

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA  
LIBRARY

AUTHOR . VANDERSTOEL, John . . . . .

TITLE . . . PERCEPTIONS OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBER IN . . .

ONE UNIVERSITY FACULTY IN RESPECT TO WORKLOADS .....

THESIS .. Ph.D., 1983 .....

I, the undersigned, agree to refrain from producing, or reproducing, the above-named work, or any part thereof, in any material form, without the written consent of the author:

This image shows a full page of white paper with horizontal dotted lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page, providing a guide for handwriting or typing. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the page.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE INFLUENCE  
OF THE INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBER  
IN ONE UNIVERSITY FACULTY  
IN RESPECT TO WORKLOADS

by

JOHN VANDERSTOEL

A thesis  
presented to the University of Manitoba  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
in  
Educational Administration and Foundations

Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1983

(c) JOHN VANDERSTOEL, 1983

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA  
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to  
the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a Ph.D. thesis  
entitled: *Perceptions of the Influence of the  
Individual Faculty Member on one University  
Faculty in Respect to Workloads*

submitted by *MR. John Vanderstoel*  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Ph.D. degree.

*Philip J. Husby*  
.....  
Advisor  
*[Signature]*  
.....  
.....

.....  
Dr. George E. Richert,  
.....  
External Examiner  
.....  
Dean, Faculty of Education  
.....  
University of Regina  
.....  
Regina, Saskatchewan  
.....

Date of oral examination: ..... July 29th, 1983 .....

The student has satisfactorily completed and passed the Ph.D.  
oral examination

*Philip J. Husby*  
.....  
Advisor  
*[Signature]*  
.....  
.....

*Michel P. Janssen*  
.....  
Chairman of Ph.D. Oral\*  
.....

(\*The signature of the Chairman does not necessarily signify that  
the Chairman has read the complete thesis.)

PERCEPTIONS OF THE INFLUENCE  
OF THE INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBER  
IN ONE UNIVERSITY FACULTY  
IN RESPECT TO WORKLOADS

BY

JOHN VANDERSTOEL

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of  
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

© 1983

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.





## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation for the invaluable assistance he received from his chief advisor, Dr. P. J. Husby. He is also indebted to Dr. A. D. Gregor, Mr. J. C. Welsh, and Dr. G. E. Richert who served on his committee.

Special gratitude must be expressed also to Mrs. R. A. Anderson of the University of Winnipeg Collegiate who, by agreeing to assume the writer's administrative responsibilities for a year, made it possible for him to complete this project.

Valuable assistance was provided as well by the members of the Computer Services departments of the University of Winnipeg and the University of Manitoba. Particular note must be made of the help provided by Mr. H. J. Hilton, Dr. R. A. Kingsley, Mr. R. E. Mikulik, Mr. D. McGregor, and Mrs. P. Percy, who taught the writer much of what one should know about the use of a computer and who resolved many of the program errors created through his ignorance.

Without the generous cooperation of the administrators and faculty members of the Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba this study would have been impossible. The writer feels deeply indebted to these individuals as well.

## ABSTRACT

The study entailed the interviewing of fourteen faculty members and seven administrators in the Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba to investigate their perceptions about the influence of the individual faculty member in the determination of his personal workload.

The results of these interviews indicate that at this Faculty the minimum requirements for the various components of a faculty member's workload are flexible to the extent that they accommodate individual needs and aspirations without detracting from the overall Faculty objectives. Some differences in requirements were evident from department to department within the Faculty, resulting from the specific needs that were to be fulfilled by each of them.

Faculty members and administrators generally perceived the individual faculty member and the Department Head to share almost equally the greater portion of power in workload determination. There were some differences in perceptions within the various components of workload and among the members of both the administration and the faculty, but the major findings were significant enough to have permitted the drawing of some tentative conclusions.

1. Workload requirements are almost uniformly perceived to be minimal. Most of these are typically treated as expectations which form part of a university professor's job.
2. Teaching appears to be considered the most vital aspect of a professor's work, and research, although considered important, appears to be perceived as second in value.
3. The methods employed to determine workloads are collegial and professional. The Department Head and the members of his department meet in committee where they negotiate teaching allotments and reach consensus on them. Other parts of workload, including teaching related activities, typically are not assigned, and are left to the professor's personal commitment and sense of responsibility.
4. Faculty members are individually very influential in the determination of their own workloads. The tenured and secure faculty members perceive themselves as most powerful and more powerful than the Department Head, and the non-tenured, less secure, perceive themselves as weak and much weaker than the Department Head.
5. There may be a moderate to strong direct relationship between satisfaction with workload and perceptions of personal power.
6. There is a tendency for the younger, less experienced and lower ranked faculty members to perceive the administration much stronger, to feel less secure, and to be less satisfied with their workloads than is the case for the older, more experienced, Full Professors.
7. The power of the individual faculty member, irrespective of the perceived influence of the Department Head, is considerably greater in workload determination than it is in general faculty business. The power of the collective faculty, on the other hand, is much greater in general faculty business than it is in workload determination.
8. Faculty members appear to meet the expectations set for them by administrators.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . . | ii  |
| ABSTRACT . . . . .         | iii |

| <u>Chapter</u>                                                           | <u>page</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| I. THE NATURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY . . . . .                      | 1           |
| Statement of the Problem . . . . .                                       | 2           |
| Workloads . . . . .                                                      | 4           |
| The Problem . . . . .                                                    | 6           |
| Specific Research Questions . . . . .                                    | 7           |
| Significance of the Study . . . . .                                      | 9           |
| Delimitations . . . . .                                                  | 11          |
| Limitations . . . . .                                                    | 13          |
| Research Methodology . . . . .                                           | 14          |
| Definitions . . . . .                                                    | 15          |
| Organization of the Study . . . . .                                      | 17          |
| II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .                                 | 19          |
| Management Power in Universities . . . . .                               | 20          |
| Models of University Governance . . . . .                                | 23          |
| The Bureaucratic Model . . . . .                                         | 23          |
| The Human Relations Model . . . . .                                      | 26          |
| The Collegial Model . . . . .                                            | 27          |
| The Anarchical Model . . . . .                                           | 28          |
| The Professional Model . . . . .                                         | 30          |
| The Political Model . . . . .                                            | 31          |
| Governance Reality . . . . .                                             | 32          |
| Faculty Power . . . . .                                                  | 33          |
| The Faculty Union . . . . .                                              | 37          |
| Elements of Workload . . . . .                                           | 40          |
| Relative Importance of Workload Components . . . . .                     | 41          |
| Administrative and Faculty Functions in Workload Determination . . . . . | 45          |
| Summary . . . . .                                                        | 50          |
| III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY . . . . .                                      | 52          |
| The Samples . . . . .                                                    | 52          |
| The Administration Sample . . . . .                                      | 53          |
| The Faculty Sample . . . . .                                             | 55          |
| The Interviews . . . . .                                                 | 62          |

|       |                                                                           |     |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
|       | The Preparation of Data . . . . .                                         | 63  |
| IV.   | STUDY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA - WORKLOAD REQUIREMENTS . . . . .      | 65  |
|       | Teaching . . . . .                                                        | 68  |
|       | Scholarly Work . . . . .                                                  | 79  |
|       | Service . . . . .                                                         | 91  |
|       | Governance and Committee Work . . . . .                                   | 91  |
|       | Community Service . . . . .                                               | 99  |
| V.    | STUDY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA - WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENTS . . . . .       | 106 |
|       | Teaching . . . . .                                                        | 106 |
|       | Scholarly Work . . . . .                                                  | 118 |
|       | Governance and Service . . . . .                                          | 121 |
|       | Total Faculty Workload . . . . .                                          | 123 |
| VI.   | COMPARISONS OF STUDY RESULTS BY SUBGROUPS . . . . .                       | 137 |
|       | Workload Requirements . . . . .                                           | 139 |
|       | Workload Determination . . . . .                                          | 147 |
|       | Teaching . . . . .                                                        | 147 |
|       | Scholarly Work . . . . .                                                  | 153 |
|       | Service . . . . .                                                         | 157 |
|       | Total Workload . . . . .                                                  | 161 |
| VII.  | STUDY RESULTS COMPARED WITH THE LITERATURE ON GOVERNANCE MODELS . . . . . | 173 |
|       | The Bureaucratic Model . . . . .                                          | 173 |
|       | The Collegial Model . . . . .                                             | 174 |
|       | The Anarchical Model . . . . .                                            | 176 |
|       | The Professional Model . . . . .                                          | 177 |
|       | The Political Model . . . . .                                             | 178 |
|       | Summary . . . . .                                                         | 179 |
| VIII. | SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .                       | 180 |
|       | Summary . . . . .                                                         | 180 |
|       | Major Findings . . . . .                                                  | 182 |
|       | Conclusions . . . . .                                                     | 200 |
|       | Recommendations . . . . .                                                 | 203 |
|       | Implications . . . . .                                                    | 203 |
|       | Recommendations for Further Study . . . . .                               | 205 |

## Appendix

## page

|    |                                               |     |
|----|-----------------------------------------------|-----|
| A. | INTERVIEW SCHEDULE - ADMINISTRATORS . . . . . | 207 |
|----|-----------------------------------------------|-----|

|    |                                                  |     |
|----|--------------------------------------------------|-----|
| B. | INTERVIEW SCHEDULE - FACULTY . . . . .           | 212 |
| C. | A REPORTING OF RELATED INTERVIEW RESPONSES . . . | 217 |
|    | SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                  | 234 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Table</u>                                                                   | <u>page</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Composition of Administration Sample . . . . .                              | 54          |
| 2. Composition of Administration Sample . . . . .                              | 55          |
| 3. Eligible Faculty by Department and Rank . . . . .                           | 56          |
| 4. Faculty Sample by Department and Rank . . . . .                             | 57          |
| 5. Faculty Sample by Age Group and Rank . . . . .                              | 58          |
| 6. Faculty Sample by Sex and Rank . . . . .                                    | 58          |
| 7. Faculty Sample by Experience at Faculty and Rank . .                        | 59          |
| 8. Faculty Sample by Tenure Status and Rank . . . . .                          | 60          |
| 9. Faculty Sample by Highest Degree Held and Rank . . .                        | 60          |
| 10. Faculty Sample by Teacher Certification and Rank . .                       | 61          |
| 11. Faculty Sample by Grade School Teaching<br>Experience and Rank . . . . .   | 61          |
| 12. Group Verification of Estimated Hours of Work<br>for All Faculty . . . . . | 67          |
| 13. Hourly Teaching Loads per Week per Term . . . . .                          | 69          |
| 14. Teaching Hours and Teaching Related Duties . . . . .                       | 71          |
| 15. Pro-Rated Weekly Teaching Hours . . . . .                                  | 74          |
| 16. Perceptions of the Definition of Scholarly Work . .                        | 79          |
| 17. Perceptions of Requirements for Scholarly Work . . .                       | 81          |
| 18. Adequacy of Time Spent on Scholarly Work . . . . .                         | 83          |
| 19. Adequacy of Research Time . . . . .                                        | 84          |
| 20. Annual Research and Publications . . . . .                                 | 85          |

|     |                                                                          |     |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 21. | Consequences of Non-Involvement in Scholarly Work . . . . .              | 86  |
| 22. | Workload Components Considered Most Important by Participants . . . . .  | 88  |
| 23. | Workload Components Considered Least Important by Participants . . . . . | 89  |
| 24. | Perceptions of Requirements for Committee Work . . .                     | 91  |
| 25. | Committee Membership . . . . .                                           | 93  |
| 26. | Consequences of Not Belonging to Committees . . . .                      | 95  |
| 27. | Consequences of Not Attending Committee Meetings . .                     | 97  |
| 28. | Administrative Knowledge of Non-Attendance at Meetings . . . . .         | 97  |
| 29. | Definition of Community Service . . . . .                                | 99  |
| 30. | Perceptions of Payment for Community Service . . .                       | 100 |
| 31. | Perceptions of Requirements for Community Service . . . . .              | 101 |
| 32. | Consequences of Not Providing Community Service .                        | 103 |
| 33. | Knowledge of Non-Involvement in Community Service . . . . .              | 103 |
| 34. | Components Thought Least Important - with Percentages . . . . .          | 104 |
| 35. | Decision Making Authority in Workload Determination . . . . .            | 107 |
| 36. | Power in Joint-Decision As Seen by Seven Faculty Members . . . . .       | 110 |
| 37. | Power of Department Head As Seen by Faculty - in Percentages . . . . .   | 111 |
| 38. | Averages of Decision Making Powers - Teaching Duties . . . . .           | 113 |
| 39. | Relative Powers in Teaching Assignments . . . . .                        | 113 |
| 40. | Possible Refusal of Allotted Teaching Load . . . .                       | 114 |
| 41. | Perceptions of Appeals about Teaching Loads . . .                        | 115 |



|     |                                                                         |     |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 42. | Averages of Decision Making Powers - Scholarly Work . . . . .           | 118 |
| 43. | Relative Powers in Scholarly Work . . . . .                             | 120 |
| 44. | Averages of Decision Making Powers - Governance and Service . . . . .   | 121 |
| 45. | Relative Powers in Governance and Service . . . . .                     | 122 |
| 46. | Averages of Decision Making Powers - Total Faculty Workload . . . . .   | 124 |
| 47. | Relative Powers in Total Faculty Workload . . . . .                     | 125 |
| 48. | Averages of Decision Making Powers - General Faculty Business . . . . . | 126 |
| 49. | Relative Powers in General Faculty Business . . . . .                   | 127 |
| 50. | Workload as Typical or Substantially Different . . . . .                | 128 |
| 51. | Refusal to Do Governance or Service Work . . . . .                      | 130 |
| 52. | Satisfaction with Workload . . . . .                                    | 131 |
| 53. | Possible UMFA Assistance Requested . . . . .                            | 132 |
| 54. | Possible Grievance Procedures Initiated . . . . .                       | 133 |
| 55. | Power Perceptions on Faculty Council and Administration . . . . .       | 135 |
| 56. | Teaching Duties Averaged by Department . . . . .                        | 139 |
| 57. | Teaching Duties Averaged by Age . . . . .                               | 140 |
| 58. | Teaching Duties Averaged by Gender . . . . .                            | 141 |
| 59. | Teaching Duties Averaged by Experience at the Faculty . . . . .         | 142 |
| 60. | Teaching Duties Averaged by Tenure Status . . . . .                     | 143 |
| 61. | Teaching Duties Averaged by Highest Degree Held . . . . .               | 144 |
| 62. | Teaching Duties Averaged by Academic Rank . . . . .                     | 145 |
| 63. | Averages of Decision Making Powers - Teaching Duties . . . . .          | 148 |
| 64. | Score Differentials from Faculty Member's Scores - Teaching . . . . .   | 151 |

|     |                                                                                |     |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 65. | Averages of Decision Making Powers - Scholarly<br>Work . . . . .               | 154 |
| 66. | Score Differentials from Faculty Member Scores -<br>Scholarly Work . . . . .   | 155 |
| 67. | Averages of Decision Making Powers - Governance<br>and Service . . . . .       | 158 |
| 68. | Score Differentials from Faculty Member's Score<br>- Service . . . . .         | 159 |
| 69. | Averages of Decision Making Powers - Total<br>Workload . . . . .               | 162 |
| 70. | Score Differentials from Faculty Member's Score<br>- Total Workload . . . . .  | 163 |
| 71. | Average Scores by Subgroups of Tenured Faculty -<br>Total Workload . . . . .   | 165 |
| 72. | Score Differentials from Tenured Faculty<br>Member's Scores . . . . .          | 166 |
| 73. | Power Perceptions and Satisfaction - Total<br>Workload . . . . .               | 168 |
| 74. | Correlations - Personal Power and Satisfaction . .                             | 169 |
| 75. | Correlations - Power Differentials and<br>Satisfaction . . . . .               | 170 |
| 76. | Factors Considered for Determining Staffing<br>Needs . . . . .                 | 218 |
| 77. | Faculty Involvement in Determining Staffing<br>Needs . . . . .                 | 219 |
| 78. | Time Spent on Teaching Related Activities . . . .                              | 221 |
| 79. | Professional Activities in Average Hours per<br>Year and Percentages . . . . . | 223 |
| 80. | Total Hours of Professional Activities per Year .                              | 225 |
| 81. | Workload Components Considered Most Important . .                              | 226 |
| 82. | Workload Components Considered Most Important by<br>Colleagues . . . . .       | 226 |
| 83. | Workload Components Considered Least Important . .                             | 227 |

|     |                                                                           |     |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 84. | Workload Components Considered Least Important<br>by Colleagues . . . . . | 227 |
| 85. | Workloads Compared in Same Department . . . . .                           | 228 |
| 86. | Workloads Compared with Other Departments . . . . .                       | 229 |
| 87. | Perceptions of the Position of Dean . . . . .                             | 230 |
| 88. | Perceptions of the Position of Associate Dean . . . . .                   | 231 |
| 89. | Perceptions of the Position of Department Head . . . . .                  | 232 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| <u>Figure</u>                                                             | <u>page</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. The Scale of Relative Powers . . . . .                                 | 112         |
| 2. Scale of Values for Levels of Satisfaction with<br>Workloads . . . . . | 131         |

## Chapter I

### THE NATURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The university, as an institution of higher learning, is in many ways unique among formal organizations. Certainly it seems that definitions and terms normally used in business cannot be applied very readily to a university.<sup>1</sup> It has many unusual operational characteristics, not the least of which is the role played by faculty. Dressel notes that the legitimated authority of the Board of Governors is delegated to the President and extended through him to other administrative officers, much as in other organizations, but emphasizes the unique nature of faculty in that

... the major chores of higher education institutions are performed by faculty members, who to a much greater extent than the workers in business, are autonomous both in what they do and in how they do it.<sup>2</sup>

There are, of course, many theories of university management which endeavor to account for the manner in which a university operates. Governance models have been developed seeking to incorporate the unique role of faculty but, like the many management theories for formal organizations in

---

<sup>1</sup> P. L. Dressel, Handbook of Academic Evaluation: Assessing Institutional Effectiveness, Student Progress, and Professional Performance for Decision-Making in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 378.

<sup>2</sup> op. cit.

general, they reflect at best speculations on how a university may be functioning in practice.

Most of the models that evolved recognize that faculty has considerable influence and holds substantial power in the decision-making processes of the institution. The models, however, seem to attempt to account for the role of faculty mostly in terms of the collective faculty and do not usually incorporate the faculty member as an individual. In fact, little if any attention has been given to the amount of influence or power that an individual faculty member may enjoy. It is to that specific aspect of faculty influence that this study addresses itself.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Faculty influence and power seem to be derived, both collectively and individually, from such sources as the rational, legitimated authority granted to it by legislation and collective agreements, from personal powers derived from specialized knowledge, and from the traditional powers enjoyed by the members of many professions.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, J. Victor Baldrige and Frank R. Kemerer, "Images of Governance: Collective Bargaining versus Traditional Models," in Governing Academic Organizations, eds. Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldrige (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977), Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach (San Francisco: Chandler, 1962), and Morris Keeton, "The Constituencies and Their Claims," in Governing Academic Organizations, eds. Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldrige (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977).

The faculty uses its power to play such a major role in the university that the administrative hierarchy probably has far less power than the authority systems of other kinds of organizations. This was suggested by Hill and French in their 1971 study which concluded that in the professors' eyes an authority system does exist but that it is not seen to be a "command system" because, among other reasons, the influence of the administration is limited by the collegial norms of academia.<sup>4</sup> Similarly Hind showed that

...authority relations in a university (are) highly dependent on the interaction among academic colleagues, and not predominantly determined by the administrative hierarchy of the university.<sup>5</sup>

It appears then that the collective faculty holds an unusual position in the university setting and that much of its power probably may be found in decision-making functions. It is not at all clear, however, if individual members of the faculty also may have those powers in decision-making.

To determine if the individual faculty members share that unusual position and how much influence they do have, it was necessary to choose an area of investigation that is of vital concern to them. Because workloads can be seen as

<sup>4</sup> Winston W. Hill and Wendell L. French, "Perceptions of the Power of Department Chairmen by Professors," in Academic Governance, ed. J. Victor Baldrige (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1971), pp. 229-30.

