governance system. There are approximately 38 percent of the institutions in the United States which do have some form of a formal constituted nonacademic council which is involved in the decision-making process. There may be a tendency for public institutions to have a greater restriction by legal means than private institutions. Likewise, these colleges or universities that have the nonacademic staff affiliated with labor union representation also tend to have legal or governing board policies which would not permit access to the decision-making process.

However, both the preliminary and the principal study data point out that approximately one-third of the institutions of higher education allow means for formal participation for the nonacademic staff in the university governance system. Thus, Hypothesis 3, which states that

there are presently no formal means of participation for the nonacademic staff in the university governance system, is rejected.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

Principle 1 was accepted by all institutions tested; thus, showing that most respondents in this study believed that systems of governance should provide a means for open lateral communication to the highest level in the administrative hierarchial chain where the particular concern would receive final disposition.

There were some differences among institutions in how well they perceive Principle 1 to be valid. Administrators from comprehensive colleges tended to agree with the principle, more so than administrators from liberal arts colleges and doctoral granting research universities. Neither ownership nor size of the institution had any affect on the perceived validity and, regardless of union affiliation of any of the nonacademic staff, there were no differences in the acceptance of Principle 1.

Most institutions have open lines of communication to the president of the college or university for concerns which affect the nonacademic staff. Most doctoral granting research universities have those lines of communication to the vice-president level.

There were no significant differences among any of the institutional variables in instrumenting the means of how the communication was relayed. Fifty percent of the institutions of higher education utilized

an independent council as a method of providing lateral communication to the highest level in the hierarchial chain.

Principle 2 was accepted by all institutions tested as a valid principle. Most administrators perceived that their institutions provided a separate but equal means of representation for its various campus constituencies. The public liberal arts colleges tended to accept the principle more so than the private doctoral granting research universities.

The majority of institutions believed that governance representation was afforded to all of the constituencies on an equal basis. That faculty, nonacademic staff, and students were included in the decision-making process in a separate but equal representation.

Principle 3 is considered valid by most administrators in higher education in how the form of governance is used as a means of unifying staff representation and, thus, ensures accountability as well as a means of utilizing their knowledge and skills. In order to incorporate the nonacademic staff into the governance system, it becomes necessary to either legitimize it by democratic election or by administrative appointment. Most private institutions preferred to appoint representatives to the decision-making process while the majority of public institutions have elected staff members representing their accountability.

Even though there were some differences among institutions in the means of representation, most institutions (with the exception of private doctoral granting research universities) had a method of accountability--a democratically elected representation.

Principle 4 dealt with systems of governance in providing a democratic and equitable approach to the concerns of tokenism, paternalism,

unequal representation, snobbery, and welfare politics. Most administrators in this study agreed that governance should be democratic and take equitable approaches in dealing with staff concerns. The only support that was clearly defined as not acceptable came from those institutions where the administrative and professional staff had labor union representation.

There were differences among colleges and universities in the acceptance of the validity of the principle. Doctoral granting research universities did not accept the validity as well as did comprehensive colleges and universities. Institutions which had a smaller labor force accepted the principle more so than the larger institutions, and institutions that had no labor union affiliation accepted the validity at a higher percentage than those institutions that were unionized.

Most administrators in the study agreed that institutions of higher education had a democratic and equitable approach to governance and believed that faculty, staff, and student councils receive equal consideration on matters germane to all three councils. There were, however, differences between institutions that had labor union affiliation and those institutions that were nonunion. A more collegial mode of governance is present when labor union affiliation is absent and likewise when the nonacademic classified staff have labor union representation, then the approach becomes more autocratic with one area of representation controlling the actions of the council.

Principle 5 was strongly accepted as a valid principle of governance whereby boards or administrators should plan with their staff and not for them. A very high percentage of administrators in the study perceived their institutions as practicing this principle of collegiality.

Although institutions may strongly accept the principle, most did not practice it and those who did, implemented the principle by some informal means rather than by formal constituted councils. This principle is a good example of perception, and what actually takes place in terms of legitimacy of governance.

Principle 6 was accepted by administrators as valid and showed that governance systems should provide an openness of spirit to challenge and question the relativity of administration's stance. Liberal arts colleges accepted the principle more so than doctoral granting research universities and also tended to have a more open style of challenge by constituted means rather than by some administrative authority allowing input into the governance system only upon administrative request.

Principle 7 was shown to be valid by all institutions tested. The principle stated that systems of governance should provide a means whereby a relative autonomous administration would be held accountable to its campus constituencies. There were some differences among institutions in how well the principle was accepted with comprehensive and private colleges and universities tending to accept the validity more so than other types and ownership.

The means whereby administration is held accountable differs among institutions. Colleges and universities which are public, doctoral granting research universities, and those that have in excess of 1,500 full-time nonacademic staff employees, used formal councils as a mechanism of governance for accountability. Institutions other than those used campus-wide committees for the method of administrative accountability to the nonacademic staff.

If the nonacademic staff had no union affiliation, then campus-wide committees were generally used as a means of showing accountability. Otherwise, if the staff had labor union representation, then formal councils were the most common mechanism for administrative accountability. Those institutions that were doctoral granting research universities had a very strong tendency for unionization, institutions that were classed as comprehensive colleges had a slight trend toward unionization, and those colleges that were classed as liberal arts colleges had a strong tendency not to have unionization of the classified staff. Only 13 percent of the doctoral granting research universities, 12 percent of the comprehensive colleges, and 3 percent of the liberal arts colleges had labor union affiliation of the administrative and professional staff; while 48 percent of the doctoral granting research universities, 31 percent of the comprehensive colleges, and 6 percent of the liberal arts colleges had labor union affiliation of the classified nonacademic staff. As the size of labor force increased, then the percentage of labor union affiliation increased both for the classified as well as the administrative and professional nonacademic staff.

There was a relationship between the classified nonacademic staff that were represented by labor unions and ownership of the institution. Institutions of higher education that were privately owned had a tendency for nonunion representation of the classified staff, while public owned colleges and universities had a greater number of labor union affiliations. Although the same trend existed for the administrative and professional employees, the number of institutions having labor union representation was very small.

Many institutions of higher education provided both formal and informal means of participation for the nonacademic staff in the decision-making process of governance systems. Both the preliminary and the principal study showed that over one-third of the institutions of higher education had some means of formal participation. Legal or governing board policies which prohibited participation in governance was very minimal except for institutions that had labor union affiliation by the nonacademic staff.

There was a tendency for comprehensive colleges and universities to include the nonacademic staff in the decision-making process more so than doctoral granting research universities and liberal arts colleges.

Institutions of higher education that were under public domain and had a small labor force, had a tendency to include the nonacademic staff into the system of governance more so than any other category.

Concluding Statements

Based on the findings, several conclusions seem warranted. They are presented in this section as they were related to the three hypotheses. A set of seven principles dealing with university governance does apply to the nonacademic staff; there is a relationship between the various types, sizes, or ownership of institutions and the unionization of classified or administrative and professional nonacademic staff employees, and there are presently formal means of participation for the nonacademic staff in the university governance system.

First, perceived legitimacy of participatory decision-making in the governance of higher education is well documented. However, who is or should be included have not been adequately explored. For the most part,

the major emphasis of research and literature have been on faculty and student involvement in the governance process. This study concentrated on the perceived legitimacy of the nonacademic staff and their inclusion in governance systems of higher education.

Administrators included in this study made statistically significant discriminations among the three areas researched and the results confirm other studies which have involved the legitimacy of faculty and students in participatory governance.

Data presented in this study included both factual values and perceived responses of administrators in higher echelons of the hierarchical chain. In examining the data, it should be considered that this was an exploratory study into an area that yields personal biases, distrust of purpose, and fear of erosion of administrative responsibilities.