<sup>5</sup> R. R. Hind, "Analysis of a Faculty: Professionalism, Evaluation and the Authority Structure," in Academic Governance, ed. J. Victor Baldrige (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1971), p. 266.

such an area of great interest to both the faculty members and the administration, this study investigates how faculty workloads are determined. From its findings inferences may be drawn which may provide some knowledge on how much influence the faculty member does enjoy.

### Workloads

The determination of workloads is a recurring concern in any university Faculty and should be crucial to both the administration and the faculty member. It is suggested that one of the primary tasks of a university administration is to determine academic staff needs, and that it is "... also charged with determining their appropriate allocation to teaching units and ... if they (are) utilized properly".<sup>6</sup>

A number of factors influence administrative decision-making in respect to workloads. These include restraints like financial resources because the budget impacts on the number of faculty members hired, collective agreements which may prevent alternative (and cheaper) staffing arrangements, and declining student enrollment which is projected to be a major concern in this decade.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Meredith A. Gonyea, "Determining Academic Staff Needs, Allocation, and Utilization," in Improving Academic Management, eds. Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 366.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 369.

Administrative tasks in workload determination include the hiring and retaining of a teaching staff appropriate to the programs offered and within the confines of a number of restraints. The administration must ensure as well that sufficient time is allocated to each of the various aspects of the faculty members' responsibilities so that the missions of the university may be fulfilled.<sup>8</sup> It seems reasonable to assume that the administration would wish to give considerable direction, through the use of its power, in the determination of faculty workloads to ensure that these missions may indeed be attained.

The amount of time a professor spends on teaching, as compared to research and service, is crucial to both faculty and administration. As an extreme example of possible conflict of interest, a professor may consider research to be the only university activity worth doing and deserving of his time and efforts, while the administration, on the other hand, may consider teaching to be the university's primary mission, with research and other scholarly activities to be carried out by the professor for his own benefit and then only after regular workhours. Granted that this example is extreme, it serves the purpose of showing how differences of opinion on the values of workload components can become a

<sup>8</sup> Cohen and March, as do others, suggest that teaching, research, and service are the primary missions of a university. They also point out that "...every employee in it shares these responsibilities". See M. D. Cohen and J. March, Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), p. 331.



normal part of campus life. Obviously, conflicts of this nature must be addressed, although they may never be resolved. Any resolution would depend a great deal on the intricacies of the decision-making processes employed, and on the extent to which administrative power may be offset by the faculty member's influence.

It can be seen, therefore, that the general problems associated with faculty workloads in a university are many, and that the determination of those workloads is an excellent specific field in which to investigate the influence of the faculty member.

### The Problem

It can be assumed then that faculty should be concerned enough about workloads in general and about their own explicit time commitments in particular that an individual member who has some influence would apply it in the area of workload determination.

Accordingly, the major question addressed in this study concerns the influence an individual faculty member may have in determining his personal workload in a university. Is the workload merely assigned in a bureaucratic fashion, or is it negotiated in the collegial manner? Is it determined by the self-interest of the faculty member as an anarchical approach might suggest, or is it resolved by institutional interests as the professional model would suggest? Are

other factors involved as would be the case if the politicized concepts were in force? Answers to these questions may reveal whether the faculty member has influence in this area and, if he does, how great this influence may be as compared to the power held by administrators.

Power, however, is basically only what it is perceived to be by those who apply it and by those who are its recipients.<sup>9</sup> This research, therefore, must be an inquiry into the perceptions of the parties to workload determination; the administration and the faculty members.

The study, therefore, states as its major problem an investigation of the perceptions of administrators and faculty members in respect to the influence held by the individual faculty member. The determination of workloads was chosen as the specific area in which to carry out this study.

#### Specific Research Questions

The research follows primarily a case study approach in which one Faculty is studied in depth with the intent to obtain answers to general questions affecting all universities and their administrators and faculty members.

To address the more general theoretical problem a number of specific research questions were developed. These questions are categorized as follows:

---

<sup>9</sup> Christopher Hodgkinson, Towards a Philosophy of Administration (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978).

## I. Workload Requirements:

1. What are the perceptions of faculty members about the minimum requirements for the three components of workload: teaching, scholarly work, and community service?
2. What are the administration's perceptions about these minimum requirements?
3. How do the perceptions of faculty members and administrators compare and contrast on the perceived minimum requirements in workload?

## II. Workload Assignments:

4. What are the perceptions of faculty members on how the various parts of their workloads are determined?
5. What are the administration's perceptions on how these various parts of workload are determined?
6. How do the perceptions of faculty members and administrators compare and contrast on the issue of decision-making in workloads?

## III. Comparison of Subgroup Perceptions:

7. Are the perceptions of administrators uniform or are there measurable differences among subgroups based on department, administrative or academic rank, age, sex, experience, and tenure status?
8. Are the perceptions of faculty members uniform or are there measurable differences among subgroups based on department, academic rank, age, sex, experience, and tenure status?

## IV. Comparison with the Literature:

9. How do the measured perceptions resulting from this research compare or contrast with the literature on university governance and its various theoretical models?

## SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

There are a number of reasons for carrying out this study. First, research into the power structure of a university is generally done in the fields of governance, administrative functions, institutional goals and similar areas, and tends to deal with the faculty collectively. A specific study of the influence or power of individual faculty members has apparently not been done.

Secondly, specific research into university faculty workloads seems to have dealt largely with only the basics of workload. Various studies have investigated its meaning, its components, and the relative importance of those components; the reward systems associated with workload; the measurement of workloads; and similar basic concepts. They do not, however, seem to have addressed the actual determination of workloads.

Thirdly, it appears that, in spite of the many workload studies, and possibly because of conflicting results and views, there are no simple and well-defined perceptions on workloads.<sup>10</sup> Gonyea notes that "(w)e still do not have a clear perception of the relationship between what faculty

---

<sup>10</sup> Note the claim of professors that they produce little research because they are required to spend too much time on teaching activities. This is discussed by many authors. See, for instance, Cohen and March in Leadership and Ambiguity. Mandell suggests, however, as do others, that professors defend their relatively low quality of teaching with the claim that they are required to spend too much time on research. This is the 'publish or perish' concept. See Richard D. Mandell, The Professor Game (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977).

say they do, what they actually do, and what administrators perceive they are supposed to do."<sup>11</sup>

Lastly, because the topics of power and workload tend to be examined as separate items of investigation, the act of determining workloads does not appear to have been a topic of research.

The study may be considered significant then because the investigation of power and workloads appears to have been treated as two distinct topics, the former usually dealing in general terms with the collective faculty and the latter mostly leaving unclear perceptions.

Its significance, therefore, is two-fold. The relationship between the faculty member's influence and the administrator's power, as well as the distribution of those powers in the determination of workloads are established through the perceptions of the parties concerned. As a result of these power relationships significant conclusions are reached which may be of value both for practical application and for further research. There is no doubt that a fuller understanding of those relationships is essential for good governance in the modern university.

---

<sup>11</sup> Gonyea, "Determining Academic Staff Needs," p. 367.

## DELIMITATIONS

Certain specific delimitations were established for this study. Most of these are based on the fact that this research was primarily of an exploratory nature, proposed to shed some light on the relatively unknown extent of the faculty member's influence in a university.

The study was essentially intended to establish perceptions of the roles of the administration and the faculty member in the determination of faculty workloads. Accordingly, the first delimitation is that other possible power sources, or parties potentially having a concern in workload determination, were ignored for purposes of this inquiry. It is suggested, in other words, that an interest group like students and their organizations may have some influence in the determination of workloads, but that such concerns were not examined in this research.

The study is also delimited to investigate the faculty member's influence in one Faculty in one university only. For the sake of convenience, and for no other reason, the Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba was selected.

A further delimitation is imposed as a result of the assumption that only certain members of this Faculty are likely to have influence in the determination of their own workloads. It would seem unreasonable, for instance, to suspect that a part-time, stipend teacher has control to any

significant extent over the determination of his workload. For that reason part-time members, stipend teachers, fellowship holders, and all those below the rank of Assistant Professor were excluded. Included were only full-time, tenured faculty members, as well as those who were appointed to a full-time 'tenure-track' position. Not included in the study, however, were faculty members from among those eligible who were on leave-of-absence during the 1982-83 academic year, who were seconded to other positions or locations for that year, or who for some other reason were not directly employed at the Faculty on campus.

A final delimitation is that this research was exploratory of the Education Faculty as a whole. An attempt was made to examine data and to draw conclusions in relation to the four Departments. Similarly, a discrimination of results was attempted on the basis of academic rank, while comparisons were also attempted for sex, age group, years of service, and similar sub-groups. Some of these comparisons may be questionable, however, because of the relative smallness of such sub-groups.<sup>12</sup> Refined comparative analyses of that nature were then attempted but were not the primary objective of this examination.

---

<sup>12</sup> The relative smallness of the sub-group of Assistant Professors, for instance, caused by the fact that many are on leave or are seconded this year, prevented a discrimination of results on that basis. See Chapter III, Research Methodology, and see Walter R. Borg, Educational Research: An Introduction (New York: David McKay, 1965), pp. 172-73.

### LIMITATIONS

The limitations of this study are a direct result of its primary delimitations. Because only one Faculty at one university was studied, this research was mainly exploratory. Its findings, therefore, cannot be applied on a campus-, province-, or nation-wide basis. The conclusions reached reflect merely the situation as it is perceived to be at this one Faculty.

As well, because the Faculty of Education is a professional Faculty, results obtained through this research equally may not be applicable to academic faculties like Arts and Science. Also, because Education probably is significantly different from other professional faculties like Medicine and Engineering, a further delimitation is that results may not be valid for other professional faculties.

Another limitation is the fact that virtually all of the literature on universities is American with a very definite tendency to concern itself with American universities. Canadian universities, however, have developed historically through the British tradition and thus tend to reflect a very definite British influence. Comparisons between data from this study and such data as appear in the literature are, therefore, very tentative.

A further limitation is a result of the basic assumption that the determination of faculty workloads is a viable area



for testing a faculty member's influence. It was, of course, not possible to prove that in this study, although the findings suggest its validity.

As well, the sampling employed in the study was based on academic rank and thus may have resulted in some inaccurate data on the bases of department, age, and so on. Problems which may result from generalizing from specifics obtained on the basis of a small sample are inherent to an in-depth study of this nature. The conclusions drawn from the major findings must, therefore, be tempered by this limitation.

Finally, the investigation is limited in that no attempt was made to develop general or specific solutions to problems revealed through this study. It restricted itself to a reporting of perceptions and an interpretation of such data as were derived from them.

#### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data necessary to carry out this research were obtained through personal interviews with the academic administrators and with randomly selected faculty members of the Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba.

For interview purposes academic administrators only were selected from the administrative officers of the Faculty of Education, because only the former could be expected to have some input into the determination of faculty workloads.

Random sampling techniques were employed to select a sample population of fourteen faculty members, distributed proportionately over the three ranks included in the study.

The interviews of both administrators and faculty members were of similar format. Each interview was semi-structured for its objectivity, permitting at the same time a more thorough understanding of respondents' opinions and the reasons behind them. The questions employed were structured, but open-form, to ensure effective and ready communication between the two parties to the interview.<sup>13</sup>

Most interviews were recorded on tape, initially to study basic techniques for possible improvements, and to ensure as well that no valuable information was omitted from the study.

Wherever it was possible and useful, the data obtained through the interviews were quantified to permit tabulation and similar reporting methods.

#### DEFINITIONS

Key terms that were employed in this paper may be defined as follows:

|                    |                                                                                               |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| collective faculty | - the collegial group of faculty members within the Faculty                                   |
| faculty            | - the collective entity that is composed of all members of a university's instructional staff |

---

<sup>13</sup> Borg, Educational Research, pp. 222-31.

|                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Faculty          | - the Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| faculty member   | - an individual member of a university Faculty                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| governance       | - the total of all parties and interest groups that are able to participate in university management; the total system of institutional administration                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| governance model | - a model that is designed to describe how governance operates in practice in a university                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| influence        | - the power to produce a desired result without the use of coercion; power dependent largely on ability, knowledge, or personality; power not necessarily derived from formal position in an organization <sup>14</sup>                                                                                                                                                                     |
| power            | - the legitimated authority that can be used to attain a desired result, including the use of coercion; power dependent mostly on formal position and its associated legal status <sup>15</sup>                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| seminar          | - a component of the Seminar and School Experience courses which are compulsory for all students in the first and second year of Education studies and optional in the third year. The seminar component consists of a weekly discussion period during which students exchange student teaching experiences and present special, related assignments under the guidance of a seminar leader |
| seminar hour     | - a one-hour meeting per week held by a seminar group in one of the Seminar and School Experience courses                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| UMFA             | - the University of Manitoba Faculty                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

---

<sup>14</sup> See, for instance, Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive, 16th ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964) and Kenneth Culp Davis, Discretionary Justice: A Preliminary Inquiry (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971).

<sup>15</sup> op. cit.

### Association

- workload - the total of all work performed by a faculty member
- workload components - the major areas of a faculty member's professional work, generally divided into teaching, research, and service.

For the purpose of simplification of tables the following abbreviations were employed:

- |              |                                                            |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| Asst. Prof.  | - Assistant Professor                                      |
| Assoc. Dean  | - Associate Dean                                           |
| Assoc. Prof. | - Associate Professor                                      |
| Full Prof.   | - Professor                                                |
| Dept. Head   | - Department Head                                          |
| Fac. Mem.    | - Individual faculty member                                |
| Coll. Fac.   | - Collective faculty                                       |
| EAF          | - Department of Educational Administration and Foundations |
| EPs          | - Department of Educational Psychology                     |
| HSS          | - Department of Humanities and Social Sciences             |
| MNS          | - Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences           |

### ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The report commences with a chapter dealing with a review of the literature. Theories dealing with power and workloads are examined under the subheadings:

- Management Power in Universities
- Models of University Governance
- Faculty Power
- Elements of Workload
- Administrative and Faculty Functions in Workload Determination.

A chapter is then devoted to the methodology of this research. It contains a discussion of the methods employed to collect the required data, a statistical tabulation of

the sample population interviewed, and a reporting of the interviews themselves.

The following four chapters discuss the findings. In them the data collected from the interviews are reported wherever possible in the form of Tables and are subjected to careful analysis. Similarities and contrasts are identified and analysed from the two perspectives investigated - the administrative and the faculty's. Comparisons are also made with governance models reported in the literature. The findings of the research are identified on an on-going basis.

A final chapter summarizes those findings. It essentially recapitulates the problem of the study and discusses the major conclusions drawn from the findings. It also identifies implications for the universities and recommendations for further studies.

Appended are the structured questions employed during the interviews as well as a statistical report of such data derived from the interviews as are not immediately relevant to the study.

## Chapter II

### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The unusual, and probably unique, nature of the university among formal organizations is characterized by great confusion in at least two major areas. The first of these is the concept of applied power on campus; the other, the notion of faculty power. Both result in much disagreement among theorists. In fact, problems and dilemmas surround these ideas and usually appear more evident than solutions.

Clark expresses these difficulties exceedingly well:

This combination of what seem contradictory forms of organization (in a university) perplexes observers of academia. Is the faculty collegial? Yes, somewhat. Is it split into fragments? Yes, somewhat. Is it professional? Yes, somewhat. Is it unitary? Yes, somewhat. Is it bureaucratic? Yes, somewhat. Different features of the faculty strike us according to the occurrences of the week or the events we chance to observe. ... One observer will see the campus as a tight ship, the next will speak of the same campus as a lawless place where power lies around loose. No wonder we are confused and no wonder that outsiders are so often even more confused or more irrelevant in giving advice.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Burton R. Clark, "Faculty Organization and Authority," in Governing Academic Organizations, eds. Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977), p. 77.

It is this apparent confusion of contradictory forms of organization in the university, so aptly described by Clark, that makes it difficult to understand the position of individual faculty members. To gain some insight into this seeming anarchy requires some perception of administrative power, campus governance, collective faculty power, and workloads. It is for this reason that the literature on these topics is reviewed, with conclusions drawn as they appear to be relevant to the individual faculty member's influence.

#### MANAGEMENT POWER IN UNIVERSITIES

The literature suggests that administrative power depends a great deal upon administrative functions like planning and goal-setting. However, although the setting of plans and goals has given administrators much of their power, some theorists feel that budgeting rather than planning is the most dynamic function of university management, lying at the heart of the management process and affecting most management decisions.<sup>17</sup>

The administration may be seen as holding great power because of its direction over planning and goal-setting, and its control of the budget. It can, and does, influence faculty through such direction and control.

---

<sup>17</sup> Melvin D. Orwig and J. Kent Caruthers, "Selecting Budget Strategies and Priorities," in Improving Academic Management, eds. Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 342.

It is interesting that in recent years two trends have developed which tend to strengthen the position of administrators. One is the decline in resources coupled with high inflation. This has brought about the concept of goals-oriented resource allocation.<sup>18</sup> This creates a situation wherein institutional goals often set jointly by administration and faculty to maintain a sense of unity and common purpose in the university, in the end are centrally controlled by the administration through the basic operating budget, so that the administration in reality determines the overall direction and priorities of the university.<sup>19</sup> Academic programs can be strengthened or weakened by this practice at the whim of the central administration.<sup>20</sup>

The second trend which strengthens the position of administrators is the development of modern information systems which place at the disposal of the administration powerful tools of knowledge to be applied in practical situations. Such detailed and valuable information is available to other parties to the decision-making process only if it is given to them by the administration. Lack of such knowledge places

---

<sup>18</sup> Robert H. Fenske, "Setting Institutional Goals and Objectives," in Improving Academic Management, eds. Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 180.

<sup>19</sup> F. A. Rogers and R. L. Van Horn, "Goals-Oriented Resource Allocation for University Management," in Conflicting Pressures in Post-Secondary Education, ed. R. H. Fenske (Tallahassee, Fla.: Association for Institutional Research, 1976), p. 142.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 181.



those parties at a distinct disadvantage. Tierney suggests that much of the traditional collegial approach to decision-making is now little more than a formality because of declining resources and increasing availability of information.<sup>21</sup>

The vital nature of this 'organizational' intelligence is explained by Tierney who believes that the relative access of various campus constituencies to these data should be included in a definition of governance.<sup>22</sup> As well it is shown by the fact that faculty unions attempt to negotiate for the right of access to this type of information.

On the other hand, it appears in some ways that management powers may be reduced as a result of unionized faculties. Lam suggests this when he sees the union as becoming more powerful.<sup>23</sup> Young too suggests that the improvement of working conditions resulting from salary and benefits bargaining will lead to a reduction of management's control over the budget, and hence, to a reduction of management power.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Michael L. Tierney, "Administration: The Impact of Management Information Systems on Governance," in Governing Academic Organizations, eds. Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977), p. 223.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 224.

<sup>23</sup> Y. L. J. Lam, "Collective Bargaining: Present and Future Perspectives," The Canadian School Executive 1 : 5 (1981): p. 8.

<sup>24</sup> L. G. Young, "Is Collective Bargaining Compatible with Educational Objectives?" Alberta School Trustees 41

It is remarkable then that in evaluating the trends in administrative power some theorists see it increasing, largely due to better information systems and a declining economy, while others see it decreasing, mostly as a result of a gradual loss of control over the budget. Both trends are probably occurring simultaneously with administrative powers increasing in some areas and decreasing in others.

#### MODELS OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

It is impossible to appreciate fully the concept of administrative power in a university without considering faculty power. This has been done by many theorists through the development of governance models attempting to account for the unusual nature of the university.

#### The Bureaucratic Model

Bureaucracy seems to be most evident in a university and, possibly for that reason, is strongly espoused by Stroup and some other theorists.<sup>25</sup> In this model faculty has very little influence, while what little it has is directed mainly to the areas of curriculum and instruction.<sup>26</sup> The model recognizes a strong hierarchy in which the faculty is

(April 1971): p. 4.

<sup>25</sup> Herbert H. Stroup, Bureaucracy in Higher Education (New York: Free Press, 1966), Ch. IV.

<sup>26</sup> M. A. F. Ritchie, The College Presidency: Initiation into the Order of the Turtle (New York: Philosophical Library, 1970), p. 156.

positioned on the lowest level of the organization chart.

Baldrige considers a bureaucratic image helpful for studying the university, but insists that it does not portray accurately the influence of faculty.<sup>27</sup> In his view one of the weaknesses of this model is that it envisions the faculty member as a minor bureaucratic agent who accepts commands from higher levels in the hierarchy. This is probably not an accurate description of reality, as shown by Hill and French.<sup>28</sup>

Yet it is true that the university appears to be becoming more bureaucratic with each newly created position and each newly formulated policy. There appear to be more formal channels to follow than ever before, not only for students but for faculty and administrators.<sup>29</sup> There seem to be more formally designated positions, each with its limited and structured powers, and with its bureaucratic prerogatives for making regulations. There also appears to be more interaction between superiors and subordinates including the professors, along the formal channels laid out. Finally, there are more officially created policies, carefully

---

<sup>27</sup> J. Victor Baldrige, ed., Academic Governance (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1971), p. 3.

<sup>28</sup> Hill and French, "Perceptions of Power".

<sup>29</sup> This is partly caused by the emergence of the faculty union which, if nothing else, has replaced informal, tacit, and customary procedures in the area of governance with formal, explicit, and contractual procedures. See Joseph W. Garbarino, Faculty Bargaining (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975).

written out and published, and more written rules and regulations resulting from them than ever before.<sup>30</sup>

Much of the bureaucratic element is, however, present only in the daily lives of students, university employees like support staff personnel, and administrators, among which groups hierarchies with limited authority areas are very evident. Professors seem involved in the bureaucratic aspects of the university only in terms of their own bureaucratic relationships to students and support staff, and in their relationships to the administrators through the faculty union and the collective agreement.<sup>31</sup>

Dressel suggests not only that the bureaucratic model of governance does not correctly explain how universities operate, but that this model is actually very inappropriate. The model, in his view, fails to account for the faculty's unusual position in the organization by attempting to place at the lowest echelon a group which is highly self-directed and engaged in a wide range of specialized functions.<sup>32</sup> He warns that, should the university become bureaucratic with its faculty, the negative impact of bureaucracy on this type of individual would be most damaging.

---

<sup>30</sup> Clark, "Faculty Organization and Authority," pp. 236-37.

<sup>31</sup> Garbarino, Faculty Bargaining.

<sup>32</sup> Dressel, Handbook of Academic Evaluation, p. 383.

It appears then that the bureaucratic model should be rejected as not being representative of university governance and as failing to accommodate properly the role of faculty.<sup>33</sup>

### The Human Relations Model

It is the concern to account for the apparent independence of faculty that has led some theorists to a model that attempts to emphasize human values. The human relations model seemed to them to explain the unusual position of faculty. It is possible, however, to see the human relations point of view as a system in which management manipulates workers for better production. It is probably not very efficient, although the model has supporters, particularly in industry.<sup>34</sup>

It seems that most governance theorists give little time to the human relations model and that those who do, dismiss it quickly for being unrepresentative of the operation of the university.<sup>35</sup> The model falls far short of recognizing the self-directing and self-motivating nature of faculty.

---

<sup>33</sup> See also Baldridge, Academic Governance, and Cohen and March, Leadership and Ambiguity.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 384.

<sup>35</sup> See Baldridge, Academic Governance.

### The Collegial Model

The collegial model has held prominence in the literature for a considerable length of time. It is based on the concept that there should be full participation of the members of the academic community in the governance process.<sup>36</sup> Martin and Millett are among those who strongly advance the collegium as a model of governance.<sup>37</sup> Dressel comments:

The collegiality model, in its ideal sense, engages faculty and administration ... in rational dialogue to specify and clarify goals and means of achieving them.<sup>38</sup>

Dressel suggests that this model has long been attractive, and even active, usually in the smaller institutions, but that it is no longer practical today, particularly in the large universities. The model depends on a theoretical "ideal sense" which in practice does not exist.

As Baldrige so aptly suggests, most supporters of the collegial model say basically that the university ought to be a collegium; they do not say it is one. Its major shortcoming seems to be that it does not allow for conflict.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Millett, "Governance and Leadership," p. 5.

<sup>37</sup> Warren B. Martin, "The University as Community," The Educational Record (Fall 1967), and John Millett, The Academic Community (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962).

<sup>38</sup> Dressel, Handbook of Academic Evaluation, p. 385.

<sup>39</sup> Baldrige, Academic Governance, p. 7.

He points out that the collegium's round-table discussions are not realistic. These may still happen at the departmental levels, but at higher levels they do not occur in most instances. In short, he dismisses this model as useful only as a tool of reform, but seems to imply that such reform would probably be merely a setting back of the clock.

The model, however, has some elements that seem to reflect reality. In particular, it recognizes a considerable amount of influence for the faculty. Probably as well, the individual faculty member is seen as sharing in that influence through the collegial relations he has with both his peers and the administrators.

### The Anarchical Model

Another model developed by a number of authors to describe how a university operates is the anarchical model, also known as the benevolent-anarchic or the organized anarchy model.

It is described by Cohen and March as follows:

In a university anarchy each individual in the university is seen as making autonomous decisions. Teachers decide if, when, and what to teach. Students decide if, when, and what to learn. Legislators and donors decide if, when, and what to support. Neither coordination ... nor control is practiced. Resources are allocated by whatever process emerges but without explicit accommodation and without explicit reference to some superordinate goal. The 'decisions' of the system are ... intended by no one and decisively controlled

by no one.<sup>40</sup>

As a description of what seems to be happening in a university it is accurate in that it reflects the confusion that is so often evident. As a model it seems to show only that everyone goes his own way and, therefore, emphasizes merely the need for a better understanding of the practical operation of a university.

Dressel, on the other hand, sees the anarchical image as having some use if a university is seen as operating on the basis that each of its sectors pursues its own interests almost divorced from other sectors and from the central administration. This, he feels, is possible in very large institutions if resources are ample or if sectors of an institution are financially self-sufficient.<sup>41</sup>

Most authors do not deal with the university viewed as anarchy. This may well be because in depicting the general state of confusion, the model shows individuals to have such total freedom as to seem unreasonable in respect to actual practice. However exaggerated though, it recognizes more than any other the faculty and the faculty member as having great power and influence.

---

<sup>40</sup> Cohen and March, Leadership and Ambiguity, pp. 33-34.

<sup>41</sup> Dressel, Handbook of Academic Evaluation, p. 385.



### The Professional Model

The professional model was devised to account for the faculty's specialized esoteric knowledge. It is felt by some that this knowledge leads to a desire for a large degree of independence from lay and normal organizational control, as is the case with members of professional organizations.<sup>42</sup>

Clark believes that the professional model is a view of campus governance that can be justified by four trends: the change from a unitary to a composite nature of the university, the movement from single to multiple values within the institution, the change from non-professional to professional work, and the change from consensus governance to one of bureaucratic coordination.<sup>43</sup>

This model is particularly interesting because it envisions superimposed coordination by management, in the form of bureaucracy, to allow the professor to continue his complex role in the university.<sup>44</sup>

According to Clark then, the professional model seems to approach more nearly to campus reality, particularly in that it views faculty and faculty members as holding considerable professional influence, with conflicts between faculties and faculty members mediated by the administration.

---

<sup>42</sup> Clark, "Faculty Organization and Authority," p. 240.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 237.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 248.

### The Political Model

The political model is very strongly espoused by Baldrige and is somewhat similar to the professional model. The political model, however, views conflict as a power struggle between interest groups with disagreements not necessarily settled, whereas the professional model sees it as simply resolved by the administration.

As Baldrige explains:

These groups articulate their interests in many different ways, bringing pressure to bear on the decision-making process from any number of angles and using power and force whenever it is available and necessary.... All this is a dynamic process, a process clearly indicating that the university is best understood as a 'politicized' institution.<sup>45</sup>

Baldrige calls this model 'political' because he sees six similarities with the political process employed in a democracy. He notes that in a university, as in politics, inactivity prevails because most faculty members, like voters, do not participate in the process. Similarly there is fluid participation with participants moving into and out of decision-making processes at will. Interest groups vary tremendously with a great diversity of goals and values. Conflict is very evident and promotes healthy organizational change. Also the university, like the political arena, has very specific limitations on formal authority. Finally, as in politics, external interest groups abound.

---

<sup>45</sup> Baldrige, Academic Governance, pp. 8-9.

He sees the university as a social system which is founded on conflict between interest groups, and on power alliances under the leadership of a president who is primarily a negotiator and mediator, in strong contrast with the bureaucratic model in which the president may be viewed as the "hero" who solves all problems.<sup>46</sup>

The political model then depicts the university as a political arena in which faculty has power but in which it is essentially only one of the many gladiators pitting its strength against opponents. The model gives little recognition to the individual faculty member.

#### Governance Reality

Each of these models envisions a different role for the faculty. In the university viewed as bureaucracy the faculty is seen primarily as a group of nonentities. This position is somewhat similar to that found in the human relations model in which faculty is basically to be manipulated. The collegial and professional models see the faculty as a strong force on campus, but only the anarchical model gives the individual faculty member extensive influence - and that is possibly based on self-interest. The political model sees faculty as having substantial power but only on a collective and competitive basis.

---

<sup>46</sup> Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldrige, ed., Governing Academic Organizations (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977), pp. 21-23.

All these views reflect tentative theories which have not been proven to be correct. It is very well possible indeed to see the campus in a manner which includes bureaucratic tendencies, anarchical inclinations, human relations philosophy, collegiality and professionalism, and many other elements, all bound together with a strong political orientation.

A complex view of this type would create a model that not only may describe best what is happening on campus, but may account for a faculty which seems never less than an important aspect of governance procedures, and at times appears a dominant power.

#### FACULTY POWER

Historically faculty has shared power with the governing boards and administrators. Faculty has been primarily responsible for decision-making in curriculum and instruction, while the board has been mostly responsible for general policy-making and developmental planning and growth.<sup>47</sup> This is depicted in the bureaucratic model.

A virtually free hand in the teaching aspects of the institution has given faculty considerable power because it has been, and has been seen to be, the expert in that field. Faculty still plays the role of the professional in that respect and, because of that, needs and seeks a large degree

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 156.

of autonomy from lay control and normal organizational control.<sup>48</sup> This aspect is present in the professional model.

A further source of power for the faculty lies in the all-encompassing nature of its work. The major work of the institution is performed by faculty members who generally are proficient in that work. They were hired for these capabilities which tend to exceed the qualifications of those in non-academic administrative positions. Also, departments and individual professors handle all areas of research, development, production, sales, and service which are clearly separated functions in business and industry.<sup>49</sup> In formal organizations divisions of power normally occur as a result of separation of functions. In the university this does not happen, so that at least an element of control in all those areas strengthens the power-base of the faculty.

Another historic basis of faculty influence can be seen in the traditionally collegial nature of academia. The collegial model depicts that special relationship between faculty and administration. In this view the administrator can be seen primarily as an academic who tends to be loath to use the legitimated power associated with his position unless it is absolutely required. He will rather discuss, consult, and negotiate with faculty, and is much inclined, and often forced by university regulations, to listen to

---

<sup>48</sup> Clark, "Faculty Organization and Authority," p. 65.

<sup>49</sup> Dressel, Handbook of Academic Evaluation, p. 384.

faculty opinion and advice. This gives faculty a distinct advantage over the academic administrator who feels the need to obtain agreement - a feeling not normally experienced by faculty.<sup>50</sup>

The structure of senate, council, and committee, which resulted from collegiality, has become formalized, partly as a result of the introduction on campus of the faculty union which demands formalized procedures, and partly as a result of the great expansion of the university which led to a more political environment with heavy bureaucratic overtones.<sup>51</sup> The faculty union has insisted on retaining much of the former informal structure of faculty participation in governance, but in a formal setting, and uses this traditional structure in what is now supposed to be primarily an adversary rather than a collegial relationship.

Faculty strength also appears derived in part from the peer review committee as it has developed over the years. University teaching as a profession displays many of the characteristics identified in the professional typologies.<sup>52</sup> One of these characteristics is illustrated in the peer review committee which over the years has given faculty an element of control over tenure and promotion (including the

---

<sup>50</sup> See Dressel, Handbook of Academic Evaluation.

<sup>51</sup> See Baldrige, Academic Governance, and Garbarino, Faculty Bargaining.

<sup>52</sup> Ernest Greenwood, "Attributes of a Profession," Social Work 2 : 3 (July, 1957).

reward of salaries associated with rank), and, more recently, in many institutions, an element of control over merit increases.<sup>5 3</sup>

There are, of course, many other sources of faculty power, not the least of which are the non-formal types of power and influence, like threats, appeals to sentiment, appeals to powerful community groups and figures, emotionalism, and so on.<sup>5 4</sup>

It is probably in part in this area that one would find individual faculty influence, reinforced by the leadership qualities and interpersonal skills that each individual may have to a greater or lesser degree.

Finally, individual influence would also be attained through the university's democratic tendencies which prevent the institution from ordering decisions. This leads to a search for compromises which "... compels the university to pay attention to even the most junior faculty member".<sup>5 5</sup>

---

<sup>5 3</sup> Robert T. Blackburn, Colman O'Connell, and Glenn Pellino, "Evaluating Faculty Performance," in Improving Academic Management, eds. Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), pp. 470-71.

<sup>5 4</sup> Baldridge, Academic Governance, p. 4.

<sup>5 5</sup> Ibid., p. 10.

### The Faculty Union

It is only in recent years that the faculty has turned seriously to the concept that there is strength in unity. As a result of the general acceptance of that idea many university administrations today have to contend with a faculty union on campus. The effect of the union is difficult to determine at this time, although studies are in progress and theorists have attempted to project its potential impacts.

The concept of union is, however, still alien to some of the most common university traditions. Baldrige and Kemerer suggest that there are at least four basic assumptions which characterize the philosophy of unions:

1. There is conflict between those who are employed and those who administer.
2. The employee group accepts an organization as its exclusive representative vis-a-vis management.
3. Individuals and small groups are protected; for example, there is the concept of 'fair representation' of all individuals, even if they don't belong to the union.
4. The employee group must win representative status as a collective bargaining agent within a legal framework that has authority beyond the employer. The organization must not depend on the continued good graces of the employer for its continued existence.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Baldrige and Kemerer, "Images of Governance," p. 253.



Baldrige and Kemerer suggest that an appreciation of those basic assumptions shows that there are at least two implications for university governance: the faculty which wishes to form, or has formed, a union claims to be the employee with all the employee rights granted by legislation, and such a faculty sees itself in an adversary rather than a collegial relationship with the employer - a relationship established through the business-industrial model.<sup>57</sup>

These implications are, of course, far-reaching because the union concept tends to negate all that makes university governance unusual. The union contract, for instance, greatly formalizes relationships and thus encourages bureaucratic tendencies. As well, the adversarial stance is based on the master-servant relationship, which certainly seems foreign to academia, while the very notion of employee rights is contrary to the concept of collegiality which faculty generally still appears to believe valid in governance. Nevertheless these implications are there.<sup>58</sup>

There is probably little question that a unionized faculty encourages polarization on campus with the administration controlling certain decisions and union contracts

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., pp. 260-61.

<sup>58</sup> Donald H. Wollett, "Historical Development of Faculty Bargaining and Current Extent," in Proceedings, First Annual Conference, ed. Maurice C. Benewitz (New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, 1973), p. 32.

governing others.<sup>59</sup>

Another key concept almost implicit in unionization is that union contracts govern and guarantee group rights and essentially transfer the rights of the individual faculty member to the union.<sup>60</sup>

Garbarino considers the introduction of an effective grievance procedure as the most important change resulting from the introduction of the union, and stresses the ensuing emphasis on formalized procedures. He notes, however, that the introduction of third-party determination of some issues through arbitration will probably affect processes more than the substance of decisions.<sup>61</sup>

All this suggests that two major changes will probably occur in the relative power of administration and faculty.<sup>62</sup> The faculty collectively will be much more powerful because of its legalized bargaining position, while the individual faculty member will probably be weaker because the union concept negates individualism in spite of the individual's rights to grievance procedures. As well, the administration will probably gain some power because it will have at hand formalized, procedural, and negotiated rules and regulations

---

<sup>59</sup> op. cit.

<sup>60</sup> Baldrige and Kemerer, "Images of Governance," pp. 263-64.

<sup>61</sup> Garbarino, Faculty Bargaining, p. 256.

<sup>62</sup> See Wollett, "Historical Development of Faculty Bargaining", and Garbarino, Faculty Bargaining.

which will be much more readily enforceable than those of the consensus system in which they tended to be informal and, hence, difficult to implement.

However, the exact nature of the individual faculty member's influence remains unknown, as does the extent of that influence. It appears reasonable to assume that the individual has lost some influence because he has granted the union the right to be his representative. Nevertheless, it seems equally reasonable to suggest that he has gained a stronger power-base because he has access to formal and effective grievance procedures.

#### ELEMENTS OF WORKLOAD

The component elements of faculty workload have been defined by many students of this topic, with differences being largely a matter of personal preference.

Mandell discusses at length the components of a professor's workload and states that in most universities the duties of a professor are officially identified as research, publications, and other scholarly activities; teaching; and service to the department, college, university, and community. He points out as well that the relative importance of each of these components changes with the institution and the field.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Mandell, The Professor Game, p. 184.

It appears that the majority of authors concur and, for discussion purposes, divide workload into three major components: teaching, research, and service.<sup>64</sup>

### Relative Importance of Workload Components

The amount of time that should be spent on each of the components of workload is a controversial topic. Authors tend to disagree largely on the basis of the perspective from which they write. The more moderate approaches to this issue are inclined to see an equal need for all components and tend to recognize that different institutions, disciplines, and people require individual time allocations to these components.

The most common controversy over the components of workload is between the supporters of teaching on the one hand and research on the other. Brook decries the tendency to place emphasis on a specific component:

Discussion about universities is bedevilled by unreal antitheses, presented with the suggestion that we must choose one or the other: teaching or research, ... In all of these it is possible to say that there is no mutual exclusion.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> D. J. Cornish, Faculty Workloads - A Critical Examination (Edmonton: Alberta Colleges Commission, ERIC ED 067 065, 1972), pp. 12-13, and Paul Jedamus, "Teaching Loads Over Time," New Directions for Institutional Research 2 (Summer 1974), p. 17.

<sup>65</sup> G. L. Brook, The Modern University (London, Andre Deutsch Ltd., 1965), p. 9.



Ritchie supports this negation of the antithesis between research and teaching:

The question of research ... frequently comes up in any discussion of publication. Too often research and teaching are thought of as "either-or". I do not agree .... My firm opinion is that research and teaching should be interactive and that the one should stimulate the other .... I reject the notion that it has to be one or the other.<sup>66</sup>

In all probability it is wrong to assume that one or another component is generally or always most important. The value of the components, after all, depends a great deal also on other factors.

The common expectation that every professor should engage in classroom teaching, teach undergraduates as well as graduates, do research, advise, and serve on committees should be discarded. Professors, like everyone else, vary in interest and abilities. To retain their positions, they should be asked to demonstrate effective performance in at least two of the major faculty functions, and their assignments should take these individual differences into account.<sup>67</sup>

This seems to support the concepts that all components of workload are important, that motivation towards particular components varies with disciplines, and that interests and abilities in various components change with individuals. The point is made as well that such differences must be recognized in the assignment of workloads.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Ritchie, The College Presidency, p. 160.

<sup>67</sup> Cohen and March, Leadership and Ambiguity, p. 369.

<sup>68</sup> Blackburn et al., "Evaluating Faculty Performance", p. 466.

In spite of the foregoing, however, it must be realized that many authors favour one particular component. The literature on faculty workload tends to emphasize research. Teaching is mostly dealt with in the context of evaluation, while both teaching and service as components of total workload tend to be viewed generally as activities which unfortunately interfere with research.

This has been reflected recently in what appears to be a continuing effort on the part of faculty to reduce the teaching component of workload, ostensibly to make available more time for research. Cornish comments on this faculty pressure by calling it a tendency to negotiate for fewer and fewer teaching hours without apparent objective or rational goal.<sup>69</sup>

Mandell emphasizes the little time that actually appears to be spent on the teaching activity. He feels that teaching cannot be considered exhaustive work unless it were required for forty hours a week and fifty weeks a year. This, however, is not the case.

In American universities the twelve-, nine-, or most especially, six-hour teaching load is officially justified by the need of the professor to stay abreast of his field.<sup>70</sup>

Earlier Mandell indicates that little time appears to be spent on any faculty activity:

---

<sup>69</sup> Cornish, Faculty Workloads, p. 2.

<sup>70</sup> Mandell, The Professor Game, p. 193.