Second, with regard to issues, there was a sound basis for the concept of legitimacy of the nonacademic staff in the decision-making process of the governance systems in higher education. It was determined that the seven principles were valid. The paradox is that although most administrators in the study believed that the principles were valid for their institution, there were not many that incorporated the principles into their system of governance. This finding is important because the lack of formal recognition into the system indicates that administrators perceive their institutions as collegial in governance, but in fact may be operating a bureaucratic or even an autocratic model. This is not to imply that a legitimate role does not exist for the non-academic staff in participatory decision-making in any form of governance system. As the data indicated, there were institutions of various sizes,

types, and ownerships that had formal councils made up of all constituents of the college or university campus.

With regard to findings of institutional variables in relation to acceptance of principle validity, colleges and universities that have small labor forces tended to perceive legitimacy of the staffs' role in governance more so than institutions that had large labor forces. This finding may not necessarily be due to size alone but may have been caused by organizational design that profiles levels of administration in relation to the number of employees in a particular entity. Thus, institutions that are larger in size have more administrative levels than those institutions that are smaller. Therefore, communication and hence participation in decision-making becomes less as size increases.

As a type, liberal arts colleges tended to be more collegial in style in regard to the acceptance of the principles. This finding should be tempered with the relationship that exists with institutional size in that most liberal arts colleges do not have an overly large size labor force and, thus, it may be the causal effect of size rather than type of institution.

Institutional ownership cannot be detected as having any pronounced effect upon acceptance of the principles. Regardless, if the institution was under private ownership or responsible to the public domain, there was only an insignificant difference in the acceptance of the principles as a whole.

In regard to union affiliation and principle validity, an important finding related to legitimization of the nonacademic staff role in governance was detected. Administrators tested were more lenient in their perception of legitimacy for the classified staff than they were

for the administrative and professional staff. This finding was important as it helped explain the disproportionate number of institutions that had labor union affiliation by the classified staff as compared to the number of institutions that had labor union affiliation by the administrative and professional staff.

It would have to be concluded that this set of principles, as perceived by administrators in higher education, are a relatively legitimate means of determining the role of the nonacademic staff in the governance processes which allows at least some feeling of involvement in influencing decisions.

Third, generalizations about nonacademic staff's affiliation with labor unions and the relationship to various types, sizes, or ownership of institutions of higher education are warranted. The pattern of labor union affiliation does differ among types of colleges and universities and seem to reflect the effect of size. While there are clear indications that doctoral granting research universities have greater staff unionization than liberal arts colleges, it may be that this is correlated to institutional size.

This finding does have implications for the legitimization of including the nonacademic staff in the governance system. As organizations increase in size, there is a decrease in lateral communication to the highest level of authority and, thus, decisional deprivation becomes more evident. Previous research has correlated decisional deprivation with favorable disposition toward strikes, unions, and collective bargaining.

Fourth, the results of the present study support the collegial model of governance in that there were formally constituted councils which

represented the nonacademic staff in the decision-making process. The research showed that there were few institutions of higher education that had legal or governing board policies that prohibited staff from having input into the decision-making structures.

Perhaps the most intriguing result obtained from this study was the lack of any information regarding the existence of participatory decision-making that included the nonacademic staff. Both in the preliminary and principal study, a large number of inquiries were received from administrators of institutions that did have nonacademic councils wanting to know the names of other institutions that did incorporate their staff in the governance process. Both faculty and students have national recognition for organizations that are a part of the governance system, but the nonacademic staff does not have any such recognition.

This finding has implication to the legitimacy of the nonacademic staff being involved in the governance of higher education. This constituency of campus staff is presently being recognized by 38 percent of institutions of higher education as a legitimate segment of the quadri-cameral system of the governance structure. The perplexing problem is that few administrators in the study were aware that other institutions of higher education had similar methods of permitting a universal desirability of increased participation in decision-making.

Recommendation for Further Study

This study will have value if it stimulates further research in the area of personnel management in insitutions of higher education. Some areas that may be considered include the following:

1. What should be the role of the nonacademic staff in university governance?
2. What are the alternatives for the nonrepresented nonacademic staff in decisional participation?
3. Is there alienation of faculty and nonacademic staff to conditions of deprivation of unequal participation in university governance?

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine the involvement of the nonacademic staff in the decision-making role in colleges and universities. The study was based on the concept of the collegial model of governance which would include administration, faculty, staff, and students in the decision-making process.

The hypotheses tested were related to the data gathered from the questionnaire, both in terms of response of perceived and factual values and processes. The data were considered in relation to the variables of institutional type, size, ownership, institutional codes, and union affiliation.

Hypothesis 1 stated that a set of principles dealing with university governance does not apply to the nonacademic staff. It was rejected. The principles were all accepted as valid and, thus, gave a reasonable measure of the perceived legitimacy for the acceptance of the nonacademic staff's role in the systems of governance in higher education.

Hypothesis 2 stated that there is no relationship between the various types, sizes, or ownership of institutions of higher education and unionization of classified or administrative and professional nonacademic staff employees. It was rejected. There are relationships among types of institutions and the unionization of the classified but not the administrative and professional employees, public institutions tend to have

labor unions more so than private institutions, and the increasing size of the institutions' labor force has a positive relationship to labor union affiliation.

Hypothesis 3 stated that there are presently no formal means of participation for the nonacademic staff in the university governance system. It was rejected. Approximately one-third of the institutions of higher education include the nonacademic staff in the decision-making process of the governance system by some means of a formally constituted council.

Most administrators in the study perceived institutions of higher education to be open and democratic as indicative of the collegial mode of university governance, but in reality the data did not support that perception.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alutto, Joseph A. and James A. Belasro. "A Typology for Participation in Organizational Decision Making." Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1972), pp. 117-125.
- American Association of University Professors. "Statements on Colleges and Universities." Policy Documents and Reports (1973), pp. 35-39.
- American Association of University Professors. "Student Participation in College and University Government: A Report to Committee T." Policy Documents and Reports (1973), pp. 49-51.
- Baldrige, J. Victor and Frank R. Kemerer. "Academic Senates and Faculty Collective Bargaining." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLVII, No. 4 (1976), pp. 391-411.
- Brubacher, John S. and Willis Rudy. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
- Chaney, F. B. "Employee Participation in Manufacturing Job Design." Human Factors, Vol. 11 (1969), pp. 101-106.
- Corson, John J. "Institutional Governance Within a System." Educational Record, Vol. 54 (1973), pp. 107-114.
- Corson, John J. The Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1960.
- Drew, Clifford J. Introduction to Designing Research and Evaluation. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby Co., 1976.
- Hazelbeck, Robert E. "Toward an Optimum Decision-Making Structure in Colleges." Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 6 (1973), pp. 3-14.
- Ikenberry, Stanley O. "Restructuring the Governance of Higher Education." A.A.U.P. Bulletin, Vol. 56 (1970), pp. 371-374.
- Katz, D. and R. Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Keeton, Morris. Shared Authority on Campus. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.