...the statutory workyear of less than eight months and a workweek of less than ten hours is sheltered by an obscurantist bureaucracy and a social organization that is overwhelmingly authoritarian, mutually protective, and sealed from almost any scrutiny that might be sceptical.<sup>71</sup>

Workloads then, and in particular their teaching component, appear to be light - an impression that seems usually shared by the public.<sup>72</sup> This tacit general perception led Toombs to suggest the incorporation of a symbolic workweek of 40 to 48 hours as the base of a faculty workload formula to help dispel such beliefs.<sup>73</sup>

In spite of this apparently light teaching load, service activities are often considered only to detract from teaching and research. Keeton, for instance, notes a number of difficulties and disadvantages to faculty participation in campus governance. One of these he suggests is that "(t)he use of faculty time to governance withdraws that time and talent from the tasks for which the faculty were employed and in which they are most expert".<sup>74</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 189.

<sup>72</sup> See, for instance, Colorado State University, Office of University Planning and Budgets, Comparative Staffing Units as a Measure of University Instructional Workload (Fort Collins: 1975), ERIC ED 139 367, p. 2, and John Lombardi, Faculty Workload. Topical Paper No. 46 (Los Angeles: California University, 1974), ERIC ED 097 925), p. 6.

<sup>73</sup> Lombardi, Faculty Workload, p. 9.

<sup>74</sup> Morris Keeton, "The Constituencies and Their Claims," in Governing Academic Organizations, eds. Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977), p. 196.

Others claim that service is often taken on by professors only because they find research too taxing.<sup>75</sup> Service activities like committee work should, however, be considered important because it is through those activities that faculty acquires and maintains valuable power to be applied in the governance process.

Research and scholarly work seem to receive most attention in the literature on workloads. No evidence is produced to show that research is an unpleasant activity that detracts from more worthwhile pursuits. As this argument is frequently used for the teaching and service components, it appears, by deduction alone, reasonably safe to assume that research is considered by many to be most vital.

The literature suggests then that all components of workload should be important but that research is seen by many faculty members as most taxing with the least amount of time available for it.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE AND FACULTY FUNCTIONS IN WORKLOAD DETERMINATION

No studies appear to have been done on the power applied by administrators to determine workloads. It is recognized that one of the administration's primary tasks is to determine academic staff needs and that it is also "...  
charged with determining their appropriate allocation to

<sup>75</sup> Brook, The Modern University, p. 138.



teaching units and determining if they were utilized properly".<sup>76</sup>

Gonyea suggests that data available for determining staff allocations are mostly budgetary, while for determining workloads these data "...very rarely would contain information on faculty allocation of time or effort to instructional programs or missions".<sup>77</sup> This situation exists in spite of the administration's improved information systems.

To be able to allocate staff to best advantage some basic data are required. A major effort to obtain useful information was put into the faculty inventory or activity analysis. A great deal has been written about their use, but to this day their validity remains questionable.<sup>78</sup>

The literature implies that faculty members appear to have controlled the determination of their workloads, and as Gonyea observes, "... by and large, they accepted and carried out their responsibility effectively".<sup>79</sup> It appears that the responsibility for workload determination has been primarily self-oriented, with the administration principally coordinating efforts.

---

<sup>76</sup> Gonyea, "Determining Academic Staff Needs," p. 366.

<sup>77</sup> op. cit.

<sup>78</sup> op. cit.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., p. 367.

Workload literature does not include very much at all about administrative input into its determination. The literature suggests that administrators now recognize more than ever faculty's right to set its own workloads, which may be deduced from Lombardi's definition of workload which states that it is "... the sum of activities which take the time of a college ...teacher and which are related either directly or indirectly to his professional duties, responsibilities, and interests".<sup>80</sup> This combination of virtually all of a professor's activities as part of his workload has had a major impact on the ideas of where and when a professor works. Particularly since the beginning of the 70's, "...an increasing number of administrators are recognizing the professional status of the instructor, including his right to direct his energies in whatever direction he desires on- or off-campus".<sup>81</sup>

It is suggested that faculty's obligations consist of teaching a specific number of hours, set at the departmental level for and with each individual, and of performing other professional work to the best interest of the institution. The latter would be in the areas of scholarly work and public service, seen as two of the major functions of the university.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Lombardi, Faculty Workload, p. 1.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>82</sup> C. B. Lee, "Whose Goals for American Higher Education?" in Whose Goals for American Higher Education?, eds. C. G.

As a result of the vague description of workload, theorists submit that the faculty member will have considerable freedom in the choice of location in which he carries out his professional work. This should be evident particularly in the four months of the year that are not part of the regular academic session. As well, it may be expected that he will have considerable freedom in the choice of the type of professional work he does when he is not engaged in actual teaching and that he will be almost totally free to regulate the amount of work he performs.

This situation in which the faculty member seems to have considerable say over his own workload is not considered by many to be to the institution's best advantage today. Present circumstances "... demand faculty requirements to be determined by responsible academic policy makers who can implement their strategies and evaluate their effectiveness as well".<sup>83</sup>

Because of the problems of scarce resources and declining enrollments the roles of administrators and faculty members must change, according to Gonyea, in respect to the determination of workloads. Administrators must change their role from co-ordinating faculty and department decisions to one of managing effectively the scarce resources available, while faculty must change from being self-directed to

Dobbin and C. B. Lee (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968), p. 1.

<sup>83</sup> Gonyea, "Determining Academic Staff Needs", p. 367.

playing effectively their allocated activity role to meet the needs of the university's missions.<sup>84</sup>

Faculty reaction to this idea still seems primarily negative as can be seen by the exhortations of various authors who favour evaluations and the use of faculty inventories, and who attempt to convince faculty of their need and value.<sup>85</sup>

It seems clear that faculty members utilize their time in multiple tasks that relate closely to the university's missions. Administrative planning of academic staff needs must, therefore, be done within the context of the determination of missions, goals, and programs because change in the latter three will affect faculty resource requirements. Administrators can, therefore, not operate in a vacuum but must take many factors into account when determining staffing needs. One of those factors, it is suggested, is that they must know how faculty spends its time; another is that they must probably determine that in the end.

---

<sup>84</sup> op. cit.

<sup>85</sup> See, for instance, John A. Centra, Determining Faculty Effectiveness (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979), and Kenneth E. Eble, The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching (Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 1974).

## SUMMARY

This chapter has attempted to review the literature related to the influence of the individual faculty member. Some of the major observations made are summarized here.

A review of theoretical models of governance indicates basically that none of them do more than approximate the facts of power as they can be observed. University governance is seen, however, as becoming more politically oriented than ever before, although the political model itself falls short of describing accurately the power structure on campus.

Adjustments in power distributions between the administrative and faculty groups are occurring, although their full implications are not as yet understood. University management is seen as having gained considerable power recently, partly through better information systems and partly through greater control of the budget in inflationary times. At the same time, however, the faculty is seen to have increased its power through unionization which formalized and structured many of the processes heretofore left informal and vague. The union's ability to control at least part of the budget through negotiations of working conditions has greatly enhanced faculty's position.

Theorists intimate that in all probability these opposing trends will result in a more clear-cut division of power, with management ending up controlling certain specific areas

of decision-making and faculty controlling others. This dichotomy in the power structure would be a departure from traditional collegiality and would emphasize the adversary relationship between the two parties.

Administrative weakness in workload determination is shown through administrators' inability to know what faculty does.<sup>86</sup> A review of the workload literature reveals that faculty itself seems to determine to a considerable extent what it does with its time.

The individual faculty member is rarely mentioned in the literature on university power. His strength cannot be estimated on the basis of theories, although it is possible, by inference from the literature, to suggest that he should have considerable influence in the determination of his own workload.

---

<sup>86</sup> See Gonyea, "Determining Academic Staff Needs".

### Chapter III

#### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study set out to ascertain the perceptions of administrators and faculty members about faculty workload requirements and the determination of those workloads. Because of the exploratory nature of the research, it was decided to select one Faculty at one university to obtain the necessary data. For the sake of convenience the Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba was chosen as the site of the investigation. Interviews were held with twenty-one individuals from among the administration and the instructional staff of this Faculty.

#### THE SAMPLES

Two different methods were employed to select the samples for these two populations. A total of seven administrators and fourteen faculty members were chosen as samples sufficiently large to obtain results that may be considered statistically reliable. The methods of selection and the resulting composition of the samples are detailed below.

### The Administration Sample

Because only administrators who could be expected to have some input in faculty workload determination on campus should be included in the study, all other administrative officers were eliminated. Thus, members chosen for interviews for the administration sample were selected by taking those employed on the campus proper and holding 'academic' administrative positions. Those not included in the sample were the Director of Student Teaching and his Assistant. The sample then consisted of seven persons including the Dean, two Associate Deans, and four Department Heads, and represented 77.8 per cent of the academic administrators.

As a result of this method of selection sub-groups emerged as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

It may be noted in Table 1 that the administrative sample is remarkably uniform in that subgroups usually consist of six members in one category and one in the other. All seven administrators had more than five years experience at the Faculty and only one had more than 10 years experience in the administrative position.

Table 2 exhibits the same general uniformity as is shown for the subgroupings in Table 1. It is thus impossible to carry out comparative analyses by administrative subgroups because no valid differences are evident among the members of this sample.



TABLE 1

## Composition of Administration Sample

Administrative Sample by  
Age, Sex, Marital Status, Academic Rank,  
Years of Experience at Faculty, and  
Years of Experience in this Administrative Position

| <u>Subgroup</u>                       | <u>Category</u>  | <u>Numbers</u> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Age                                   | Under 40         | 2              |
|                                       | 40 yrs. or Older | 5              |
|                                       | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
|                                       | Total            | 7              |
| Sex                                   | Male             | 6              |
|                                       | Female           | 1              |
|                                       | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
|                                       | Total            | 7              |
| Marital Status                        | Married          | 6              |
|                                       | Single           | 1              |
|                                       | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
|                                       | Total            | 7              |
| Academic Rank                         | Professor        | 6              |
|                                       | Assoc. Professor | 1              |
|                                       | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
|                                       | Total            | 7              |
| Experience at Faculty                 | 5 yrs. or Fewer  | 0              |
|                                       | 6-10 yrs.        | 3              |
|                                       | 11 yrs. or More  | 4              |
|                                       | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
|                                       | Total            | 7              |
| Experience in This<br>Admin. Position | 5 yrs. or Fewer  | 3              |
|                                       | 6-10 yrs.        | 3              |
|                                       | 11 yrs. or More  | 1              |
|                                       | <hr/>            | <hr/>          |
|                                       | Total            | 7              |

TABLE 2  
Composition of Administration Sample

Administrative Sample by  
Degrees Held, Tenure Status,  
Teacher Certification, and  
Years of Teaching Experience  
in Grade School

| <u>Subgroup</u>                         | <u>Category</u>              | <u>Numbers</u> |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Degrees                                 | Doctorate                    | 6              |
|                                         | Working towards<br>Doctorate | 1              |
|                                         | <hr/>                        | <hr/>          |
|                                         | Total                        | 7              |
| Tenure                                  | Yes                          | 7              |
|                                         | No                           | 0              |
|                                         | <hr/>                        | <hr/>          |
|                                         | Total                        | 7              |
| Teacher Certification                   | Certified                    | 6              |
|                                         | Not Certified                | 1              |
|                                         | <hr/>                        | <hr/>          |
|                                         | Total                        | 7              |
| Teaching Experience<br>in Grade Schools | No Experience                | 1              |
|                                         | 1-4 yrs.                     | 2              |
|                                         | 5yrs. or More                | 4              |
|                                         | <hr/>                        | <hr/>          |
|                                         | Total                        | 7              |

### The Faculty Sample

The teaching staff of the Faculty for 1982-83 consisted of 65 members, of whom 20 were not considered for this study because of full or partial research/study leaves, secondment

to other positions, ranks below Assistant Professor, or other delimitations specified for the study. Also not included was the chief advisor for this research project. The remaining 44 were divided by department and rank as shown in Table 3:

| TABLE 3                                 |                       |                         |                        |              |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Eligible Faculty by Department and Rank |                       |                         |                        |              |
| <u>Department</u>                       | <u>Full<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Asst.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| EAF                                     | 3                     | 2                       | 1                      | 6            |
| EPs                                     | 3                     | 8                       | 0                      | 11           |
| HSS                                     | 3                     | 8                       | 4                      | 15           |
| MNS                                     | 5                     | 6                       | 1                      | 12           |
|                                         | <hr/>                 | <hr/>                   | <hr/>                  | <hr/>        |
| Totals                                  | 14                    | 24                      | 6                      | 44           |

Proportional, stratified random sampling was used to select four of the 14 Full Professors (28.6 per cent), seven of the 24 Associate Professors (29.2 per cent), and three of the six Assistant Professors (50.0 per cent) to obtain the total sample of 14 faculty members, representing a large enough section of the total population (31.8 per cent) to be statistically valid. The selection was made in this particular manner to ensure that a proportionate representation of the three academic ranks would be part of the

sample. As a result of this sampling technique sub-groups of faculty emerged as shown in Tables 4 to 11.

Table 4 indicates that the fourteen faculty members chosen at random were divided reasonably among the four departments. Comparative analyses on this bases are, therefore, attempted.

| TABLE 4                               |                   |                     |                    |              |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Faculty Sample by Department and Rank |                   |                     |                    |              |
| <u>Department</u>                     | <u>Full Prof.</u> | <u>Assoc. Prof.</u> | <u>Asst. Prof.</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| EAF                                   | 1                 | 1                   | 1                  | 3            |
| EPs                                   | 2                 | 2                   | 0                  | 4            |
| HSS                                   | 0                 | 1                   | 2                  | 3            |
| MNS                                   | 1                 | 3                   | 0                  | 4            |
| <hr/>                                 | <hr/>             | <hr/>               | <hr/>              | <hr/>        |
| Totals                                | 4                 | 7                   | 3                  | 14           |

Table 5 shows that, by using 40 years of age as a dividing mark, a fairly even division in ages can be established, permitting comparative analyses.

TABLE 5

## Faculty Sample by Age Group and Rank

| <u>Age Group</u> | <u>Full<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Asst.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Under 40 yrs.    | 0                     | 4                       | 2                      | 6            |
| 40 yrs. or Older | 4                     | 3                       | 1                      | 8            |
|                  | <hr/>                 | <hr/>                   | <hr/>                  | <hr/>        |
| Totals           | 4                     | 7                       | 3                      | 14           |

As is evident from Table 6, males represent 64.3 per cent and females 35.7 per cent of the faculty sample. Although the male subgroup is almost twice as large as the female, there are sufficient numbers in each to permit some comparisons of study results on this basis.

TABLE 6

## Faculty Sample by Sex and Rank

| <u>Sex</u> | <u>Full<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Asst.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Male       | 2                     | 4                       | 3                      | 9            |
| Female     | 2                     | 3                       | 0                      | 5            |
|            | <hr/>                 | <hr/>                   | <hr/>                  | <hr/>        |
| Totals     | 4                     | 7                       | 3                      | 14           |

Table 7 suggests an even distribution in the subgroups of faculty members based on fewer or more than ten years experience at the Faculty. The small group with five or fewer years experience may, however, be more crucial for an analysis of study results than the larger group with less than eleven years.

TABLE 7

Faculty Sample by Experience at Faculty and Rank

| <u>Experience</u> | <u>Full<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Asst.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| 5 yrs. or Fewer   | 0                     | 2                       | 2                      | 4            |
| 6 - 10 yrs.       | 1                     | 1                       | 1                      | 3            |
| 11 yrs. or More   | 3                     | 4                       | 0                      | 7            |
| <hr/>             | <hr/>                 | <hr/>                   | <hr/>                  | <hr/>        |
| Totals            | 4                     | 7                       | 3                      | 14           |

Table 8 indicates that only three faculty members in this sample were non-tenured. However, because of the possible unique perceptions of the non-tenured, comparisons are attempted on the basis of tenure status.

TABLE 8

## Faculty Sample by Tenure Status and Rank

| <u>Tenure Status</u> | <u>Full<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Asst.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Tenure               | 4                     | 7                       | 0                      | 11           |
| No Tenure            | 0                     | 0                       | 3                      | 3            |
|                      | <hr/>                 | <hr/>                   | <hr/>                  | <hr/>        |
| Totals               | 4                     | 7                       | 3                      | 14           |

According to Table 9 five members in the sample did not hold doctorate degrees. Results are analysed on this basis because of the similarity with the subgroups based on sex.

TABLE 9

## Faculty Sample by Highest Degree Held and Rank

| <u>Doctorate Degree</u> | <u>Full<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Asst.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Yes                     | 3                     | 5                       | 1                      | 9            |
| No                      | 1                     | 2                       | 2                      | 5            |
|                         | <hr/>                 | <hr/>                   | <hr/>                  | <hr/>        |
| Totals                  | 4                     | 7                       | 3                      | 14           |

Only one faculty member in the sample had not certified as a public school teacher as indicated in Table 10. Comparisons on this basis, therefore, cannot be attempted.

TABLE 10

## Faculty Sample by Teacher Certification and Rank

| <u>Certified Public<br/>School Teacher</u> | <u>Full<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Asst.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Yes                                        | 4                     | 6                       | 3                      | 13           |
| No                                         | 0                     | 1                       | 0                      | 1            |
| _____                                      | _____                 | _____                   | _____                  | _____        |
| Totals                                     | 4                     | 7                       | 3                      | 14           |

Table 11 indicates that almost all faculty members in the sample had taught in the public school system for a period of one to four years prior to working at the Faculty. Comparisons on this basis, therefore, cannot be made.

TABLE 11

## Faculty Sample by Grade School Teaching Experience and Rank

| <u>Public School<br/>Teaching Experience</u> | <u>Full<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Asst.<br/>Prof.</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| No Experience                                | 0                     | 1                       | 0                      | 1            |
| 1 - 4 yrs.                                   | 4                     | 4                       | 3                      | 11           |
| 5 yrs. or More                               | 0                     | 2                       | 0                      | 2            |
| _____                                        | _____                 | _____                   | _____                  | _____        |
| Totals                                       | 4                     | 7                       | 3                      | 14           |



## THE INTERVIEWS

The questions employed during the interviews of administrators and faculty members were designed to be similar and to provide a semi-structured nature which keeps interviews objective. The questions were field-tested with two volunteers and revised and reworded to accommodate both greater clarity and simplicity. The questions eventually employed were structured and open-form, ensuring ready communication. The interview schedules used are found in Appendix A for administrators and in Appendix B for faculty members.

The twenty-one interviews were carried out from December 9, 1982 to February 8, 1983. Most of the participants seemed very willing to be interviewed and extended their full cooperation before, during, and after the sessions. Interviews ranged in length from 55 to 95 minutes.

The purpose of the interviews was explained at the initial meeting, or by telephone at the time a specific appointment was arranged. At the beginning of each interview some time was taken to thank the participant for his or her assistance, to explain the confidentiality of the study, and to request permission to record the interview. Two of the participants preferred that no recording be made as they would feel more comfortable without electronic devices. Two other interviews were not recorded as a result of malfunctioning of the equipment. Substantial notes were taken during all interviews. All participants answered the last question on the interview schedule in writing.

Interviews were held in private in the offices of the participants.

#### THE PREPARATION OF DATA

Several questions provided data that could be readily quantified. These included questions relating to estimated hours of work, estimated percentages of decision-making authority, relative importance of workload components, personal reactions to workloads, perceptions of the power structure, and so on.

Data of this nature were first quantified and then transferred by hand to computer sheets. From these the data were transferred mechanically to computer cards which then were used to obtain analyses. Further item analyses were then made, using routine computer programs, for specific sub-groups of administrators and faculty members.

Other questions did not provide 'hard' data which could be quantified. These were primarily descriptive in nature, were reported in tabulated form as much as possible, and were analysed in respect to attitudes and perceptions, using comparative analysis.

Some problems were encountered during the interviews. In a number of instances among both administrators and faculty members the subjects felt completely unable to make estimates or to give opinions on certain issues. At times this was understandable, and noted accordingly, because of

lack of exposure to a specific issue, relative distance from it, or lack of willingness to respond. Wherever it was possible, responses that were provided were incorporated into the tabulation, analyses, and interpretation of data.

## Chapter IV

### STUDY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA - WORKLOAD REQUIREMENTS

The general problem addressed in this study concerns the amount of influence individual faculty members have in the determination of personal workloads. To investigate this influence a total of twenty-one interviews were held to ascertain the perceptions of administrators and faculty members on this issue.