- Koehler, Jerry C., Karl W. E. Anatol, and Ronald L. Applebaum. Organizational Communication Behavioral Perspectives. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Book Company, 1976.
- Mix, Marjorie C. "The 'Other Professionals' in University Governance." Educational Record, Vol. 53 (1972), pp. 331-336.
- Mustan, R. A. "Governance Changes are Catching Colleges by Surprise." College and University Business, Vol. 49 (1969), p. 29.
- Patchen, Martin. Participation, Achievement, and Involvement on the Job. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Book Co., 1970.
- Sanders, Irwin T. "The University as a Community." In: The University as an Organization, James A. Perkins (Ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1973, p. 69.
- Shaffer, Jay C. "Students in the Policy Process." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 41 (1970), pp. 341-349.
- Sturner, William F. "University Governance Through the Bicameral Legislature." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 42 (1971), pp. 219-228.
- Sutherland, Elizabeth. "Nonacademic Personnel and University Governance." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, Vol. 24 (1973), pp. 60-84.
- Tenboer, Marlin H. "A Study of the Extent and Impact of Organized Labor in Colleges and Universities." The Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, Vol. 22 (1970), pp. 27-73.
- Wilson, Logan. "Changing University Governance." Educational Research, Vol. 50, No. 4 (1969), pp. 388-404.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PRELIMINARY CORRESPONDENCE


OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER 74074

Department of Agronomy

 Office of the Superintendent
 405-624-7036

Agronomy Research Station

September 5, 1978

Dear Sir:

With the exception of those colleges and universities that have employee union representation, the nonacademic staff generally has very little voice in determining rules and regulations affecting conditions of employment. A possible alternative to union representation is the establishment of a method of internal communication in order to relate concerns and advisement to the highest administrative level.

This may be done by a staff advisory council which would be a representative body of nonacademic staff employees who are part of a tri-cameral governance system. This is a relatively new concept in the decision-making process within the philosophy of "shared authority" and one which I am currently researching as a means for better communication of mutual concerns among university staffs. It appears that this model of collegial governance would allow a competent and dedicated staff to share their knowledge and skills with faculty and student councils in advising the president in a very effective manner.

In order to determine to what extent this model has been accepted, I would appreciate an acknowledgment if your college does or does not have a nonacademic staff organization as part of your governance system. If you do have such an organization, I would appreciate a copy of its constitution or articles of incorporation.

Sincerely,

 Harold R. Myers, Chairman
 Staff Advisory Council
 Superintendent
 Agronomy Research Station

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER 74074**

Department of Agronomy

Agronomy Research Station

Office of the Superintendent
405-624-7036

November 6, 1978

Attention: Director of Personnel

Dear Sir:

On September 5, 1978, I mailed a letter to 80 of the more prestigious colleges and universities in the United States inquiring if their institution had a governance system which included a non-academic staff organization.

There has been a great deal of interest with over a 70 percent return on my inquiry along with numerous constitutions or statements of purpose. As of this date, I have not yet received a reply from your institution and would like very much to include you in the research data.

In case the letter was lost or misssent, I am enclosing the body of the original letter for clarification.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Myers, Chairman
Staff Advisory Council
Superintendent
Agronomy Research Station

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPLES

Principle 1: The system of governance should provide for open lateral communication to the highest level in the administrative hierarchical chain where the particular concern would receive final disposition.

Keeton, Morris. Shared Authority on Campus. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1971, p. 36.

The system of governance of a campus should provide for a division of labor between policy making and managing, and between the board of trustees and other councils and committees. The system should provide effective means for constituencies to be heard and heeded at that level and focus where their particular concerns receive final disposition.

Principle 2: The system of governance should provide separate but equal means of representation for its various constituencies.

Sturner, William. "University Governance Through the Bicameral Legislature." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 43, No. 3 (1972), pp. 219-228.

Realism suggests that the university seek unity where possible and build mechanisms for consultation and common consent, while granting each group an identity of its own.

Principle 3: The system of governance should provide a means to unify its staff's representation in order to insure its accountability as well as utilize their knowledge and skills.

Mix, Marjorie C. "The 'Other Professionals' in University Governance." Education Record, Vol. 53, No. 4 (1972), pp. 333-336.

Two advantages are gained immediately into governance: First, as individuals, professional staff members have the skill and knowledge vital to continuance of the institution. Second, the effect of silent service is not only the loss of informed

opinion, but also the concomitant loss of allegiance which occurs when those who 'only work here' can say or do anything in performing their functions and not be accountable.

Principle 4: The system of governance should provide a democratic and equitable approach to the concerns of tokenism, paternalism, unequal representation, snobbery, and welfare politics.

Sutherland, Elizabeth. "Nonacademic Personnel and University Governance." The Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, Vol. 24, No. 1 (1972), pp. 11-49.

As such it will need to drop the last remaining vestiges of the kind of 'paternalistic' treatment it has historically afforded staff employees and move to a more democratic and equitable approach in its dealing with them.

Tokenism would be avoided with all its attendant psychic and political scars. Paternalism, unequal representation, snobbery and welfare politics may also fade under this new setup.

Principle 5: The system of governance should provide a means whereby boards or administrators should plan with their staffs, not for them.

Tenboer, Marlin H. "A Study of the Extent and Impact of Organized Labor in Colleges and Universities." The Journal of College and University Personnel Association, Vol. 23 (1970), pp. 27-73.

Recognition be made of the fact that democracy in education demands that staff services employees participate in campus governance, along with interest of diminishing the autocratic paternalism that has marked relations with the employees, that boards and administrators should plan with their employees, not for them.

Principle 6: The system of governance should provide an openness of spirit to challenge and question the relativity of administrations stance.

Smith, Baidwell and Robert Reita. "Authority, Shared and Increased."

Liberal Education, Vol. 56, No. 4 (1970), pp. 501-510.

The sharing of authority and power will serve to foster an openness of spirit which enables one to admit not only the relativity of his stance but the necessity of its being challenged and supplemented by others. Shared governance guarantees nothing: it simply affords new possibilities.

Principle 7: The system of governance should provide a means whereby its relatively autonomous administration would be held accountable to its campus constituencies.

Anderson, Carl. Unpublished, Oklahoma State University, 1978.

The relatively institutional autonomy owes some accountability to its employees. By means of shared governance within the institution, administration and staff have a direct line of communication not otherwise afforded.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACCOMPANYING CORRESPONDENCE

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER 74074**

Department of Agronomy

Agronomy Research Station

Office of the Superintendent
405-624-7036

June 1, 1979

In a previous survey of the style of governance of colleges and universities, it was learned that approximately 38 percent included the nonacademic staff in a formal means of recognition. Of the remaining fraction, 11 percent included the nonacademic staff only in a very limited and informal manner and the other 49 percent did not recognize staff contributions into the governance system.

It is recognized that the style of governance which may be used at any particular institution is dependent on many factors which may or may not be controlled by the institution's governing board. There are, however, certain established principles of the collegial governance mode which appear to be applicable to all employee constituencies of the institution. This survey will attempt to measure that applicability.

Your advice in this area of governance will be used in confidence. I have two purposes in mind. First, this information will serve as the basis for my Ed.D. dissertation and secondly, as part of the ongoing effort of our own Staff Advisory Council to understand and promote those ideas and concerns which aid in the betterment of service to the university community.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Myers, Chairman
Staff Advisory CouncilEnclosure
HRM/msh

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER 74074**

Department of Agronomy

Agronomy Research Station

Office of the Superintendent
405-624-7036

July 2, 1979

Dear Sir or Madam:

This letter is being written in reference to a questionnaire on university governance which was mailed on June 1, 1979.

Perhaps our letters have crossed in the mail and if that is the case then please let me express my appreciation to you for your kind help. In case the original questionnaire was lost or misplaced, please accept the replacement copy. Your helpful consideration in returning the questionnaire will certainly be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Myers, Superintendent
Agronomy Research Station

A Survey of the Role of the Nonacademic Staff in the Governance Process in Colleges and Universities

To aid in a better understanding of the survey, a glossary of certain terms is provided.

Governance: A system of which scholars, students, teachers, administrators, and trustees associated together in a college or university, establish and carry out the rules and regulations that minimize conflict, facilitate their collaboration, and preserve essential individual freedom.

Constituency: A group of individuals who have like concerns and are set apart from other groups by some defined reason. In this survey the term will apply to faculty, staff, and students.

Lateral Communication: Direct communication to any level of the hierarchy of administration.

Vertical Communication: Either in an upward or downward flow of communication through the chain of administrative hierarchy.