A number of the questions posed during the interviews do not appear to be directly related to this investigation, and their responses do not necessarily form a part of the study results reported here. The value of these questions lies primarily in having permitted the researcher to obtain a "feel" for the Faculty and the many complications relating to working on campus, and secondarily in having allowed the participants to become accustomed to free and open discussion of many of the topics "closest to their hearts". Such data, obtained from this type of question and not used in the study itself, are reported separately in Appendix C.

A major weakness of data obtained through personal interviews is the danger of potential unreliability caused by errors of recording, mistaken impressions, and the relatively indeterminate nature of the topic discussed. This

type of unreliability is difficult to prevent because of the very nature of the interviews which were intended to gather perceptions of fairly complex concepts.

An effort was made, therefore, to determine the extent of reliability through an estimate of the potential margins of error. The data obtained could have been verified in a number of ways, but only one was chosen using information obtained through the interviews but not directly employed in the study itself.

Faculty members were requested to estimate the number of hours per year spent on each of their professional activities. Later in the interview they were asked to estimate the total hours worked per year in a professional capacity. This information is provided in Appendix C because it is not directly relevant to the study. Interview responses may be considered reliable, however, if total estimates of all professional activities are reasonably close to estimated total hours worked per year.

It must be noted, however, that in a number of instances faculty members felt unable, or unwilling, to estimate the hours of work for a component and would not commit themselves beyond comments like "a large number", "very many", or "I have no idea". Accordingly, for each work component an average number of hours per year was calculated for those faculty members who provided specific figures. The resulting verification, as shown in Table 12, gave a margin

of error in estimates of 5.06 per cent. This margin may be considered sufficiently small to suggest that interview responses on the whole should be reasonably reliable.

TABLE 12

Group Verification of Estimated Hours of Work for All Faculty

| <u>Activity</u>               | <u>Number of<br/>Faculty Members<br/>Involved</u> | <u>Average<br/>Hours<br/>per Year</u> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Teaching-Regular Session      | 12                                                | 191.7                                 |
| Teaching-Other Sessions       | 11                                                | 95.5                                  |
| Teaching-Seminars, etc.       | 12                                                | 8.3                                   |
| Related Teaching Activities   | 11                                                | 527.3                                 |
| Student Teaching Supervision  | 12                                                | 122.5                                 |
| Grad. Student Supervision     | 12                                                | 133.8                                 |
| Independent Study Supervision | 12                                                | 76.3                                  |
| Research, Scholarly Work      | 12                                                | 447.9                                 |
| Committee Work                | 12                                                | 121.7                                 |
| Community Service             | 10                                                | 159.5                                 |
| Other Professional Activities | 12                                                | 186.3                                 |
| <hr/>                         |                                                   | <hr/>                                 |
| Total Average Hours per Year  |                                                   | 2069.8                                |
| All Professional Activities   | 12                                                | 2174.6                                |
| <br>Margin of Error = 5.06 %  |                                                   |                                       |

The major problem was approached through the posing of specific research questions. For workload requirements these are:

1. What are the perceptions of faculty members about the minimum requirements for the three components of workload?

2. What are the administrators' perceptions about these minimum requirements?
3. How do the perceptions of administrators and faculty members compare and contrast on the issue of minimum requirements in faculty workload?

### TEACHING

As may be seen from Table 13, administrative perceptions about the minimum required hours of teaching ranged from a low of 7.5 to a high of 12.5 teaching hours per week in each of the two terms of the regular session. A "normal" load was said to consist of nine lecture hours per week, and either one one-hour seminar per week or the responsibility of supervision of student teachers. Although some administrators saw the load to be higher and others saw it lower, this perception of a "normal" load is reflected in the average estimate of ten teaching hours per week.

The interviews indicated, however, that these administrative perceptions were somewhat vague. No definite guidelines appeared to exist for either the number of seminar hours for which a faculty member should be responsible nor for the number of student teachers supervised that could be considered to be the equivalent. As an example of this lack of clarity, two administrators stated that one seminar hour per week was expected in each of the two terms, while others spoke of one seminar hour in one term and none in the other. Similarly, in some departments the Head indicated that the supervision of five student teachers would be considered

TABLE 13

## Hourly Teaching Loads per Week per Term

| <u>Hours per Week</u> | <u>Estimated by<br/>Administrators</u> | <u>Actually<br/>Reported by<br/>Faculty</u> |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 12.5                  | 1                                      | -                                           |
| 11                    | 1                                      | -                                           |
| 10.5                  | -                                      | 1                                           |
| 10                    | 3                                      | 4                                           |
| 9                     | 1                                      | 4                                           |
| 7.5                   | 1                                      | 3                                           |
| 6                     | -                                      | 1                                           |
| 5                     | -                                      | 1                                           |
| <hr/>                 | <hr/>                                  | <hr/>                                       |
| Totals                | 7                                      | 14                                          |
| Average Hours         | 10                                     | 8.6                                         |

equivalent to one seminar hour in one term. In other departments, however, the supervision of at least ten student teachers was considered equivalent to one seminar hour in one term.

The vagueness of these perceptions was increased by the fact that some faculty members were not expected to include one or more seminar hours or the supervision of student teachers in their regular loads. These faculty members seemed to be exempt from this expectation, perhaps because they supervised graduate students, functioned in special capacities, like program coordinator, or had a number of independent study students.



Table 14 indicates the teaching and teaching related duties of the faculty members in the sample. It should be noted that one faculty member did not provide estimates of numbers of students supervised.

As may be seen from this Table, there were faculty members who participated in almost all activities, while others appeared to see very few students. The workloads of faculty members 3 and 5, for instance, appear to be heavier and to have more diversified elements than the workloads of faculty members 8 and 13.

The statement that seminar teaching and student teacher supervision are considered equivalent in some way, is not too apparent with some faculty members. In spite of the fact that the four faculty members who taught a seminar hour each did not supervise student teachers, three others, who did not supervise student teachers, did not teach a seminar hour. It should be noted, however, that of the latter three (Numbers 7, 9, and 13), one (Number 7) taught an extra three lecture hours in one term, one (Number 9) had extra research time granted, and one (Number 13) had special duties allotted. Apparent discrepancies in workloads are thus not necessarily true.

When an administrator stated then that a faculty member was expected to teach a certain number of hours per week and to assume seminar teaching or student teacher supervision, this perception was usually modified by many exceptions.

TABLE 14

## Teaching Hours and Teaching Related Duties

Teaching Hours, Seminar Teaching, and Number of Students Supervised per Faculty Member in Student Teaching, Graduate Studies, and Independent Studies

| <u>Faculty Member</u> | <u>Teaching Hours</u> | <u>Number of Seminars</u> | <u>Number of Student Teachers</u> | <u>Number of Graduate Students</u> | <u>Number of Independent Studies</u> |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1                     | 9                     | 1                         | 0                                 | 6                                  | 13                                   |
| 2                     | 9                     | 1                         | 0                                 | 9                                  | 17                                   |
| 3*                    | 9                     | 0                         | 14                                | 5                                  | 2                                    |
| 4                     | 9                     | 0                         | 11                                | 5                                  | 0                                    |
| 5                     | 9                     | 0                         | 11                                | 4                                  | 6                                    |
| 6*                    | 9                     | 1                         | 0                                 | 4                                  | 0                                    |
| 7                     | 10.5                  | 0                         | 0                                 | 33                                 | 5                                    |
| 8                     | 7.5                   | 0                         | 8                                 | 0                                  | 2                                    |
| 9*                    | 7.5                   | 0                         | 0                                 | 10                                 | 15                                   |
| 10*                   | 7.5                   | 0                         | 7                                 | 4                                  | 7                                    |
| 11*                   | 5                     | 0                         | 10.5                              | 3                                  | 0                                    |
| 12                    | 9                     | 0                         | 6                                 | 6                                  | 14                                   |
| 13*                   | 6                     | 0                         | 0                                 | 4                                  | 1                                    |
| 14                    | 9                     | 1                         | N/R                               | N/R                                | N/R                                  |
| Averages              | 8.3                   | 0.3                       | 5.2                               | 7.2                                | 6.3                                  |

\* Designates special responsibilities like coordinating a program, consulting duties, extra responsibilities to the Department Head, developing new courses, and additional free time allotted for a research project.

N/R Designates 'No Response'.

Requirements, in fact, seemed to be more somewhat indefinite expectations than specific, Faculty-wide or uniform guidelines.

On the whole it seemed that the three Deans expressed their views mostly in very general terms and appeared to base them primarily on vague impressions rather than on factual knowledge. They indicated that the Department Heads negotiate with the faculty members to determine what and how much each should teach, with the Department Heads guiding faculty to reach a compromise which would meet everyone's needs and abilities.

The Department Heads themselves appeared to speak for their own departments only, each of which seemed to operate on its own regulations or guidelines. They indicated that these are set by the faculty members in sub-groups, variously known as the departmental committee, the divisional committees, the personnel committee, and the subject area committees. These committees appear to reach compromises which accommodate personal needs, desires, and abilities within the framework of departmental requirements.

The minimum expectations for teaching loads are then somewhat vague and appear to be set at the Faculty level and modified at the departmental level by departmental committees. Differences in teaching loads seem to be caused mainly by varying departmental needs and by circumstances of enrollments, course location, and so on.

The interviews indicated generally that, if a faculty member had to assume an overload, an extra stipend would be negotiated or other arrangements made for a later term. An

overload, however, appeared to be assumed voluntarily by a faculty member.

At times in the past there has been some direction from the administration, requiring departments to meet new and specific Faculty needs. The one instance particularly referred to by both administrators and faculty members during the interviews occurred some years ago, when apparent budget restraints required the teaching of seminars to be done by regular faculty members rather than by outsiders on a stipendary basis. It appears that the faculty assumed this additional responsibility, but with reluctance. Some pressure was applied by Department Heads, but this, however, was largely a matter of saying that "it had to be done" and that the departmental committee would have to decide how it would be done.

One wonders how heavy this additional load in fact was if one considers that only four of the fourteen faculty members actually reported teaching a seminar (See Table 14). Two of these four, nevertheless, expressed some resentment about this additional duty and suggested they saw little advantage to their teaching a seminar except that it saved the Faculty money at their expense. The other two believed that seminar teaching was not an additional duty but rather a specific assignment agreed to in lieu of other work.

According to administrators' statements, as indicated in Table 13, the average teaching load should consist of 10

hours per week, incorporating lecture hours, seminar hours, and pro-rated supervision of student teachers. Table 15 indicates that the administrators' estimates are slightly higher than what appears to be actual practice.

TABLE 15  
Pro-Rated Weekly Teaching Hours

| <u>Faculty Members</u>            | <u>Weekly Lecture Hours</u> | <u>Weekly Seminar Hours</u> | <u>Student Teachers Supervised Expressed in Seminar Hours</u> | <u>Total Pro-Rated Weekly Hours</u> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1                                 | 9                           | 1                           | 0                                                             | 10                                  |
| 2                                 | 9                           | 1                           | 0                                                             | 10                                  |
| 3                                 | 9                           | 0                           | 1                                                             | 10                                  |
| 4                                 | 9                           | 0                           | 1                                                             | 10                                  |
| 5                                 | 9                           | 0                           | 1                                                             | 10                                  |
| 6                                 | 9                           | 1                           | 0                                                             | 10                                  |
| 7                                 | 10.5                        | 0                           | 0                                                             | 10.5                                |
| 8                                 | 7.5                         | 0                           | 0.5                                                           | 8                                   |
| 9                                 | 7.5                         | 0                           | 0                                                             | 7.5                                 |
| 10                                | 7.5                         | 0                           | 0.5                                                           | 8                                   |
| 11                                | 5                           | 0                           | 1                                                             | 6                                   |
| 12                                | 9                           | 0                           | 0.5                                                           | 9.5                                 |
| 13                                | 6                           | 0                           | 0                                                             | 6                                   |
| 14                                | 9                           | 1                           | 0                                                             | 10                                  |
| Average of Pro-Rated Weekly Hours |                             |                             |                                                               | 9.4                                 |

The actual average reported by faculty members appears to be only 8.6 hours, as shown in Table 13, but this figure does not incorporate student teaching supervision.

Table 15 converts the number of student teachers supervised to equivalent seminar hours. For this purpose the assumption was made that fewer than 10 students supervised is equivalent to .5 seminar hours, and that 10 or more is equal to one seminar hour, as suggested in a number of the interviews. The resulting average per faculty member is 9.4 weekly teaching hours. This figure, however, does not include a pro-rating of special duties as shown in Table 14. As six faculty members had assumed such duties, it is reasonable to suppose that, if these activities could also be pro-rated into specific hours, the administrators' estimated average of 10 hours per week is probably too low.

Perceptions of administrators about minimum requirements for teaching in the Winter session then appear to be close to the actual situation as it was revealed through the interviews.

All administrators stated that teaching in Spring and Summer sessions was done on a completely voluntary basis. A number commented that in that time period faculty should be doing "non-assigned things" other than teaching, and suggested that, in fact, the central administration of the university tended to favour this time period to be used for research and other scholarly work.

The perceptions of faculty members about minimum requirements to be satisfied in the workload component of teaching generally supported the statements made by administrators.

As far as choice of teaching time was concerned, faculty members reported their impressions as follows: four (28.6 per cent) felt they had complete control over the times at which they taught their courses, provided they stayed within the bounds of the general timetable and within common reason; eight (57.1 per cent) believed they had some control over the times within the parameters already mentioned but also subject to negotiation with their peers whose wishes entered into the matter; and two (14.3 per cent) asserted they had no control at all over this because course times were determined entirely by program and student needs.

A number stated that room bookings, course conflicts, and similar physical restraints at times made it impossible for the Administrative Assistant to meet all personal timetabling preferences. All seemed resigned to this without displaying rancour.

It should be noted that all faculty members felt they had complete control over the choice of evenings on which they would teach. The restraint here, however, appears to be that all are expected to teach at least one evening per week as part of their normal "nine hour" load.

No particular pattern emerged for the reasons why faculty members would prefer to teach at one time over another. Largely they expressed personal preferences for early morning or late afternoon work. Some suggested they preferred some type of block scheduling to have other time

blocks free for more concentrated research work, while most expressed the view that they preferred to teach only one night per week to be able to be with their families in the evenings.

None seemed to resent the requirement to teach in at least one evening slot, but five indicated that they considered the uniform slot timetable forced upon the Faculty by the central administration to be inappropriate for the program demands of the Faculty. Some resentment about this enforced slot scheduling was evident.

Faculty members felt, as did administrators, that teaching in the Spring and Summer sessions was completely voluntary, and many viewed this time period as an excellent opportunity to concentrate their efforts on scholarly work rather than on the other components of workload.

Eleven of them said that they taught in at least one of those sessions on a regular basis. All indicated this was done for stipend and was almost completely voluntary. There appears to be some onus on the faculty member, in the case of a course absolutely required by the program or the students, to assume the teaching of that course or to find a suitable replacement. Those teaching courses not of the type mentioned indicated that, if they could not find a suitable replacement and they did not wish to teach the course themselves, the course would be cancelled.



The three who indicated that they did not normally teach in the extra sessions appeared to feel no pressure at all to do so.

#### Observation 1:

There are minimum requirements for a faculty member to meet in the workload component of teaching. These requirements appear to be treated as expectations, seem very flexible, and are met through negotiation which incorporates departmental needs and individual desires.

1.1 Both administrators and faculty members perceive minimum expectations in the workload component of teaching to consist generally of nine lecture hours per week per term and one seminar hour per week or the supervision of a number of student teachers. In lieu of, or in addition to, one of the latter options a faculty member may supervise graduate and/or independent study students.

1.2 A teaching load which consists of less than nine hours can be justified as acceptable if other responsibilities have been assumed with the approval of the departmental committee and the Department Head.

1.3 Expectations for teaching loads include some additional restraints. These seem to be the timetable slots designated by the central administration, peer consent, program and student needs, room bookings, course conflicts, and the expectation that all faculty members must teach one evening class.

1.4 Both administrators and faculty members perceive that each department sets its own minimum teaching load requirements through the departmental committee structure. At this level general expectations seem adjusted to meet individual needs as well as requirements that are unique to the department.

1.5 The setting of minimum requirements in teaching loads seems primarily a collegial task with administrators trusting the professional judgement of faculty members.

1.6 On the average, faculty members meet the expectations of administrators in their teaching and teaching related activities.

SCHOLARLY WORK

The study entailed the defining of scholarly work and requested both administrators and faculty members to agree or disagree with this definition:

Scholarly work includes only such research, study, and preparation as is published or produced, or as could be published or produced. It does not include work done for lesson preparation and similar teaching related activities.

As may be seen from Table 16, none of the administrators and only five of the faculty members fully agreed with this statement. Two of the administrators disagreed and felt that the definition needed to be more specific and should include the concept of a critical review by peers in addition to publication.

TABLE 16

## Perceptions of the Definition of Scholarly Work

| <u>Perceptions</u>                                                                                       | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Fully Agree with Definition                                                                              | 0                     | 5              |
| Disagree:                                                                                                |                       |                |
| 1. Definition Must Include a<br>Critical Review, as well as<br>Publication.                              | 2                     | 0              |
| 2. Teaching and Public Service<br>Activities Are Also Scholarly<br>Work; Publication Is Not<br>Necessary | 5                     | 9              |
| <hr/>                                                                                                    | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                                                                                                   | 7                     | 14             |

No faculty members considered the definition to be too indefinite. On the contrary, nine of the faculty (64.3 per cent), as well as five of the administrators (71.4 per cent), perceived it to be too specific and indicated that the three components of workload are so closely interrelated that each of them must be seen as scholarly work, and that hence publication would not be necessary.

The Collective Agreement, however, specifies that research, scholarly work, and other creative activities should have as their primary objective the expansion of knowledge, understanding, and scholarly competence, and hence that the publication of results should be endeavoured.<sup>87</sup>

Perceptions about minimum requirements in respect to scholarly work, however it may be defined, are recorded in Table 17.

It should be noted that, although three administrators replied that scholarly work was required of faculty, their responses were modified: one stated that it was required only philosophically and that in reality there existed no mechanism or structure to force obedience to the requirement; one saw it more as a job expectation; while the third noted that it was more or less a requirement in his department because department members had agreed that at the beginning of each year all would outline their intentions

---

<sup>87</sup> UM/UMFA Collective Agreement, pp. 28 and 29.

TABLE 17

## Perceptions of Requirements for Scholarly Work

| <u>Perceptions</u>             | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| It Is Required                 | 0                     | 0              |
| Philosophically Only           | 1                     | 0              |
| It Is a Department Expectation | 1                     | 0              |
| It Is Not Required             | 0                     | 3              |
| A Job Expectation              | 1                     | 9              |
| Personal Values Only           | 0                     | 1              |
| Encouraged Only                | 4                     | 1              |
| <hr/>                          | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                         | 7                     | 14             |

for scholarly activities for that year and at the end would report on their progress with those proposals. In the latter case it was made clear that no mechanism of enforcement was available to ensure that plans were indeed carried out. It was equally evident that a great deal of faith was placed in peer pressure making non-producing scholars more productive.

Four administrators stated without hesitation that no requirements existed for a faculty member to produce scholarly work and that this particular activity could only be encouraged through the offering of specific rewards.

Only one faculty member shared the latter view; one saw it as an exercise exclusively for personal benefit and value; while three stated outright that scholarly work was

not a requirement. The remaining nine said that it was a requirement only in the sense that it was a job expectation.

It seemed generally understood by the majority of respondents that a university professor participates in some form of scholarly work because he is first and foremost a scholar. Statements of this nature appeared to refer to a common and traditional community concept of the university professor as scholar.

Most participants made reference to the collective agreement which states that the duties of a faculty member

- ...shall include an appropriate combination of, but not necessarily all of or limited to:
- (1) undergraduate and/or graduate teaching;
  - (2) research, scholarly work and other creative activities;
  - (3) administrative duties and committee work;
  - (4) community service.<sup>88</sup>

By this definition of a faculty member's duties any of the four identified components may be seen as an expectation, while none should be considered a requirement because "not necessarily all" are included in those duties. It is, therefore, not surprising that none of the faculty members interviewed saw scholarly work as required, while 71.4 per cent viewed it as something expected and encouraged.

Table 18 pursues perceptions about the adequacy of time spent by faculty members on research. It indicates that only one administrator believed that a sufficient amount of time

---

<sup>88</sup> UM/UMFA Collective Agreement, p. 27.

is spent on research for it to be considered adequate; three perceived this time to be insufficient for the needs of the Faculty; and the remaining three did not feel able to judge.

TABLE 18

## Adequacy of Time Spent on Scholarly Work

| <u>Perceptions</u>      | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Sufficient Time Spent   | 1                     | 4 *            |
| Insufficient Time Spent | 3                     | 8 *            |
| No Idea About It        | 3                     | 0              |
| No Answer               | 0                     | 2              |
| <hr/>                   |                       |                |
| Totals                  | 7                     | 14             |

\* See Table 19.

Four of the faculty members believed that they had sufficient time for research (two of these had additional research time allocated in their workload), and eight faculty members perceived themselves to have insufficient time. Table 19 records the statements of those twelve about the percentage of their professional time spent on research.

The average percentage of time reported as spent on research by those who felt they had sufficient time was 25 per cent, substantially higher than the 19.4 per cent reported by those who saw this time as insufficient. Personal values about workload components become very

TABLE 19  
Adequacy of Research Time  
and Percentage Time Spent on Research

| <u>Percentage<br/>of Time Spent<br/>on Research</u> | <u>Number<br/>Stating<br/>Sufficient</u> | <u>Number<br/>Stating<br/>Insufficient</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 10                                                  | 1                                        | 3                                          |
| 20                                                  | 0                                        | 2                                          |
| 25                                                  | 1                                        | 2                                          |
| 30                                                  | 1                                        | 0                                          |
| 35                                                  | 1                                        | 1                                          |
| <hr/>                                               | <hr/>                                    | <hr/>                                      |
| Totals                                              | 4                                        | 8                                          |
| Average Percentage                                  | 25.0                                     | 19.4                                       |

evident, however, if one considers that while one faculty member believed a certain percentage sufficient, another found the same percentage insufficient.

Table 79 in Appendix C indicates that the reported average for the whole sample population is 21.64 per cent of total time spent on research.

The expectations that administrators may have for the faculty members in scholarly work were difficult to determine, although most seemed to feel that not enough time was available for faculty members to be able to produce adequate and sufficient work. Administrators expressed the

opinion that special tasks, like practicum supervision and services to the educational community, took much of the faculty members' time that might otherwise have been spent on research. Their perceptions of what faculty members actually do in research are indicated in Table 20.

TABLE 20

## Annual Research and Publications

| <u>Perceptions</u>                         | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| A Great Deal                               | 2                     |                |
| A Low Faculty Average                      | 3                     |                |
| Only 20% of Faculty                        |                       |                |
| Are "Into Real Research"                   | 1                     |                |
| No Perception                              | 1                     |                |
| <u>Number of Items Published Last Year</u> |                       |                |
| Nothing                                    |                       | 4              |
| 2 Articles                                 |                       | 2              |
| 3 Articles                                 |                       | 3              |
| 4 Articles                                 |                       | 1              |
| 6 Articles                                 |                       | 2              |
| 1 Study                                    |                       | 2              |
| 1 Chapter                                  |                       | 2              |
| 1 Small Textbook                           |                       | 1              |
| <hr/>                                      |                       |                |
| Average Number of Articles per Year        |                       | 2.4            |

Faculty members reported an average of 2.4 articles in the year prior to this research, as well as a number of studies and chapters, and a small textbook.



There seems then to be a general lack of real requirement for scholarly work, the absence of which is emphasized in Table 21, which shows that the majority of both administrators and faculty members believed that only tenure and promotion possibilities are affected if a faculty member does no scholarly work or does research that is not published.

TABLE 21

## Consequences of Non-Involvement in Scholarly Work

| <u>Perceptions</u>                                    | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Nothing, but Tenure and Promotion Affected            | 6                     | 13             |
| Nothing - Tenure and Promotion Not Affected           | 0                     | 1              |
| Greater Load Allotted in Other Components of Workload | 1                     | 0              |
| <hr/>                                                 | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                                                | 7                     | 14             |

Only one administrator suggested that more work in other workload components would be assigned if a faculty member did not appear to be doing scholarly work. This in itself, of course, is a questionable statement because it seems from information provided during the interviews that if a faculty member claimed to be working on research, little could be done to disprove this.

Only one faculty member felt that, because of the vague wording of the collective agreement, tenure and promotion possibilities would not be influenced if no scholarly work were done.

Everyone of the nineteen participants who indicated that tenure and promotion potentialities would be affected stated, when questioned, that once a faculty member had obtained tenure and was satisfied with his existing rank at the time, nothing at all could be done to force him into producing scholarly work of some kind.

It should be noted as well that scholarly work, although seen as important in the Faculty, is generally considered to be second in importance to teaching. The four administrators (see Table 17) who stated that scholarly work was encouraged, also suggested that, although it was seen as important, it was not promoted ahead of teaching. Two suggested that some of the research done consisted of paper work of no great significance and seemed on the whole unneeded.

These views are supported by Tables 22 and 23 which indicate that six of the seven administrators identified teaching as the most important component of workload. Of these six, three saw service as least important, while the other three rated service and research equally as second to teaching.

TABLE 22

## Workload Components Considered Most Important by Participants

| <u>Workload Components</u>                 | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Teaching                                   | 6                     | 7              |
| Teaching & Research Equally                | 0                     | 5              |
| Teaching, Research, and<br>Service Equally | 1                     | 1              |
| No Opinion                                 | 0                     | 1              |
|                                            | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                                     | 7                     | 14             |

Only one half of the faculty members (seven) saw teaching by itself as most important. Twelve, however, considered research and/or service as least important. The one faculty member who expressed no opinion on this was the one who felt that research was carried out for personal benefits only (see Table 17).

It appears then that research is generally considered to be second in importance to teaching and that for that reason alone one might expect no minimum requirements for scholarly work. It should be noted, however, that this does not imply that scholarly work is considered unimportant, because more than half of the faculty members interviewed wished for more time for that activity (see Table 18).

A number of administrators and faculty members indicated that the emphasis placed on scholarly work by the central

TABLE 23

Workload Components Considered Least Important by  
Participants

| <u>Workload Components</u>                               | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Research                                                 | 0                     | 2              |
| Service                                                  | 3                     | 9              |
| Research & Service Equally                               | 3                     | 1              |
| Teaching, Research, and<br>Service Are Equally Important | 1                     | 1              |
| No Opinion                                               | 0                     | 1              |
| <hr/>                                                    |                       |                |
| Totals                                                   | 7                     | 14             |

administration suggests that research may come to be considered more important in the near future. This possible change is not as yet evident in the Faculty, but seems to cause some concern among both administrators and faculty members who believe that in a Faculty of Education teaching should always be considered most important, whatever the value of research.

Observation 2:

There are perceived to be no minimum requirements for a faculty member to meet in satisfying the workload component of scholarly work.

2.1 There appears to be no consensus of opinion on the meaning of scholarly work or on the requirements that should be met for activities to be considered scholarly work. The majority of administrators and faculty members consider all workload components to be so closely interrelated that all should be considered as scholarly work.

2.2 Scholarly work may be viewed generally as an expectation which is part of a university professor's job.

2.3 There is no effective technique or structure to ensure that scholarly work expectations are met.

2.4 The withholding of tenure or promotion, as a possible tool of enforcement of an expectation for scholarly work, appears to become meaningless once tenure has been awarded and the faculty member is satisfied with the rank he has attained.

2.5 Scholarly work, however it may be defined, is perceived to be a priority by both administrators and faculty members, but not as vitally important as teaching should be in a Faculty of Education.

2.6 The majority of faculty members appears to feel that insufficient time is available for proper research.

## SERVICE

In this study the service component of faculty workload was divided into two elements: Governance and Committee Work, and Community Service. This is in keeping with the Collective Agreement.<sup>89</sup>

### Governance and Committee Work

The likelihood that committee work and similar governance activities are on the whole not required from faculty members is indicated by the wording of the collective agreement as discussed in the previous subsection, and is supported by the perceptions of both administrators and faculty members, as shown in Table 24.

TABLE 24

Perceptions of Requirements for Committee Work

| <u>Perceptions</u>           | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| It is Required               | 0                     | 2              |
| It is Part of the Job        | 0                     | 8              |
| It is a Department Agreement | 2                     | 3              |
| Informally Required          |                       |                |
| Formally Not Required        | 3                     | 1              |
| It is Not Required           | 2                     | 0              |
| <hr/>                        | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                       | 7                     | 14             |

---

<sup>89</sup> op. cit.

Only two faculty members gave an unqualified "yes" response to the question concerning the possible requirement for providing governance and committee work as part of a normal workload. Eleven modified their answers to indicate that such activities are not really a requirement, but rather an expectation or a departmental agreement. The remaining faculty member believed them to be a non-formal requirement which may be considered similar to an expectation.

Administrators on the whole expressed more negative views on this matter, with two indicating an unqualified "no", three seeing them as a non-formal requirement, while two viewed them as a departmental agreement.

In all, it seems that the great majority (100 per cent of administrators and 85.7 per cent of faculty members) perceived governance activities and committee work as a necessary component of the university professor's job but not as a requirement. Hence it appears that there are no minimum requirements for this component of faculty workload.

A number of faculty members indicated that committee work should be discussed in two different contexts: governance activities through committee work on a Faculty- and University-wide basis, and committee work at the departmental level. These individuals suggested that all departments carried out their business through a variety of committees and that each faculty member was required to serve on at

least one of those committees. The same people were quick to point out, however, that they did not know if anything could or would be done about or to a faculty member who refused to follow this departmental requirement. All stated that this requirement, even if it were enforced, would not apply beyond the departmental level.

Administrators indicated that they believed most faculty members to belong to about three committees. Actual committee membership is shown in Table 25, which indicates an average membership of 3.3 committees per faculty member that responded. There seems to be a high level of agreement between the perceptions of administrators and faculty members on committee membership.

TABLE 25

## Committee Membership

| <u>Number of Committees</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Faculty Members</u> |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2 committees                | 4                                    |
| 3 committees                | 5                                    |
| 4 committees                | 3                                    |
| 8 committees                | 1                                    |
| No Answer                   | 1                                    |
| <hr/>                       |                                      |
| Total                       | 14                                   |

Average Number of Committees - 3.3 per Member.



The interviews did not pursue specific committee memberships as far as department, Faculty, or University level was concerned. The impression obtained by the interviewer was, nevertheless, quite definite that the majority of these committees as reported by faculty members were at the departmental level. This feeling was strengthened by a review of the responses of the seven faculty members who indicated that they chaired a committee. Of these seven committees five were at the departmental level, one at the Faculty level, and one at the University level.

It should be noted that for most Faculty and University committees members are elected following a nomination procedure. It is logical then that most of the faculty members interviewed would not belong to such committees. Some people tend to get nominated and elected while others do not, and the total number of members required for all committees in any given year is limited.

If, in fact, there were minimum requirements for committee membership, there should be a method or structure to enforce them. Table 26 indicates, however, that this is not perceived to be the case.

Only one administrator suggested the written or verbal reprimand as a method of enforcing committee membership and participation. He also indicated, however, that such a reprimand, if made in writing, would become merely a part of the faculty member's personal file and would result in no

TABLE 26

## Consequences of Not Belonging to Committees

| <u>What Is Perceived to Result</u> | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Nothing                            | 2                     | 4              |
| Peer Pressure Applied              | 2                     | 0              |
| Encouragement Provided             | 1                     | 0              |
| Reprimand Given                    | 1                     | 0              |
| Tenure and Promotion Affected      | 1                     | 10             |
| <hr/>                              | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                             | 7                     | 14             |

adverse effects for him unless that faculty member could also be proven to be negligent in other duties or expectations. Further discussion revealed as well that, if the faculty member had tenure, he would be virtually "untouchable", unless he could be proven to be incompetent in most of his various professional activities.

Table 26 also shows that four faculty members felt that nothing would happen as a result of non-participation in committee work, while the other ten saw tenure and promotion possibilities affected. All of the latter agreed that, once tenure had been attained and a level of promotion satisfactory to the faculty member had been achieved, nothing could then be done about non-participation.

In contrast, only two administrators perceived that nothing could be done, while only one saw tenure and

promotion possibilities affected for those who still needed them. The other four appeared to recognize the weakness of administrators in this respect by suggesting that encouragement and peer pressure might help to bring the recalcitrant faculty member into line and by admitting that a reprimand, if given, would have little or no impact.

The interviews also explored the possibility that a faculty member might belong to a committee for the sake of appearance but might conceivably not attend any meetings.

Table 27 indicates that two administrators could not perceive this as a possibility, while those who did showed a definite administrative inability to do anything about such a situation except the replacement of the member on that committee by another. Faculty members as well saw no penalty resulting from continued absence at meetings except for the possible denial of tenure and promotion to those who still needed and wanted them.

Table 28 explores the possibility that administrators might actually not know whether or not a faculty member does attend committee meetings. It shows that, although nine faculty members (64.3 per cent) believed that administrators know or probably know this, only two (28.6 per cent) of the administrators claimed to have this knowledge. The latter two were Department Heads and may have been speaking in terms of their own departmental committees.

TABLE 27

## Consequences of Not Attending Committee Meetings

| <u>What Is Perceived to Result</u>       | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Nothing                                  | 1                     | 5              |
| May Be Asked to Resign<br>from Committee | 1                     | 0              |
| Will Be Replaced Next Year               | 2                     | 0              |
| Peer Pressure Applied                    | 1                     | 3              |
| Promotion and Tenure Affected            | 0                     | 5              |
| This Does Not Happen                     | 2                     | 0              |
| No Idea                                  | 0                     | 1              |
| <hr/>                                    |                       |                |
| Totals                                   | 7                     | 14             |

TABLE 28

## Administrative Knowledge of Non-Attendance at Meetings

| <u>Knowledge Perceptions</u>   | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Yes                            | 2                     | 6              |
| Probably Yes                   | 0                     | 3              |
| Sometimes - Peer Reputation    | 1                     | 0              |
| Sometimes - Chairman Complains | 3                     | 0              |
| Probably No                    | 0                     | 2              |
| No                             | 1                     | 3              |
| <hr/>                          |                       |                |
| Totals                         | 7                     | 14             |

It may be assumed that, should minimum requirements for this element of the service component exist, the adminis-

tration would have a mechanism to ensure reasonably valid knowledge about attendance at committee meetings. The indicated general lack of knowledge basically confirms the absence of both a reporting mechanism and minimum requirements for participation in governance activities and committee work.

Observation 3:

Administrators and faculty members generally are agreed that there are no minimum requirements for a faculty member to meet in the workload element of governance and committee work.

3.1 Governance activities and committee work are generally perceived as an expectation that is part of a university professor's job.

3.2 There is no mechanism for reporting participation in governance activities and committee work nor a method through which administrators may know that such services have been provided.

3.3 There is no effective technique or mechanism to ensure that the expectations associated with committee work are met.

3.4 The withholding of tenure and promotion may be the only tool of enforcement in this element, but its value is questionable because it is at best effective only until tenure and promotion have been achieved.

3.5 Faculty members apparently are perceived to meet the expectations of administrators in governance and committee work.

### Community Service

The study defined community service and asked participants to agree or disagree with this definition:

Community service is those activities which benefit the community outside of the institution and do not benefit a faculty member personally in any other professional activities.

Only one administrator and three faculty members fully agreed with the definition, as is shown in Table 29.

| TABLE 29                                                                                |                       |                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Definition of Community Service                                                         |                       |                |
| <u>Perceptions</u>                                                                      | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
| Fully Agree                                                                             | 1                     | 3              |
| Disagree; "Benefit" Should Be<br>Removed from Definition                                | 1                     | 5              |
| Disagree; "Benefit" Should<br>Say "Intended for"                                        | 1                     | 1              |
| Disagree; Community Service<br>Can Not Be Separated from<br>Teaching and Scholarly Work | 2                     | 5              |
| Disagree; Most Faculty Members<br>Are Paid for Such Service                             | 2                     | 0              |
| <hr/>                                                                                   | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                                                                                  | 7                     | 14             |

Most of the others disagreed. They felt the word "benefit" to be inappropriate because everyone benefits in some way from such activities, or because they viewed

community service to be closely interrelated with the other components of the total workload of the faculty member. Two administrators stated that most faculty members were paid for such services and that, as a result, the definition would not be valid.

The concept of payment for community service was discussed during twelve of the interviews, although it was not planned in the interview schedules. Table 30 indicates the perceptions of the twelve participants who expressed an opinion on such payment and shows a fairly even division of opinion on its acceptability.

| TABLE 30                                     |                       |                |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Perceptions of Payment for Community Service |                       |                |
| <u>Perceptions</u>                           | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
| Paid Service Is Acceptable                   | 3                     | 4              |
| Paid Service Is Not Acceptable               | 2                     | 3              |
| <hr/>                                        | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                                       | 5                     | 7              |

As may be seen, two administrators (40 per cent) and three faculty members (43 per cent) were opposed to paid community service, although some of them found the idea of an honorarium or a reimbursement of expenses quite acceptable.

The majority of those who favoured payment for community service indicated freely that they were regularly being paid for the services they provided.

Table 31 shows that one administrator perceived the requirement for community service to be an expectation, another one considered it to have a requirement only if a faculty member had been engaged specifically to provide such service, while all others suggested it is voluntary and, therefore, only encouraged.

| TABLE 31                                          |                       |                |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Perceptions of Requirements for Community Service |                       |                |
| <u>Perceptions</u>                                | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
| It Is Not Required                                | 0                     | 0              |
| -Encouraged                                       | 4                     | 6              |
| -Voluntary                                        | 1                     | 2              |
| It Is Required                                    | 0                     | 1              |
| -If Fac.Member Hired for<br>That Purpose          | 1                     | 0              |
| -It Is Assumed                                    | 1                     | 2              |
| -For Promotion and Tenure                         | 0                     | 2              |
| Do not Know                                       | 0                     | 1              |
| <hr/>                                             | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                                            | 7                     | 14             |

Only one faculty member viewed community service as a requirement, while only two suggested it would be a



requirement to obtain promotion or tenure. It seems then that the perceptions of the great majority of participants (76.2 per cent) suggest that there are no minimum requirements for community service, although more than half (61.9 per cent) saw requirements in the form of expectations.

Community service appears to have associated with it still less of the concept of requirements in participants' minds than is the case with governance and committee work. This is shown in Table 32 which indicates that three administrators and eight faculty members perceived that nothing at all would or could be done about failure to provide such services. Only three administrators and five faculty members saw some possible effect on tenure and promotion possibilities, although, as in previously discussed workload components, it was clear that this mechanism would not affect those already tenured and at a rank with which they were satisfied.

The possibility that administrators might not know about community service provided by faculty members was explored during the interviews. Table 33 indicates that there seems little provision for the obtaining of such knowledge by administrators.

Fully eight faculty members had no idea whether or not administrators knew about their contributions to the community, while four were convinced that they did not know.

TABLE 32

## Consequences of Not Providing Community Service

| <u>What Is Perceived to Result</u>                     | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Nothing                                                | 3                     | 8              |
| Nothing, Except for<br>Promotion and Tenure            | 3                     | 5              |
| Encouragement Provided                                 | 1                     | 0              |
| Depends on Involvement in<br>Other Workload Components | 0                     | 1              |
| <hr/>                                                  | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                                                 | 7                     | 14             |

TABLE 33

## Knowledge of Non-Involvement in Community Service

| <u>Perceptions</u>           | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Administrators Do Not Know   | 0                     | 4              |
| - Faculty Are Professionals  | 2                     | 0              |
| Administrators Probably Know | 0                     | 1              |
| - Usually Hear about It      | 5                     | 1              |
| Do Not Know                  | 0                     | 8              |
| <hr/>                        | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                       | 7                     | 14             |

Although five administrators claimed to have such knowledge, it appeared based on hear-say alone.

It seems then not only that there are no requirements for participation in community service, but also that no mechanisms exist to give or obtain information about such services as are provided.