Nonexempt Employees: Those employees who are not exempt from overtime pay as mandated by federal guidelines. Examples are laborers, secretaries, custodians, and clerical workers.

Administrative and Professional Employees: Those employees exempt from the overtime pay provisions and who do not hold academic rank.

QUESTION #1

Approximate size of your nonacademic full time staff including nonexempt, administrative, and professional employees.

100 or less	100 - 500	500 - 1500	1500 or more
100 or less	100 - 500	500 - 1500	1500 or more

QUESTION #2

Is your nonacademic staff unionized?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No

Nonexempt Personnel Administrative and Professional

QUESTION #3

Are there legal or governing board policies which prohibit the nonacademic staff to have formal input to the decision-making process, as it affects these constituents?

☐ Yes ☐ No

QUESTION #4

Which of these principles are considered valid for philosophy of governance at your institution?

Principle #1 THE SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE SHOULD PROVIDE FOR OPEN LATERAL COMMUNICATION TO THE HIGHEST LEVEL IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE HIERARCHICAL CHAIN WHERE THE PARTICULAR CONCERN WOULD RECEIVE FINAL DISPOSITION.

☐ Valid ☐ Not Valid

Li it does then what is that highest level?

☐ Director of Personnel ☐ Vice President ☐ President

Is it by an independent council or by the Faculty Senate?

☐ Independent Council ☐ Faculty Senate

Principle #2 THE SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE SHOULD PROVIDE SEPARATE BUT EQUAL MEANS OF REPRESENTATION FOR ITS VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES.

☐ Valid

☐ Not Valid

If it does then who are the constituencies?

☐ Faculty

☐ Nonacademic Staff

☐ Students

Principle #3 THE SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE SHOULD PROVIDE A MEANS TO UNIFY A STAFF REPRESENTATION IN ORDER TO INSURE ACCOUNTABILITY OF STAFF AS WELL AS UTILIZE THEIR KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS.

☐ Valid

☐ Not Valid

If it does is it by a means of elected representation or by appointment?

☐ Elected

☐ Appointed

Principle #4 THE SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE SHOULD PROVIDE A DEMOCRATIC AND EQUITABLE APPROACH TO THE CONCERNS OF TOKENISM, PATERNALISM, UNEQUAL REPRESENTATION, SNOBBERY, AND WELFARE POLITICS.

☐ Valid

☐ Not Valid

If it does then is the democratic and equitable approach done by the following methods?

- ☐ (A) One area of representation controls the actions of the council.
- ☐ (B) Upper level administrators may act only in a liaison relationship to the council.
- ☐ (C) Faculty, staff, and student councils receive equal considerations on matters germane to all three councils.

Principle #5 THE SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE SHOULD PROVIDE A MEANS WHEREBY BOARDS OR ADMINISTRATORS SHOULD PLAN WITH THEIR STAFF, NOT FOR THEM.

☐ Valid

☐ Not Valid

If it does then is it by a formal constituted council or by some informal means?

☐ Formal Constituted Council

☐ Informal Means

Principle #6 THE SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE SHOULD PROVIDE AN OPENNESS OF SPIRIT TO CHALLENGE AND QUESTION THE RELATIVITY OF ADMINISTRATIONS STANCE.

☐ Valid

☐ Not Valid

If it does is the openness of spirit by a constituted means or by direction of the institutions highest administrative authority.

☐ Constituted Means

☐ Administrative Authority

Principle #7 THE SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE SHOULD PROVIDE A MEANS WHEREBY A RELATIVE AUTONOMOUS ADMINISTRATION WOULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE TO ITS CAMPUS CONSTITUENCIES.

☐ Valid

☐ Not Valid

If the administration is held accountable, through what mechanism of governance is it handled?

☐ Formal Councils

☐ Campus Wide Committees

APPENDIX D

TABLES

TABLE II

TABULATION OF RESPONSES INDICATING THE PRINCIPLES ARE VALID AS EXPRESSED IN PERCENTAGES

Institutional Variables	P ₁	P ₂	P ₃	P ₄	P ₅	P ₆	P ₇
Doctoral Granting Research University	75.4	65.0	74.6	57.4*	83.6	82.1	72.4
Comprehensive College	88.9	66.7	73.1	67.1	88.2	89.5	74.3
Liberal Arts College	91.7	76.3	79.7	64.8	91.8	96.6	69.0
Private Owned Institutions	90.6	67.0	78.5	66.3	90.5	93.1	72.7
Public Owned Institutions	81.1	70.9	72.8	61.1	85.4	86.4	71.6
Private Doctoral Research University	80.0	55.6*	84.2	62.5*	84.2	87.5	72.2
Public Doctoral Research University	73.2	69.1	70.0	55.3*	83.3	80.0	72.5
Private Comprehensive College	96.8	61.3*	76.7	67.9	93.3	92.9	81.5
Public Comprehensive College	84.0	70.2	70.8	66.7	84.8	87.5	70.2
Private Liberal Arts College	91.0	75.6	77.3	66.7	91.3	95.4	67.4
Public Liberal Arts College	93.3	78.6	86.7	60.0*	93.3	100.0	73.3
Staff Size 0 to 50	96.0	83.3	83.0	73.2	95.9	95.7	74.5
Staff Size 50 to 500	82.9	62.3	71.0	61.3	85.3	89.6	70.8
Staff Size 500 to 1,500	82.7	63.3	76.0	63.8	84.0	87.2	75.0

TABLE II (Continued)

Institutional Variables	P ₁	P ₂	P ₃	P ₄	P ₅	P ₆	P ₇
Staff Size 1,500 or More	80.0	71.0	73.3	53.6*	87.1	82.8	66.7
Classified Staff Unionized	89.5	73.2	71.4	59.6*	89.5	90.6	69.1
Classified Staff Non Union	83.9	66.9	77.5	65.1	87.8	89.6	72.9
Administrative and Professional Staff Unionized	89.5	66.7	63.2*	47.1*	85.0	84.2	57.9*
Administrative and Professional Staff Non Union	85.1	68.9	69.6	65.4	88.6	90.5	73.4

*Z value of .10 or more.

TABLE III
CONFIDENCE TABLE OF INSTITUTIONAL VARIABLES BY
PRINCIPLES AS EXPRESSED BY Z VALUES

Variable	Principle	n	Z Score
Private Doctoral Research University	1	20	.00
	2	18	.32
	3	19	.00
	4	16	.16
	5	19	.00
	6	16	.00
	7	18	.02
Public Doctoral Research University	1	41	.00
	2	42	.00
	3	40	.00
	4	38	.26
	5	42	.00
	6	40	.00
	7	40	.00
Private Comprehensive College	1	31	.00
	2	31	.10
	3	30	.00
	4	28	.02
	5	30	.00
	6	28	.00
	7	27	.00
Public Comprehensive College	1	50	.00
	2	47	.00
	3	48	.00
	4	42	.01
	5	46	.00
	6	48	.00
	7	47	.00
Private Liberal Arts College	1	45	.00
	2	45	.00
	3	44	.00
	4	39	.02
	5	46	.00
	6	43	.00
	7	43	.01

TABLE III (Continued)

Variable	Principle	n	Z Score
Public Liberal Arts College	1	15	.00
	2	14	.01
	3	15	.00
	4	15	.02
	5	15	.00
	6	15	.00
	7	15	.03
Private Ownership	1	96	.00
	2	94	.00
	3	93	.00
	4	83	.00
	5	95	.00
	6	87	.00
	7	88	.00
Public Ownership	1	106	.00
	2	103	.00
	3	103	.00
	4	95	.01
	5	103	.00
	6	103	.00
	7	102	.00
Administrative and Professional Staff Represented by Union	1	19	.00
	2	18	.08
	3	19	.13
	4	17	.41
	5	20	.00
	6	19	.00
	7	19	.25
Administrative and Professional Staff Non Union	1	181	.00
	2	177	.00
	3	175	.00
	4	159	.00
	5	176	.00
	6	169	.00
	7	169	.00
Classified Staff Represented by Union	1	57	.00
	2	56	.00
	3	56	.00
	4	47	.10
	5	57	.00
	6	53	.00
	7	55	.00

TABLE III (Continued)

Variable	Principle	n	Z Score
Classified Staff Non Union	1	143	.00
	2	139	.00
	3	138	.00
	4	129	.00
	5	139	.00
	6	135	.00
	7	133	.00
Doctoral Research University	1	61	.00
	2	60	.00
	3	59	.14
	4	54	.00
	5	61	.00
	6	56	.00
	7	58	.00
Comprehensive College	1	81	.00
	2	78	.00
	3	78	.00
	4	70	.00
	5	76	.00
	6	76	.00
	7	74	.00
Liberal Arts College	1	60	.00
	2	59	.00
	3	59	.00
	4	54	.01
	5	61	.00
	6	58	.00
	7	58	.00
Labor Force of 50 or Less	1	50	.00
	2	48	.00
	3	47	.00
	4	41	.00
	5	49	.00
	6	47	.00
	7	47	.00
Labor Force of 50 to 500	1	70	.00
	2	69	.02
	3	69	.00
	4	62	.04
	5	68	.00
	6	67	.00
	7	65	.00

TABLE III (Continued)

Variable	Principle	n	Z Score
Labor Force of 500 to 1,500	1	52	.00
	2	49	.03
	3	50	.00
	4	47	.03
	5	50	.00
	6	47	.00
	7	48	.00
Labor Force of 1,500 or More	1	30	.00
	2	31	.01
	3	30	.00
	4	28	.36
	5	31	.00
	6	29	.00
	7	30	.00

TABLE IV
VALIDITY OF PRINCIPLE 1 BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Valid	Not Valid	Total
Doctoral Research Granting University			
Frequency	46	15	61
Expected Cell	52.20	8.80	
Chi-Square	0.70	4.40	
Percent	22.77	7.43	30.20
Row Percent	75.41	24.59	
Column Percent	26.59	51.72	
Comprehensive College			
Frequency	72	9	81
Expected Cell	69.40	11.60	
Chi-Square	0.10	0.60	
Percent	35.64	4.46	40.10
Row Percent	88.89	11.11	
Column Percent	41.62	31.03	
Liberal Arts College			
Frequency	55	5	60
Expected Cell	51.40	8.60	
Chi-Square	0.30	1.50	
Percent	27.23	2.48	29.70
Row Percent	91.67	8.33	
Column Percent	31.79	17.24	
Total			
Number	173	29	202
Percent	85.64	14.36	100.00

Chi-square = 7.660, df = 4, probability = 0.0217.

TABLE V
ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL FOR LATERAL COMMUNICATION AS
ASSOCIATED WITH PRINCIPLE 1

	Director of Personnel	Vice President	President	Total
Doctoral Granting Research University				
Frequency	0	9	35	44
Expected Cell	1.30	5.20	37.50	
Chi-Square	1.30	2.70	0.20	
Percent	0.00	5.36	20.83	26.19
Row Percent	0.00	20.45	79.55	
Column Percent	0.00	45.00	24.48	
Comprehensive College				
Frequency	2	10	59	71
Expected Cell	2.10	8.50	60.4	
Chi-Square	0.00	0.30	0.00	
Percent	1.19	5.95	35.12	42.26
Row Percent	2.82	14.08	83.10	
Column Percent	40.00	50.00	41.26	
Liberal Arts College				
Frequency	3	1	49*	53
Expected Cell	1.60	6.30	45.10	
Chi-Square	1.30	4.50	0.30	
Percent	1.79	0.60	29.17	31.55
Row Percent	5.66	1.89	92.45	
Column Percent	60.00	5.00	34.27	
Total				
Number	5	20	143	168
Percent	2.98	11.90	85.12	100.00

Chi-square = 10.581, df = 4, probability = 0.0317. Table is so sparse that Chi-square may not be a valid test.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE VI
MEANS OF STAFF REPRESENTATION BY INSTITUTIONAL OWNERSHIP
AS ASSOCIATED WITH PRINCIPLE 3

	Representation by			Total
	Election	Appointed	Both	
Private Owned Institutions				
Frequency	29	31	12	72
Expected Cell	40.70	20.60	10.80	
Chi-Square	3.30	5.30	0.10	
Percent	19.73	21.09	8.16	48.98
Row Percent	40.28	43.06	16.67	
Column Percent	34.94	73.81	54.55	
Public Owned Institutions				
Frequency	54*	11	10	75
Expected Cell	42.30	21.40	11.20	
Chi-Square	3.20	5.10	0.10	
Percent	36.73	7.48	6.80	51.02
Row Percent	72.00	14.67	13.33	
Column Percent	65.06	26.19	45.45	
Total				
Number	83	42	22	147
Percent	56.46	28.57	14.97	100.00

Chi-square = 17.182, df = 2, probability = 0.0002.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE VII

MEANS OF STAFF REPRESENTATION BY INSTITUTIONAL CODE
AS ASSOCIATED WITH PRINCIPLE 3

	Representation by			
	Election	Appointed	Both	Total
Private Doctoral Granting Research Universities				
Frequency	4	9	3	16
Expected Cell	9.00	4.60	2.40	
Chi-Square	2.80	4.30	0.20	
Percent	2.72	6.12	2.04	10.88
Row Percent	25.00	56.25	18.75	
Column Percent	4.82	21.43	13.64	
Public Doctoral Granting Research Universities				
Frequency	17	5	6	28
Expected Cell	15.80	8.00	4.20	
Chi-Square	0.10	1.10	0.80	
Percent	11.56	3.40	4.08	19.05
Row Percent	60.71	17.86	21.43	
Column Percent	20.48	11.90	27.27	
Private Comprehensive Colleges				
Frequency	10*	8	5	23
Expected Cell	13.00	6.60	3.40	
Chi-Square	0.70	0.30	0.70	
Percent	6.80	5.44	3.40	15.65
Row Percent	43.48	34.78	21.74	
Column Percent	12.05	19.05	22.73	
Public Comprehensive Colleges				
Frequency	26*	5	3	34
Expected Cell	19.20	9.70	5.10	
Chi-Square	2.40	2.30	0.90	
Percent	17.69	3.40	2.04	23.13
Row Percent	76.47	14.71	8.82	
Column Percent	31.33	11.90	13.64	
Private Liberal Arts Colleges				
Frequency	15	14	4	33
Expected Cell	18.60	9.40	4.90	
Chi-Square	0.70	2.20	0.20	
Percent	10.20	9.52	2.72	22.45
Row Percent	45.45	42.42	12.12	
Column Percent	18.07	33.33	18.18	

TABLE VII (Continued)

	Representation by			Total
	Election	Appointed	Both	
Public Liberal Arts Colleges				
Frequency	11*	1	1	13
Expected Cell	7.30	3.70	1.90	
Chi-Square	1.80	2.00	0.50	
Percent	7.48	0.68	0.68	8.84
Row Percent	84.62	7.69	7.69	
Column Percent	13.25	2.38	4.55	
Total				
Number	83	42	22	147
Percent	56.46	28.57	14.97	100.00

Chi-square = 23.873, df = 10, probability = 0.0079.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE VIII
METHODS OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPROACH TO THE CLASSIFIED
NONACADEMIC STAFF REPRESENTED BY LABOR UNIONS
AS ASSOCIATED WITH PRINCIPLE 4