This possibility is supported by the perceptions of participants on the relative importance of the three components of workload. Table 34 has been derived from Table 23 by pro-rating perceptions. If an individual chose, for instance, research and service to be equally least important in his view, both of those components were given .5 of his choice.

| TABLE 34                                              |                             |                          |                |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| Components Thought Least Important - with Percentages |                             |                          |                |                          |
| <u>Workload Components</u>                            | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Percent-<br/>ages</u> | <u>Faculty</u> | <u>Percent-<br/>ages</u> |
| Service                                               | 4.83                        | 69.1                     | 9.83           | 70.3                     |
| Research                                              | 1.83                        | 26.2                     | 2.83           | 20.2                     |
| Teaching                                              | .33                         | 4.7                      | .33            | 2.4                      |
| No Opinion                                            | --                          | --                       | 1.00           | 7.1                      |

This Table illustrates clearly that approximately 70 per cent of both administrators and faculty members consider all service activities to be of least importance in the Faculty. The predominant belief that teaching and research, in that order, are the most important activities is also emphasized in this Table.

Observation 4:

There are perceived to be no minimum requirements for a faculty member to meet in the workload element of community service.

4.1 There is no consensus of opinion on the meaning of community service or on the requirements that should be met for activities to be considered community service.

4.2 There is perceived to be an element of expectation for the provision of community service as part of a university professor's job, although very little, and much less than is the case with governance activities and committee work, or scholarly work.

4.3 There is no mechanism for reporting participation in community service, nor a method through which administrators may know that such services have been provided.

4.4 There is no effective technique or mechanism to ensure that the expectations associated with community service are met.

4.5 The withholding of tenure and promotion for failure to provide community service is not perceived to be a tool of enforcement by the majority of participants.

4.6 More than half of community service rendered by faculty members may be provided for pay.

4.7 The great majority of administrators and faculty members consider all service activities (governance, committee work, and community service) to be the least important of the three workload components.

## Chapter V

### STUDY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA - WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENTS

The following research questions were posed concerning the determination of workload.

4. What are the perceptions of faculty members on how the various parts of their workloads are determined?
5. What are the administrators' perceptions on how these various parts of workload are determined?
6. How do the perceptions of administrators and faculty members compare and contrast on the issue of workload determination?

### TEACHING

The observations made in the previous chapter indicate that teaching assignments have some requirements associated with them although they are treated primarily as expectations.

This impression became more definite as the interviews progressed to the decision making processes in respect to teaching assignments. As may be seen from Table 35, only one administrator suggested that the Dean has the decision making authority in workload determination. This statement no doubt reflected the traditional concept of the Dean's final authority and responsibility in all matters, rather

than the fact that he actually decides who teaches what or how much. The other six administrators felt that the faculty member had considerable authority in this matter; in fact, four suggested that only the faculty member and his peers decided on teaching assignments.

TABLE 35

## Decision Making Authority in Workload Determination

| <u>Perceptions</u>              | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Authority Is Held:              |                       |                |
| by the Dean                     | 1                     | 0              |
| by the Associate Dean           | 0                     | 0              |
| by the Department Head          | 0                     | 0              |
| by the Faculty Member           | 0                     | 1              |
| Jointly - Dept.Head & Fac.Mem.  | 2                     | 7              |
| Jointly - Peer Group & Fac.Mem. | 4                     | 5              |
| Jointly - All Parties           | 0                     | 1              |
| <hr/>                           | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                          | 7                     | 14             |

As already reported, the three Deans indicated that the Department Heads negotiate with the faculty members to determine what and how much each should teach, with the Department Heads to guide faculty to reach a compromise meeting everyone's needs and abilities.

The Department Heads concurred, but suggested that such negotiation is done primarily by the faculty members in sub-groups. These committees appear to reach compromises

which accommodate personal needs, desires, and abilities within the framework of departmental requirements.

All administrators believed that the Department Head has the final authority, that his approval of committee recommendations is crucial, and that he can use his power to settle disagreements about workloads among the faculty members. It was clear, however, that this force is rarely used and that Department Heads normally agree with committee recommendations.

In fact, the impression was very strong that approval was not ever withheld. One Department Head stated, for instance, that, if he actually were to use his power and were to overrule a departmental committee's recommendation on teaching loads, "...this would lead to many serious problems." Although he did not specify what those problems would be, he made it clear that he would attempt to negotiate a change, and that if he did not succeed in that, he would rather agree with the recommendation than overrule it. He, and others, stated that the Department Head's authority is "theoretical", latent rather than regularly used, and largely untested.

The Deans' views of the processes employed in workload determination appear to be based much more on bureaucratic theories of authority than those of the Department Heads. As noted earlier, it is possible that they are farther removed from the actual process and so are less realistic than the Department Heads.

Faculty members on the whole agreed with the procedures as described by administrators. In particular, they made it clear in discussion that, as far as they were concerned, administrators had little if any authority in the determination of teaching assignments. Although this is later shown not to be quite the case when faculty members rated administrators and themselves on the study's scale of relative powers, this position as taken during the interviews is clearly shown in Table 35, in which no faculty member placed the decision making authority exclusively with any of the administrators.

In fact, only eight faculty members perceived the Department Head to have an input into this process. The other six saw it as something to be worked out with peers, although one of them seemed to feel he could work it out with himself.

The seven faculty members who saw the decision making powers shared between the Department Head and the faculty member indicated the percentage of power they felt was held by the Department Head. This information is presented in Table 36 and shows an average of 39.3 per cent of those decision making powers as perceived to be the Department Head's.



TABLE 36

## Power in Joint-Decision As Seen by Seven Faculty Members

| <u>Perceptions of Shared Power</u>                          | <u>Number</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Dept.Head Has 76 - 100 per cent of Power                    | 0             |
| Dept.Head Has 51 - 75 per cent of Power                     | 2             |
| Dept.Head and Fac.Member Have Equal Power                   | 2             |
| Dept.Head Has 26 - 49 per cent of Power                     | 1             |
| Dept.Head Has 0 - 25 per cent of Power                      | 2             |
| <hr/>                                                       |               |
| Total                                                       | 7             |
| Average Percentage Power Perceived<br>for Department Head - | 39.3 %        |

Table 37 records the perceptions of all faculty members about the power of the Department Head. In it no power is assigned to the Department Head for the faculty member who felt that he himself made the decisions and for those who believed it was a peer group decision. One-third of the authority is assigned to the Department Head for the faculty member who saw it as a joint decision by all parties, and so on.

This table indicates that the fourteen faculty members in this sample perceived the Department Head as having only 22.0 per cent of the decision making power in the determination of teaching assignments.

TABLE 37

Power of Department Head As Seen by Faculty - in Percentages

| <u>Perceptions of Sources of Decisions</u> | <u>Number of Faculty Members</u> | <u>Percentage Power to Department</u> | <u>Percentage Power to Faculty</u> |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| The Faculty Member                         | 1                                | 0.0                                   | 100.0                              |
| Joint-Dept.H. & Fac.Mem.                   | 7                                | 39.3                                  | 60.7*                              |
| Joint-Peers and Fac.Mem.                   | 5                                | 0.0                                   | 100.0                              |
| Joint-All Parties                          | 1                                | 33.0                                  | 67.0                               |
| <hr/>                                      |                                  | <hr/>                                 | <hr/>                              |
| Average Percentages                        |                                  | 22.0                                  | 78.0                               |

\* From Table 36.

This method of assigning power to the Department Head may not be too reliable, however, because it does not allow for his authority to overrule recommendations and for his probable leadership in committee discussions when decisions are being made. More likely such factors would be incorporated in the overall ratings given by participants to all parties in the decision making processes, using the study's scale of relative powers, as shown in Figure 1.

Table 38 probably allows for the leadership, indirect power, and similar indefinite concepts employed by administrators. It indicates that faculty members saw only themselves, the collective faculty, and the Department Head as having more than average power in this process. It also

- |     |                                   |
|-----|-----------------------------------|
| 5   | - Extremely Powerful, Influential |
| 4   | - Very Strong                     |
| 3   | - Strong                          |
| 2.5 | - Average                         |
| 2   | - Weak                            |
| 1   | - Very Weak                       |
| 0   | - No Power at All                 |

Figure 1: The Scale of Relative Powers

Values Employed in the Study  
to Determine Relative Powers  
in Workload Determination

shows the Department Head and the individual faculty member as perceived to have approximately equal power, with a very slight edge to the former.

The Table also indicates that administrators generally agreed with this assessment. The correlation coefficients  $r = 0.94$  and  $t = 0.80$  may be considered very significant. Administrators, however, assessed the individual faculty member slightly lower and the Department Head slightly higher than did the faculty members.

These differences, and the power positions of the four other parties in decision making relative to the individual faculty member, are shown in Table 39 which measures them in terms of units of standard deviation.

This method of measuring relative powers emphasizes the perceived weakness of the Dean, the Associate Deans, and the collective faculty in the determination of teaching assign-

TABLE 38

## Averages of Decision Making Powers - Teaching Duties

| <u>Categories</u>   | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> | <u>All</u> |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Dean                | 2.36                        | 2.21                       | 2.26       |
| Associate Dean      | 2.50                        | 1.89                       | 2.10       |
| Department Head     | 4.00                        | 3.68                       | 3.79       |
| Collective Faculty  | 2.71                        | 2.71                       | 2.71       |
| Faculty Member      | 3.43                        | 3.54                       | 3.50       |
| Standard Deviations | .621                        | .708                       |            |

$r = 0.94$

$t = 0.80$

Note:  $r$  = Pearson correlation coefficient  
and  $t$  = Kendall's tau  
for administrators' and faculty members' scores.

TABLE 39

## Relative Powers in Teaching Assignments

in Standard Deviations from  
the Individual Faculty Member's Average Score

| <u>Categories</u>  | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Dean               | -1.72                       | -1.88                      |
| Associate Dean     | -1.50                       | -2.33                      |
| Department Head    | +0.92                       | +0.20                      |
| Collective Faculty | -1.16                       | -1.17                      |

ments, as well as the perceived greater power of the

Department Heads.

The interviews also pursued the possibilities of disagreements over allotted teaching loads. Administrators generally were quick to point out that disagreement over an allotted teaching load would be unlikely to occur because the faculty member would have been consulted before final decisions were made. The implication was clear for at least three administrators that disagreements would be resolved before teaching loads were allotted. One administrator commented that most faculty members are too willing to take on too much work, so that complaints were unlikely to occur.

TABLE 40

Possible Refusal of Allotted Teaching Load

| <u>Perceptions</u>              | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Definitely Cannot Refuse        | 2                     | 9              |
| Definitely Can Refuse           | 1                     | 4              |
| Do Not Know                     | 0                     | 1              |
| Department Head's Will Prevails | 4                     | 0              |
| <hr/>                           | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                          | 7                     | 14             |

Table 40 indicates that the majority of faculty members believed that it would be impossible to refuse to teach an allotted workload. Four felt confident that they would be able to refuse, but some suggested they might then have to

pay a penalty for that refusal. Two faculty members suggested that refusal to teach an allotted load would mean not being on staff the following year. One of these suggested this because he was not tenured, the other qualified this with the statement, "If I had the competence to teach that assigned load". One stated, however: "I have refused at times in the past, and changes were then made."

The interviews next checked the possibility of appeals of unwanted teaching loads. The opinions expressed by participants are shown in Table 41.

| TABLE 41                                    |                       |                |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Perceptions of Appeals about Teaching Loads |                       |                |
| <u>Appeals Possible</u>                     | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
| Yes - to Department Head                    | 5                     | 10             |
| Yes - to the Dean                           | 0                     | 1              |
| Yes - Negotiate with Peers                  | 1                     | 2              |
| No                                          | 1                     | 1              |
| <hr/>                                       |                       |                |
| Totals                                      | 7                     | 14             |

A number of administrators and faculty members suggested that appeals would be valid only if the negotiated teaching load exceeded the expertise of the faculty member. It was noted that a heavier than normal load should not be appealed because all loads tended to be equalized over a period of

years. Only one administrator and one faculty member believed that an appeal would not be possible.

Much of the discussions centered on the actual teaching loads and the method used to determine them. There are also, however, related teaching responsibilities.

Teaching related activities like program and course counselling, personal help provided to students outside class hours, grading student papers, supervision of graduate students, supervision of independent studies students, and so on were generally perceived to be activities in which a faculty member participated not because they were allotted but because they were seen to be "part of the job".

No pressure of any kind was suggested in, nor was any specific allotment made for any of these activities. It was very evident from the interviews that faculty members assumed such responsibilities voluntarily. It was equally evident that no attempt was made to have an accounting of teaching related activities. There were some guidelines in some departments for the number of office hours that a faculty member should keep, but on the whole no records had to be kept or submitted to administrators.

In the activities related to actual classroom teaching a faculty member then appeared to be totally free and expected to work independently.

Observation 5:

Decisions in respect to teaching allotments are made jointly by the Department Head, the individual faculty member, and the faculty member's peers.

5.1 The individual faculty member is perceived to have sufficient power to be able to determine the major portion of his teaching load.

5.2 Both administrators and faculty members recognize that the Department Head has more power in the determination of teaching allotments than the individual faculty member, that much of that power is more latent than regularly used, and that the Department Heads are loath to use that power.

5.3 Faculty members recognize the power of the Department Head in the determination of teaching allotments as being largely indirect, but persuasive enough to suggest that the faculty member and his peers must take his wishes into account.

5.4 Teaching related activities are not negotiated or assigned, but are left entirely to the discretion of the individual faculty member.

5.5 The majority of administrators and faculty members agree that teaching loads, once allotted, must be fulfilled, although such an allotment may be appealed if it is considered unfair.

5.6 Teaching loads generally are allotted only after consultation with the faculty member. Appeals, therefore, do not normally occur after the fact.

5.7 Appeals are seen to be valid only if a faculty member's assignment is changed without consultation and agreement, and he is asked to perform a duty for which he does not feel qualified.



SCHOLARLY WORK

The apparent absence of minimum requirements to be fulfilled by a faculty member in the workload component of scholarly work suggests that both administrators and faculty members may perceive the individual faculty member to be more powerful in this component than he is in teaching. Table 42 indicates that this is indeed the case.

| TABLE 42                                            |                             |                            |            |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Averages of Decision Making Powers - Scholarly Work |                             |                            |            |
| <u>Categories</u>                                   | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> | <u>All</u> |
| Dean                                                | 3.86                        | 2.68                       | 3.07       |
| Associate Dean                                      | 3.07                        | 2.25                       | 2.52       |
| Department Head                                     | 3.71                        | 3.00                       | 3.24       |
| Collective Faculty                                  | 2.79                        | 2.68                       | 2.71       |
| Faculty Member                                      | 4.14                        | 3.64                       | 3.81       |
| Standard Deviations                                 | .504                        | .460                       |            |
| r = 0.74                                            |                             |                            |            |
| t = 0.53                                            |                             |                            |            |
| Note: r = Pearson correlation coefficient           |                             |                            |            |
| and t = Kendall's tau                               |                             |                            |            |
| for administrators' and faculty members' scores.    |                             |                            |            |

According to this Table, faculty members perceived themselves to have slightly more power than they saw for themselves in teaching (3.64 as opposed to 3.54), and the Department Head to have considerably less than in the

teaching component (3.00 as opposed to 3.68). Administrators concurred with this assessment, increasing the faculty member from 3.43 in teaching to 4.14 in scholarly work and decreasing the Department Head from 4.00 to 3.71.

Two interesting differences in perceptions are shown in Table 42. The administrators considered the Dean to be more powerful than the Department Head and fairly close in power to the individual faculty member, whereas the faculty members continued to view the Department Head to be more powerful than the Dean, although well behind the faculty member. Administrators also saw the Associate Deans as strong in the area of scholarly work, whereas faculty members continued to view them as below average in influence. These differences are shown clearly in the weaker correlations in scholarly work ( $r = 0.74$  and  $t = 0.53$ ) than in teaching duties ( $r = 0.94$  and  $t = 0.80$ ).

It is quite possible that these differences are present because the administrators placed more value on peripheral influences in scholarly work like the granting of additional time for research, recommendations for grants, and so on, while faculty members were thinking more in terms of freedom of choice of research topic, lack of requirements in this activity, and so on.

These differences are emphasized in Table 43, which expresses the power positions of the four other parties relative to the individual faculty member in terms of units of standard deviation.

TABLE 43

## Relative Powers in Scholarly Work

in Standard Deviations from  
the Individual Faculty Member's Average Score

| <u>Categories</u>  | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Dean               | - .56                       | -2.08                      |
| Associate Dean     | -2.12                       | -3.02                      |
| Department Head    | - .85                       | -1.39                      |
| Collective Faculty | -2.68                       | -2.08                      |

This Table clearly indicates that the average scores of all participants show the individual faculty member to be the most powerful party in the determination of the workload component of scholarly work.

Observation 6:

Both administrators and faculty members perceive the individual faculty member to be the most powerful of all parties in the determination of scholarly work activities.

6.1 Administrators consider the Dean and the Department Head to have very significant powers in the determination of scholarly work, while faculty members see only the Department Head to have a strong influence.

GOVERNANCE AND SERVICE

The almost complete lack of minimum requirements for faculty members to meet in this workload component and the apparent lack of methods and structure of information gathering, suggest that faculty members would likely be most influential in this workload component.

Table 44 indicates that this is indeed perceived to be so by both administrators and faculty members.

| TABLE 44                                                                                                               |                             |                            |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Averages of Decision Making Powers - Governance and Service                                                            |                             |                            |            |
| <u>Categories</u>                                                                                                      | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> | <u>All</u> |
| Dean                                                                                                                   | 3.21                        | 2.57                       | 2.79       |
| Associate Dean                                                                                                         | 2.79                        | 2.32                       | 2.48       |
| Department Head                                                                                                        | 3.07                        | 3.14                       | 3.12       |
| Collective Faculty                                                                                                     | 2.71                        | 2.50                       | 2.57       |
| Faculty Member                                                                                                         | 3.57                        | 3.39                       | 3.45       |
| Standard Deviations                                                                                                    | .309                        | .409                       |            |
| r = 0.80                                                                                                               |                             |                            |            |
| t = 0.60                                                                                                               |                             |                            |            |
| Note: r = Pearson correlation coefficient<br>and t = Kendall's tau<br>for administrators' and faculty members' scores. |                             |                            |            |

Note that almost all values were assigned at a lower rate than was the case in Table 42, a fact which may confirm the

earlier observation that this workload component was not seen to be as significant as scholarly work.

Administrators also saw the individual faculty member as most influential in this component, with the Dean second, and the Department Head third, while faculty members agreed only with the first and placed the Department Head second and the Dean third. This is also shown by the correlation coefficients ( $r = 0.80$ ,  $t = 0.60$ ) which are less significant than those for the teaching component.

These impressions are further shown in Table 45, which expresses the power positions of the four other parties relative to the individual faculty member in terms of units of standard deviation.

TABLE 45

## Relative Powers in Governance and Service

in Standard Deviations from  
the Individual Faculty Member's Average Score

| <u>Categories</u>  | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Dean               | -1.17                       | -2.00                      |
| Associate Dean     | -2.52                       | -2.62                      |
| Department Head    | -1.62                       | - .61                      |
| Collective Faculty | -2.78                       | -2.18                      |

These results are generally far greater than those for scholarly work in Table 43 and for teaching activities in Table 39.

Observation 7:

Both administrators and faculty members perceive the individual faculty member to be most powerful in the determination of governance and service activities.

7.1 All participants believe the Department Head to have strong influence in the determination of this workload component.

TOTAL FACULTY WORKLOAD

Observations 5, 6, and 7 suggest that the Department Head probably has slightly more power than the individual faculty member in the determination of teaching activities, that the faculty member probably has considerably more power than the Department Head in the determination of scholarly work and slightly more in the determination of governance and service activities. If these observations are reasonably reliable, a study of the perceptions of relative powers in the determination of total workload should show the individual faculty member as most powerful, the Department Head as next powerful and closely behind the faculty member, and the other three parties as having very little influence.

Table 46 indicates that these are indeed the perceptions of the faculty members, although not of the administrators.

TABLE 46

## Averages of Decision Making Powers - Total Faculty Workload

| <u>Categories</u>   | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> | <u>All</u> |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Dean                | 2.93                        | 2.46                       | 2.62       |
| Associate Dean      | 2.29                        | 2.04                       | 2.12       |
| Department Head     | 3.71                        | 3.43                       | 3.52       |
| Collective Faculty  | 2.86                        | 2.36                       | 2.52       |
| Faculty Member      | 3.29                        | 3.75                       | 3.60       |
| Standard Deviations | .472                        | .661                       |            |

$r = 0.86$

$t = 0.80$

Note:  $r$  = Pearson correlation coefficient  
and  $t$  = Kendall's tau  
for administrators' and faculty members' scores.