	One Area of Representation	Administrative Liason	Equal Council Consideration	Total
Classified Staff				
Unionized				
Frequency	4	1	23	28
Expected Cell	1.30	1.90	24.20	
Chi-Square	5.20	0.40	0.10	
Percent	3.85	0.96	22.12	26.92
Row Percent	14.29	3.57	82.14	
Column Percent	80.00	14.29	25.56	
Classified Staff				
Non Union				
Frequency	1	6*	67	76
Expected Cell	3.70	5.10	65.80	
Chi-Square	1.90	0.20	0.00	
Percent	0.96	5.77	64.42	73.08
Row Percent	1.32	7.89	88.16	
Column Percent	20.00	85.71	74.44	
Total				
Number	5	7	90	104
Percent	4.81	6.73	86.54	100.00

Chi-square = 8.550, df = 3, probability = 0.0359. Data is so sparse that Chi-square may not be a valid test.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE IX

MEANS OF ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF PLANNING BY INSTITUTIONAL CODE
AS ASSOCIATED WITH PRINCIPLE 5

	Formal Council	Informal Means	Neither	Both	Total
Private Doctoral Granting Research Universities					
Frequency	4	2	10*	4	20
Expected Cell	3.50	5.60	8.10	2.80	
Chi-Square	0.10	2.30	0.40	0.50	
Percent	1.91	0.96	4.78	1.91	9.57
Row Percent	20.00	10.00	50.00	20.00	
Column Percent	10.81	3.45	11.76	13.79	
Public Doctoral Granting Research Universities					
Frequency	8	10	17*	7	42
Expected Cell	7.40	11.70	17.10	5.80	
Chi-Square	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.20	
Percent	3.83	4.78	8.13	3.35	20.10
Row Percent	19.05	23.81	40.48	16.67	
Column Percent	21.62	17.24	20.00	24.14	
Private Comprehensive Colleges					
Frequency	6	13*	11	3	33
Expected Cell	5.80	9.20	13.40	4.60	
Chi-Square	0.00	1.60	0.40	0.50	
Percent	2.87	6.22	5.26	1.44	15.79
Row Percent	18.18	39.39	33.33	9.09	
Column Percent	16.22	22.41	12.94	10.34	
Public Comprehensive Colleges					
Frequency	13	17*	17*	5	52
Expected Cell	9.20	14.40	21.10	7.20	
Chi-Square	1.60	0.50	0.80	0.70	
Percent	6.22	8.13	8.13	2.39	24.88
Row Percent	25.00	32.69	32.69	9.62	
Column Percent	35.14	29.31	20.00	17.24	
Private Liberal Arts Colleges					
Frequency	5	10	24*	8	47
Expected Cell	8.30	13.00	19.10	6.50	
Chi-Square	1.30	0.70	1.20	0.30	
Percent	2.39	4.78	11.48	3.83	22.49
Row Percent	10.64	21.28	51.06	17.02	
Column Percent	13.51	17.24	28.24	27.59	

TABLE IX (Continued)

	Formal Council	Informal Means	Neither	Both	Total
Public Liberal Arts Colleges					
Frequency	1	6*	6*	2	15
Expected Cell	2.70	4.20	6.10	2.10	
Chi-Square	1.00	0.80	0.00	0.00	
Percent	0.48	2.87	2.87	0.96	7.18
Row Percent	6.67	40.00	40.00	13.33	
Column Percent	2.70	10.34	7.06	6.90	
Total					
Number	37	58	85	29	209
Percent	17.70	27.75	40.67	13.88	100.00

Chi-square = 15.393, df = 15, probability = 0.4235.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE X
VALIDITY OF PRINCIPLE 6 BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Valid	Not Valid	Total
Doctoral Granting University			
Frequency	46	10	56
Expected Cell	50.10	5.90	
Chi-Square	0.30	2.90	
Percent	24.21	5.26	29.47
Row Percent	82.14	17.86	
Column Percent	27.06	50.00	
Comprehensive College			
Frequency	68	8	76
Expected Cell	68.00	8.00	
Chi-Square	0.00	0.00	
Percent	35.79	4.21	40.00
Row Percent	89.47	10.53	
Column Percent	40.00	40.00	
Liberal Arts College			
Frequency	56*	2	58
Expected Cell	51.90	6.10	
Chi-Square	0.30	2.80	
Percent	29.47	1.05	30.53
Row Percent	96.55	3.45	
Column Percent	32.94	10.00	
Total			
Number	170	20	190
Percent	89.47	10.53	100.00

Chi-square = 6.281, df = 2, probability = 0.0433.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XI
MEANS OF ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF PLANNING BY INSTITUTIONAL
OWNERSHIP AS ASSOCIATED WITH PRINCIPLE 7

	Formal Council	Campus Wide Committees	Both	Total
Private Owned Institutions				
Frequency	22	35	7	64
Expected Cell	24.20	28.40	11.40	
Chi-Square	0.20	1.50	1.70	
Percent	16.30	25.93	5.19	47.41
Row Percent	34.38	54.69*	10.94	
Column Percent	43.14	58.33	29.17	
Public Owned Institutions				
Frequency	29	25	17	71
Expected Cell	26.80	31.60	12.60	
Chi-Square	0.20	1.40	1.50	
Percent	21.48	18.52	12.59	62.59
Row Percent	40.85*	35.21	23.94	
Column Percent	56.86	41.67	70.83	
Total				
Number	51	60	24	135
Percent	37.78	44.44	17.78	100.00

Chi-square = 6.448, df = 2, probability = 0.0398.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XII

ADMINISTRATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH MECHANISMS OF GOVERNANCE
TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF REPRESENTED
BY LABOR UNIONS AS ASSOCIATED WITH PRINCIPLE 7

	Formal Councils	Campus Wide Committees	Both	Total
Administrative and Professional Staff Unionized				
Frequency	4	1	4	9
Expected Cell	3.40	4.00	1.60	
Chi-Square	0.10	2.20	3.50	
Percent	3.01	0.75	3.01	6.77
Row Percent	44.44	11.11	44.44	
Column Percent	8.00	1.69	16.67	
Administrative and Professional Staff Non Union				
Frequency	46	58	20	124
Expected Cell	46.60	55.00	22.40	
Chi-Square	0.00	0.20	0.30	
Percent	34.59	43.61	15.04	93.23
Row Percent	37.10	46.77	16.13	
Column Percent	92.00	98.31	83.33	
Total				
Number	50	59	24	133
Percent	37.59	44.36	18.05	100.00

Chi-square = 6.254, df = 2, probability = 0.0438. Table is so sparse that Chi-square may not be a valid test.

TABLE XIII
LABOR UNION AFFILIATION BY THE CLASSIFIED STAFF BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Union	Non Union	Total
Doctoral Granting Research University			
Frequency	29	31	60
Expected Cell	17.10	42.90	
Chi-Square	8.30	3.30	
Percent	14.01	14.98	28.99
Row Percent	48.33	51.67	
Column Percent	49.15	20.95	
Comprehensive Colleges			
Frequency	26	59	85
Expected Cell	24.20	60.80	
Chi-Square	0.10	0.10	
Percent	12.56	28.50	41.06
Row Percent	30.59	69.41*	
Column Percent	44.07	39.86	
Liberal Arts Colleges			
Frequency	4	58	62
Expected Cell	17.70	44.30	
Chi-Square	10.60	4.20	
Percent	1.93	28.02	29.95
Row Percent	6.45	93.55*	
Column Percent	6.78	39.19	
Total			
Number	59	148	207
Percent	28.50	71.50	100.00

Chi-square = 26.564, df = 2, probability = 0.0001.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XIV

LABOR UNION AFFILIATION BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL
STAFF BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	Union	Non Union	Total
Doctoral Granting Research University			
Frequency	8	53	81
Expected Cell	5.90	55.10	
Chi-Square	0.80	0.10	
Percent	3.86	25.60	29.47
Row Percent	13.11	86.89*	
Column Percent	40.00	28.34	
Comprehensive College			
Frequency	10	74	84
Expected Cell	8.10	75.90	
Chi-Square	0.40	0.00	
Percent	4.83	35.75	40.58
Row Percent	11.90	88.10*	
Column Percent	50.00	39.57	
Liberal Arts College			
Frequency	2	60	62
Expected Cell	6.00	56.00	
Chi-Square	2.70	0.30	
Percent	0.97	28.99	29.95
Row Percent	3.23	96.77*	
Column Percent	10.00	32.09	
Total			
Number	20	187	207
Percent	9.66	90.34	100.00

Chi-square = 4.260, df = 2, probability = 0.1189.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XV

LABOR UNION AFFILIATION OF THE CLASSIFIED STAFF BY SIZE OF THE
INSTITUTIONAL LABOR FORCE

	Union	Non Union	Total
50 or less			
Frequency	3	48	51
Expected Cell	14.50	36.50	
Chi-Square	9.20	3.60	
Percent	1.45	23.19	24.64
Row Percent	5.88	94.12*	
Column Percent	5.08	32.43	
50 to 500			
Frequency	19	55	74
Expected Cell	21.10	52.90	
Chi-Square	0.20	0.10	
Percent	9.18	26.57	35.75
Row Percent	25.68	74.32*	
Column Percent	32.20	37.16	
500 to 1,500			
Frequency	20	32	52
Expected Cell	14.80	37.20	
Chi-Square	1.80	0.70	
Percent	9.66	15.46	25.12
Row Percent	38.46	61.54*	
Column Percent	33.90	21.82	
1,500 or More			
Frequency	17	13	30
Expected Cell	8.60	21.40	
Chi-Square	8.30	3.30	
Percent	8.21	6.28	14.49
Row Percent	56.57	43.33*	
Column Percent	28.81	8.78	
Total			
Number	59	148	207
Percent	28.50	71.50	100.00

Chi-square = 27.304, df = 3, probability = 0.0001.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XVI

LABOR UNION AFFILIATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL
STAFF BY SIZE OF THE INSTITUTIONAL LABOR FORCE

	Union	Non Union	Total
50 or Less			
Frequency	1	50	51
Expected Cell	4.90	46.10	
Chi-Square	3.10	0.30	
Percent	0.48	24.15	24.64
Row Percent	1.96	98.04 *	
Column Percent	5.00	26.74	
50 to 500			
Frequency	6	67	73
Expected Cell	7.10	65.90	
Chi-Square	0.20	0.00	
Percent	2.90	32.37	35.27
Row Percent	8.22	91.78 *	
Column Percent	30.00	35.83	
500 to 1,500			
Frequency	6	46	52
Expected Cell	5.00	47.00	
Chi-Square	0.20	0.00	
Percent	2.90	22.22	25.12
Row Percent	11.54	88.46 *	
Column Percent	30.00	24.60	
1,500 or More			
Frequency	7	24	31
Expected Cell	3.00	28.00	
Chi-Square	5.40	0.60	
Percent	3.38	11.59	14.98
Row Percent	22.58	77.42 *	
Column Percent	35.00	12.83	
Total			
Number	20	187	207
Percent	9.66	90.34	100.00

Chi-square = 9.777, df = 3, probability = 0.0206. Data is so sparse that Chi-square may not be a valid test.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XVII
LABOR UNION AFFILIATION OF THE CLASSIFIED STAFF BY
INSTITUTIONAL OWNERSHIP

	Union	Non Union	Total
Private Owned Institution			
Frequency	15	85	100
Expected Cell	28.50	71.50	
Chi-Square	6.40	2.50	
Percent	7.25	41.06	48.31
Row Percent	15.00	85.00	
Column Percent	25.42	57.43	
Public Owned Institution			
Frequency	44	63	107
Expected Cell	30.50	76.50	
Chi-Square	6.00	2.40	
Percent	21.26	30.43	51.69
Row Percent	41.12	58.88	
Column Percent	74.58	42.57	
Total			
Number	59	148	207
Percent	28.50	71.50	100.00

Chi-square = 17.308, df = 1, probability = 0.0001.

TABLE XVIII

LABOR UNION AFFILIATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL
STAFF BY INSTITUTIONAL OWNERSHIP

	Union	Non Union	Total
Private Owned Institution			
Frequency	1	99*	100
Expected Cell	9.70	90.30	
Chi-Square	7.80	0.80	
Percent	0.48	47.83	48.31
Row Percent	1.00	99.00	
Column Percent	5.00	52.94	
Public Owned Institution			
Frequency	19	88	107
Expected Cell	10.30	96.70	
Chi-Square	7.30	0.80	
Percent	9.18	42.51	51.69
Row Percent	17.76	82.24	
Column Percent	95.00	47.06	
Total			
Number	20	187	207
Percent	9.66	90.34	100.00

Chi-square = 16.629, df = 1, probability = 0.0001.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XIX

LABOR UNION AFFILIATION BY THE CLASSIFIED STAFF
BY INSTITUTIONAL CODE

	Union	Non Union	Total
Private Doctoral Granting Research University			
Frequency	10	10	20
Expected Cell	5.70	14.30	
Chi-Square	3.20	1.30	
Percent	4.83	4.83	9.66
Row Percent	50.00	50.00	
Column Percent	16.95	6.76	
Public Doctoral Granting Research University			
Frequency	19	21	40
Expected Cell	11.40	28.60	
Chi-Square	5.10	2.00	
Percent	9.18	10.14	19.32
Row Percent	47.50	52.50	
Column Percent	32.20	14.19	
Private Comprehensive College			
Frequency	4	29*	33
Expected Cell	9.40	23.60	
Chi-Square	3.10	1.20	
Percent	1.93	14.01	15.94
Row Percent	12.12	87.88	
Column Percent	6.78	19.59	
Public Comprehensive College			
Frequency	22	30	52
Expected Cell	14.80	37.20	
Chi-Square	3.50	1.40	
Percent	10.63	14.49	25.12
Row Percent	42.31	57.69	
Column Percent	37.29	20.27	
Private Liberal Arts College			
Frequency	1	46*	47
Expected Cell	13.40	33.60	
Chi-Square	11.50	4.60	
Percent	0.48	22.22	22.71
Row Percent	2.13	97.87	
Column Percent	1.69	31.08	

TABLE XIX (Continued)

	Union	Non Union	Total
Public Liberal Arts College			
Frequency	3	12*	15
Expected Cell	4.30	10.70	
Chi-Square	0.40	0.20	
Percent	1.45	5.80	7.25
Row Percent	20.00	80.00	
Column Percent	5.08	8.11	
Total			
Number	59	148	207
Percent	28.50	71.50	100.00

Chi-square = 37.404, df = 5, probability = 0.0001.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XX

LABOR UNION AFFILIATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND
PROFESSIONAL STAFF BY INSTITUTIONAL CODE

	Union	Non Union	Total
Private Doctoral Granting Research University			
Frequency	1	19*	20
Expected Cell	1.90	18.10	
Chi-Square	0.40	0.00	
Percent	0.48	9.18	9.66
Row Percent	5.00	95.00	
Column Percent	5.00	10.16	
Public Doctoral Granting Research University			
Frequency	7	34	41
Expected Cell	4.00	37.00	
Chi-Square	2.30	0.20	
Percent	3.38	16.43	19.81
Row Percent	17.07	82.93	
Column Percent	35.00	18.18	
Private Comprehensive College			
Frequency	0	33*	33
Expected Cell	3.20	29.80	
Chi-Square	3.20	0.30	
Percent	0.00	15.94	15.94
Row Percent	0.00	100.00	
Column Percent	0.00	17.65	
Public Comprehensive College			
Frequency	10	41	51
Expected Cell	4.90	46.10	
Chi-Square	5.20	0.60	
Percent	4.83	19.81	24.64
Row Percent	19.61	80.39	
Column Percent	50.00	21.93	
Private Liberal Arts College			
Frequency	0	47*	47
Expected Cell	4.50	42.50	
Chi-Square	4.50	0.50	
Percent	0.00	22.71	22.71
Row Percent	0.00	100.00	
Column Percent	0.00	25.13	

TABLE XX (Continued)

	Union	Non Union	Total
Public Liberal Arts College			
Frequency	2	13*	15
Expected Cell	1.40	13.60	
Chi-Square	0.20	0.00	
Percent	0.97	6.28	7.25
Row Percent	13.33	86.67	
Column Percent	10.00	6.95	
Total			
Number	20	187	207
Percent	9.66	90.34	100.00

Chi-square = 17.646, df = 5, probability = 0.0034.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XXI

INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE FORMAL CONSTITUTED NONACADEMIC STAFF
COUNCILS INTEGRATED INTO THE GOVERNANCE SYSTEM AS TAKEN
FROM THE PRELIMINARY SURVEY

1. Arizona State University	16. University of Iowa
2. Brigham Young University	17. University of Maine
3. California State University and College	18. University of Missouri
4. Duke University	19. University of Nevada, Las Vegas
5. Indiana University	20. University of Nevada, Reno
6. Lehigh University	21. University of Oklahoma
7. Louisiana State University	22. University of Oregon
8. Oberlin College	23. University of South Dakota
9. Old Dominion University	24. University of South Florida
10. Oklahoma State University	25. University of Tennessee
11. Purdue University	26. University of Wyoming
12. University of Arkansas	27. University of Vermont
13. University of Chicago	28. University System of New Hampshire
14. University of Idaho	29. Vanderbilt University
15. University of Illinois	30. West Virginia University

TABLE XXII

ADMINISTRATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH MECHANISMS OF GOVERNANCE
TO THE NONACADEMIC STAFF BY INSTITUTIONAL CODE

	Formal Councils	Campus Wide Committees	Both	Total
Private Doctoral Granting Research Universities				
Frequency	5	7	0	12
Expected Cell	4.50	5.30	2.10	
Chi-Square	0.00	0.50	2.10	
Percent	3.70	5.19	0.00	8.89
Row Percent	41.67	58.33	0.00	
Column Percent	9.80	11.67	0.00	
Public Doctoral Granting Research Universities				
Frequency	12	9	8	29
Expected Cell	11.00	12.90	5.20	
Chi-Square	0.10	1.20	1.60	
Percent	8.89	6.67	5.93	21.48
Row Percent	41.38	31.03	27.59	
Column Percent	23.53	15.00	33.33	
Private Comprehensive Colleges				
Frequency	6	11	5	22
Expected Cell	8.30	9.80	3.90	
Chi-Square	0.60	0.20	0.30	
Percent	4.44	8.15	3.70	16.30
Row Percent	27.27	50.00	22.73	
Column Percent	11.76	18.33	20.83	
Public Comprehensive Colleges				
Frequency	13	12	6	31
Expected Cell	11.70	13.80	5.50	
Chi-Square	0.10	0.20	0.00	
Percent	9.63	8.89	4.44	22.96
Row Percent	41.94	38.71	19.35	
Column Percent	25.49	20.00	25.00	
Private Liberal Arts Colleges				
Frequency	11	17	2	30
Expected Cell	11.30	13.30	5.30	
Chi-Square	0.00	1.00	2.10	
Percent	8.15	12.59	1.48	22.22
Row Percent	36.67	56.67	6.67	
Column Percent	21.57	28.33	8.33	

TABLE XXII (Continued)

	Formal Councils	Campus Wide Committees	Both	Total
Public Liberal Arts Colleges				
Frequency	4	4	3	11
Expected Cell	4.20	4.90	2.00	
Chi-Square	0.00	0.20	0.60	
Percent	2.96	2.96	2.22	8.15
Row Percent	36.36	36.36	27.27	
Column Percent	7.84	6.67	12.50	
Total				
Number	51	60	24	135
Percent	37.78*	44.44	17.78	100.00

Chi-square = 10.884, df = 10, probability = 0.3666.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XXIII

LEGAL OR GOVERNING BOARD POLICIES TOWARD NONACADEMIC STAFF LABOR
UNION AFFILIATION BY INSTITUTIONAL OWNERSHIP

	Yes	No	Total
Private Owned Institutions			
Frequency	2	97*	99
Expected Cell	6.20	92.80	
Chi-Square	2.90	0.20	
Percent	0.97	46.86	47.83
Row Percent	2.02	97.98	
Column Percent	15.33	50.00	
Public Owned Institutions			
Frequency	11	97	108
Expected Cell	6.80	101.20	
Chi-Square	2.60	0.20	
Percent	5.31	46.86	52.17
Row Percent	10.19	89.81	
Column Percent	84.62	50.00	
Total			
Number	13	194	207
Percent	6.28	93.72	100.00

Chi-square = 5.851, df = 1, probability = 0.0156.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XXIV

LEGAL OR GOVERNING BOARD POLICIES TOWARD CLASSIFIED STAFF
BY CLASSIFIED STAFF LABOR UNION AFFILIATION

	Yes	No	Total
Union Representation			
Frequency	7	52	59
Expected Cell	3.70	55.30	
Chi-Square	2.80	0.20	
Percent	3.41	25.37	28.78
Row Percent	11.86	88.14	
Column Percent	53.85	27.08	
No Union Representation			
Frequency	6	140*	146
Expected Cell	9.30	136.70	
Chi-Square	1.10	0.10	
Percent	2.93	68.29	71.22
Row Percent	4.11	95.89	
Column Percent	46.15	72.92	
Total			
Number	13	192	205
Percent	6.34	93.66	100.00

Chi-square = 4.255, df = 1, probability = 0.0391. Table is so sparse that Chi-square may not be a valid test.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

TABLE XXV

LEGAL OR GOVERNING BOARD POLICIES TOWARD ADMINISTRATIVE AND
PROFESSIONAL STAFF BY ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL
STAFF LABOR UNION AFFILIATION

	Yes	No	Total
Union Representation			
Frequency	5	15	20
Expected Cell	1.30	18.70	
Chi-Square	11.00	0.70	
Percent	2.44	7.32	9.76
Row Percent	25.00	75.00	
Column Percent	38.46	7.81	
No Union Representation			
Frequency	8	177*	185
Expected Cell	11.70	173.30	
Chi-Square	1.20	0.10	
Percent	3.90	86.34	90.24
Row Percent	4.32	95.68	
Column Percent	61.54	92.19	
Total			
Number	13	192	205
Percent	6.34	93.66	100.00

Chi-square = 12.991, df = 1, probability = 0.0003. Table is so sparse that Chi-square may not be a valid test.

*Indicates a weighted analysis among the factors compared indicating their contributions to the total Chi-square.

VITA

Harold Rue Myers

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: LEGITIMACY OF THE NONACADEMIC STAFF IN THE GOVERNANCE PROCESS
OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Carnegie, Oklahoma, November 20, 1932, the
son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Myers.

Education: Attended elementary school in Carnegie, Oklahoma,
Shattuck, Oklahoma, and McAlester, Oklahoma; graduated from
Watonga High School, Watonga, Oklahoma, in 1951; received
the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University
in 1958; received the Master of Science degree from Oklahoma
State University in 1966; completed requirements for the
Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in
May, 1980.

Professional Experience: Enlisted in U.S. Navy, 1951; Superintend-
ent of Wheatland Soil and Water Research Station, Cherokee,
Oklahoma, 1958-1962; Superintendent of Agronomy Research
Station, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1962 to present.