It should be noted that faculty members perceived the Dean, the Associate Deans, and the collective faculty to have less than average power in the determination of total workload. They rated the Department Head at 3.43, halfway between strong and very strong, and the individual faculty member at 3.75, much closer to very strong.

The administrators, on the other hand, perceived less than average power only for the Associate Deans and rated all others from strong to close to very strong. They also saw the Department Head as most powerful at 3.71, followed by the faculty member at 3.29, a significant difference.

These differences of perceptions are shown still more clearly in Table 47, which measures the perceived power of the four other parties relative to the individual faculty member in units of standard deviation.

| TABLE 47                                                                     |                             |                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Relative Powers in Total Faculty Workload                                    |                             |                            |
| in Standard Deviations from<br>the Individual Faculty Member's Average Score |                             |                            |
| <u>Categories</u>                                                            | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> |
| Dean                                                                         | - .76                       | -1.95                      |
| Associate Dean                                                               | -2.12                       | -2.59                      |
| Department Head                                                              | + .89                       | - .48                      |
| Collective Faculty                                                           | - .91                       | -2.10                      |

The fact that the individual faculty member is perceived as being very influential in the determination of his own workload is emphasized by the power ratings as they are perceived in the area of General Faculty Business. This was defined for the study as "all matters of concern to the Faculty but not pertaining directly to the determination of workloads".

Table 48 shows an almost complete reversal of positions when power in general faculty business is evaluated.



TABLE 48

## Averages of Decision Making Powers - General Faculty Business

| <u>Categories</u>   | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> | <u>All</u> |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Dean                | 4.43                        | 3.96                       | 4.13       |
| Associate Dean      | 3.29                        | 2.85                       | 3.00       |
| Department Head     | 3.36                        | 3.27                       | 3.30       |
| Collective Faculty  | 2.93                        | 2.81                       | 2.85       |
| Faculty Member      | 2.79                        | 2.12                       | 2.35       |
| Standard Deviations | .371                        | .583                       |            |

r = 0.93

t = 1.00

Note: r = Pearson correlation coefficient  
and t = Kendall's tau  
for administrators' and faculty members' scores.

Both administrators and faculty members perceived the Dean as much stronger than all other parties and recognized clearly that he is the power figure in general faculty business. The Department Head was considered more than strong and the Associate Deans as strong. The collective faculty was rated fourth at just less than strong, while the individual faculty member was seen to be weakest, less than average by the faculty members and just above average by the administrators in the sample. The great level of agreement in this matter is indicated by the coefficients  $r = 0.93$  and  $t = 1.00$ .

This reversal of perceived power positions from workload determination to general faculty business emphasizes the powerful position held by the faculty member in workload determination. This difference is further emphasized with Table 49, which measures the perceived power of the four other parties in general faculty business relative to the individual faculty member by units of standard deviation.

| TABLE 49                                                                     |                             |                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Relative Powers in General Faculty Business                                  |                             |                            |
| in Standard Deviations from<br>the Individual Faculty Member's Average Score |                             |                            |
| <u>Categories</u>                                                            | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> |
| Dean                                                                         | +4.43                       | +3.17                      |
| Associate Dean                                                               | +1.35                       | +1.26                      |
| Department Head                                                              | +1.54                       | +1.98                      |
| Collective Faculty                                                           | +0.38                       | +1.19                      |

This Table shows clearly the great strength of the Dean in general faculty business according to the perceptions of both administrators and faculty members. It identifies as well that both groups consider all parties to be stronger than the individual faculty member.

The interviews also investigated several other aspects of the total workload. One of these was intended to discover if

workloads as discussed were typical or unusual compared to previous years.

Table 50 describes the perceptions of the faculty members in the sample about their workloads for this year.

| TABLE 50                                       |                        |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Workload as Typical or Substantially Different |                        |
| <u>Perceptions of Workload</u>                 | <u>Faculty Members</u> |
| Typical                                        | 9                      |
| Somewhat Different                             | 2                      |
| Substantially Different                        | 1                      |
| No Answer                                      | 2                      |
| <hr/>                                          |                        |
| Total                                          | 14                     |

Of the two faculty members who stated that their workload was somewhat different this year, one said that his load was heavier than normal because of a greater involvement in community service; the other that he was spending more time on research and less on community service than usual.

The one who said that his load was substantially different this year indicated that he was allotted fewer hours to teach and granted more time for research. The latter faculty member taught 7.5 hours per week rather than the average.

The two faculty members who provided no answer generally also had not made estimates about many other matters during their interviews.

It should be noted, however, that the majority of respondents felt that they had a typical workload. This suggests that the observations made in this study are not the result of unusual circumstances, but rather a reflection of the situation as it is perceived to be in a normal year. Such requirements and expectations, and perceptions of the powers in workload determination, as were noted earlier, are thus probably the norm for the Faculty.

Another aspect investigated was the concept of refusing to participate in governance and service activities and negotiating for a heavier teaching load instead. Table 51 suggests that this is not a common practice.

One of the faculty members who said "yes", also stated that this would not be encouraged by anyone because "it indicates the wrong attitude as loads had been negotiated". Two who said "yes" modified this with the comment that it was possible only because of the co-operative nature of the particular Department Head involved.

On the whole it appears that such exchanges of duties are not perceived by many as impossible, but should be discussed at the negotiating stage of workload determination rather than after all decisions have been made.

TABLE 51

Refusal to Do Governance or Service Work  
in Exchange for a Heavier Teaching Load

| <u>Perceptions</u>                                           | <u>Faculty Members</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Cannot Exchange Duties<br>Except by Increasing Research Load | 1                      |
| Cannot Exchange Duties                                       | 2                      |
| Exchange of Duties Is Possible                               | 7                      |
| Do Not Know                                                  | 1                      |
| No Answer                                                    | 3                      |
| <hr/>                                                        | <hr/>                  |
| Total                                                        | 14                     |

One aspect of workload that was also explored through the interviews was the level of satisfaction with workload. In order to calculate numerically the average perceptions of administrators and faculty members, the scale of values as shown in Figure 2 was employed in Table 52.

Only one administrator saw faculty members as moderately pleased, one saw them as moderately dissatisfied, and the remainder perceived the average faculty feelings to be neutral. The latter estimate of faculty members' feelings by administrators was stated as being either "halfway between moderately pleased and moderately dissatisfied" or "somewhere between" those two. In this respect adminis-

|                                |     |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Very Pleased                   | - 7 |
| Moderately - Very Pleased      | - 6 |
| Moderately Pleased             | - 5 |
| Neutral                        | - 4 |
| Moderately Dissatisfied        | - 3 |
| Moderately - Very Dissatisfied | - 2 |
| Very Dissatisfied              | - 1 |

Figure 2: Scale of Values for Levels of Satisfaction with Workloads

TABLE 52

Satisfaction with Workload

| <u>Categories</u>                 | <u>Perceptions<br/>of<br/>Administrators</u> | <u>Statements<br/>by<br/>Faculty</u> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Very Pleased                      | 0                                            | 5                                    |
| Moderately - Very Pleased         | 0                                            | 1                                    |
| Moderately Pleased                | 1                                            | 4                                    |
| Neutral                           | 4                                            | 0                                    |
| Moderately Dissatisfied           | 1                                            | 3                                    |
| Moderately - Very<br>Dissatisfied | 0                                            | 0                                    |
| Very Dissatisfied                 | 0                                            | 1                                    |
| No Opinion                        | 1                                            | 0                                    |
| <hr/>                             | <hr/>                                        | <hr/>                                |
| Totals                            | 7                                            | 14                                   |
| Average Scores                    | 4.0                                          | 5.07                                 |

trators underestimated the faculty's level of satisfaction with workloads.

The average for the faculty members in this sample is "moderately pleased", with five faculty members indicating they were very pleased. Only four in the sample considered themselves not pleased.

Finally the possible role of UMFA in workload dissatisfaction was checked through the interviews. It was noted that only one of the fourteen faculty members was active in UMFA; the others were members attending meetings but not actively engaging in official UMFA business.

Table 53 indicates that twelve faculty members (85.7 per cent) would ask UMFA assistance if they were very unhappy with their workloads. This perception seems shared by administrators.

TABLE 53

## Possible UMFA Assistance Requested

in Cases of Dissatisfaction with Workload

| <u>Perceptions</u>      | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Yes, Help Requested     | 6                     | 12             |
| No, Help Not Requested  | 0                     | 2              |
| Help Possibly Requested | 1                     | 0              |
| <hr/>                   | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                  | 7                     | 14             |

Many participants pointed out that the matter in question would have to be of a very serious nature, that was not resolvable through negotiation with the Department Head, and that asked the faculty member to perform a task which was unreasonable and not in keeping with his capabilities, before assistance from UMFA would be requested.

Table 54 indicates that eleven faculty members (78.6 per cent) would resort to grievance procedures if that became necessary. Most felt, however, that their workloads would have to be unfair and unreasonable before such action would be contemplated.

| TABLE 54                                  |                       |                |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Possible Grievance Procedures Initiated   |                       |                |
| in Cases of Dissatisfaction with Workload |                       |                |
| <u>Perceptions</u>                        | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
| Grievance Initiated                       | 6                     | 11             |
| Grievance Not Initiated                   | 0                     | 3              |
| Grievance Possibly Initiated              | 1                     | 0              |
| <hr/>                                     | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                                    | 7                     | 14             |

Because policies impact on faculty workloads, some attention, however brief, should also be given to the power structure perceptions of administrators and faculty members



in respect to the power roles of the two main groups involved in the policy making of the Faculty. These two main groups are the Administration, consisting of all Faculty administrators, and Faculty Council, consisting of all faculty members and some of the administrators. Their interaction in the setting of policies must create in time certain perceptions of relative powers to each other. Table 55 shows these perceptions of the twenty-one participants in this study.

This Table clearly indicates a number of aspects of the perceived power interaction at this level. First, it may be noted that both administrators and faculty members perceived the Administration to be more powerful than Faculty Council in all aspects of workload determination as well as in general faculty business. Secondly, it should be noted that the perceived difference in power between these two groups was seen to be greatest in the workload component of teaching duties and least in governance and service activities, and general faculty business. Thirdly it is evident that the difference in administrators' and faculty members' perceptions is minimal. Lastly it is very apparent that all average values fluctuate very little and that most range from average to strong without the outstanding differences in perceptions that have been evident in most other power concepts employed heretofore.

TABLE 55

Power Perceptions on Faculty Council and  
Administration

| <u>Categories</u>                | <u>Adminis-<br/>trators</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Members</u> | <u>All</u> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| <u>Teaching Duties:</u>          |                             |                            |            |
| Administration                   | 2.86                        | 2.71                       | 2.76       |
| Faculty Council                  | 1.86                        | 1.82                       | 1.83       |
| <u>Scholarly Work:</u>           |                             |                            |            |
| Administration                   | 3.00                        | 2.82                       | 2.88       |
| Faculty Council                  | 2.36                        | 2.57                       | 2.50       |
| <u>Governance and Service:</u>   |                             |                            |            |
| Administration                   | 2.93                        | 2.79                       | 2.83       |
| Faculty Council                  | 2.71                        | 2.61                       | 2.64       |
| <u>Total Faculty Workload:</u>   |                             |                            |            |
| Administration                   | 3.07                        | 2.75                       | 2.86       |
| Faculty Council                  | 2.57                        | 2.29                       | 2.38       |
| <u>General Faculty Business:</u> |                             |                            |            |
| Administration                   | 3.36                        | 3.46                       | 3.43       |
| Faculty Council                  | 3.14                        | 3.31                       | 3.25       |
| <u>Administration Scores:</u>    |                             |                            |            |
| Standard Deviation               | .190                        | .312                       |            |
| r = 0.93                         |                             |                            |            |
| t = 0.60                         |                             |                            |            |
| <u>Faculty Council Scores:</u>   |                             |                            |            |
| Standard Deviation               | .470                        | .543                       |            |
| r = 0.93                         |                             |                            |            |
| t = 0.80                         |                             |                            |            |

Note: r = Pearson correlation coefficient  
and t = Kendall's tau  
for administrators' and faculty members' scores.

Observation 8:

The individual faculty member is perceived to have substantial powers in the determination of his own workload.

8.1 Although administrators generally rate the Department Head as the most powerful party in the determination of a faculty member's personal workload, this perception is not shared by faculty members.

8.2 Faculty members rate themselves as the most powerful party in the determination of their own total personal workload.

8.3 The Department Head seems to hold the most power in the determination of teaching allotments, while the individual faculty member has the most in the other components of workload.

8.4 Associate Deans may be considered to be least influential in the determination of faculty workload, while the faculty collectively may be seen as having less than average influence.

8.5 Faculty members appear reasonably satisfied with their workloads, but would resort to assistance from UMFA and the grievance procedures if they were very unhappy and believed themselves to be treated unfairly.

## Chapter VI

### COMPARISONS OF STUDY RESULTS BY SUBGROUPS

The following research questions were posed concerning comparisons of study results by subgroups:

7. Are the perceptions of administrators uniform or are there measurable differences among subgroups based on department, administrative or academic rank, age, sex, experience, and tenure status?
8. Are the perceptions of faculty members uniform or are there measurable differences among subgroups based on department, academic rank, age, sex, experience, and tenure status?

A number of the Tables employed in the previous two chapters, reporting the general results obtained through this study, are analyzed in this chapter by a variety of subgroups.

Two specific difficulties were encountered, however, which restricted both the grouping itself and the conclusions that might be drawn from subgroup analysis. The first was that the administrative sample consisted of only seven individuals. To divide administrators into subgroups by department, age, academic rank, and so on, would mean that participants might be readily identified, whereas all were assured that anonymity would be retained. As a result of

this very real possibility, administrators are divided into only two subgroups for purposes of analysis, the Deans (the Dean and the two Associate Deans) and the Department Heads.

The second difficulty encountered was that the subgrouping of the fourteen faculty members in the sample resulted in several instances when a subgroup consisted of only two or three people (See Tables 4 through 11). This has been overcome partly by dividing faculty members usually into no more than two subgroups in each category and by deleting some of the categories.

For both administrators and faculty members the subgroups are, nevertheless, so small that results obtained through comparative analyses can hardly be considered reliable. Accordingly, although Tables have been prepared to show the results obtained from the study of various subgroups, conclusions drawn from these must be limited and can be no more than observations of general tendencies.

WORKLOAD REQUIREMENTS

Table 56 indicates that there are no really significant differences in the requirements for teaching allotments and related duties by department. It may be noted that, whereas Educational Administration and Foundations and Educational Psychology appear to handle all seminar teaching duties, Humanities and Social Sciences deals with a far greater number of student teachers and Mathematics and Natural Sciences handles a much greater number of graduate students. Generally, however, all average workloads appear to be quite balanced, suggesting that workload requirements in teaching are approximately the same in all departments.

TABLE 56

## Teaching Duties Averaged by Department

Derived from Table 14

| <u>Subgroups</u>   | <u>Teaching<br/>Hours</u> | <u>Number<br/>of<br/>Seminars</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Student<br/>Teachers</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Graduate<br/>Students</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Indep't<br/>Studies<br/>Students</u> |
|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Average</u>     | 8.3                       | 0.3                               | 5.2                                       | 7.2                                        | 6.3                                                   |
| <u>Department:</u> |                           |                                   |                                           |                                            |                                                       |
| EAF                | 8.0                       | 0.3                               | 5.2                                       | 7.2                                        | 6.3                                                   |
| EPs                | 8.3                       | 0.5                               | 2.8                                       | 5.3                                        | 6.0                                                   |
| HSS                | 8.5                       | 0.0                               | 11.0                                      | 3.3                                        | 1.3                                                   |
| MNS                | 7.6                       | 0.0                               | 4.4                                       | 12.5                                       | 6.8                                                   |

Table 57 indicates that the over 40 age group among the faculty deal with more graduate and independent studies students than does the younger age group. The latter group appears to handle more student teachers and seminar teaching to make up for this difference.

TABLE 57

## Teaching Duties Averaged by Age

Derived from Table 14

| <u>Subgroups</u> | <u>Teaching<br/>Hours</u> | <u>Number<br/>of<br/>Seminars</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Student<br/>Teachers</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Graduate<br/>Students</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Indep't<br/>Studies<br/>Students</u> |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Average</u>   | 8.3                       | 0.3                               | 5.2                                       | 7.2                                        | 6.3                                                   |
| <u>Age:</u>      |                           |                                   |                                           |                                            |                                                       |
| Under 40         | 8.4                       | 0.5                               | 5.8                                       | 3.8                                        | 4.8                                                   |
| Over 40          | 8.2                       | 0.1                               | 4.8                                       | 9.3                                        | 7.3                                                   |

Table 58 shows that there are few significant differences between males and females in the teaching component of workload. One difference that may be noted is that females seem to have more student teachers to supervise and males to have more graduate students to advise.

TABLE 58

## Teaching Duties Averaged by Gender

Derived from Table 14

| <u>Subgroups</u> | <u>Teaching<br/>Hours</u> | <u>Number<br/>of<br/>Seminars</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Student<br/>Teachers</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Graduate<br/>Students</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Indep't<br/>Studies<br/>Students</u> |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Average</u>   | 8.3                       | 0.3                               | 5.2                                       | 7.2                                        | 6.3                                                   |
| <u>Gender:</u>   |                           |                                   |                                           |                                            |                                                       |
| Male             | 8.5                       | 0.3                               | 4.1                                       | 9.0                                        | 6.9                                                   |
| Females          | 7.9                       | 0.2                               | 6.9                                       | 4.2                                        | 5.4                                                   |



Table 59 suggests that the more experienced university teachers teach fewer lecture and seminar hours per week on the average than do the less experienced, but deal with more graduate and independent studies students.

TABLE 59

Teaching Duties Averaged by Experience at the Faculty

Derived from Table 14

| <u>Subgroups</u>   | <u>Teaching<br/>Hours</u> | <u>Number<br/>of<br/>Seminars</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Student<br/>Teachers</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Graduate<br/>Students</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Indep't<br/>Studies<br/>Students</u> |
|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Average</u>     | 8.3                       | 0.3                               | 5.2                                       | 7.2                                        | 6.3                                                   |
| <u>Experience:</u> |                           |                                   |                                           |                                            |                                                       |
| 5 & Under          | 9.0                       | 0.8                               | 4.7                                       | 5.0                                        | 5.0                                                   |
| 6 & Over           | 8.0                       | 0.1                               | 5.3                                       | 7.8                                        | 6.7                                                   |

A significant difference exists between the tenured and the non-tenured subgroups of the faculty, as may be seen in Table 60. The non-tenured faculty members spent more time in the classroom and supervising student teachers, while the tenured faculty members supervised more graduate and independent study students.

TABLE 60

## Teaching Duties Averaged by Tenure Status

Derived from Table 14

| <u>Subgroups</u> | <u>Teaching<br/>Hours</u> | <u>Number<br/>of<br/>Seminars</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Student<br/>Teachers</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Graduate<br/>Students</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Indep't<br/>Studies<br/>Students</u> |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Average</u>   | 8.3                       | 0.3                               | 5.2                                       | 7.2                                        | 6.3                                                   |
| <u>Status:</u>   |                           |                                   |                                           |                                            |                                                       |
| Tenure           | 7.6                       | 0.2                               | 4.5                                       | 7.7                                        | 6.7                                                   |
| No Tenure        | 9.0                       | 0.3                               | 8.3                                       | 5.3                                        | 5.0                                                   |

Table 61 shows a significant difference in workloads depending on whether a faculty member holds or does not hold a doctorate degree. The latter group appears to have more student teachers but to have a lighter workload in all other respects.

TABLE 61

Teaching Duties Averaged by Highest Degree Held

Derived from Table 14

| <u>Subgroups</u>  | <u>Teaching<br/>Hours</u> | <u>Number<br/>of<br/>Seminars</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Student<br/>Teachers</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Graduate<br/>Students</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Indep't<br/>Studies<br/>Students</u> |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Average</u>    | 8.3                       | 0.3                               | 5.2                                       | 7.2                                        | 6.3                                                   |
| <u>Doctorate:</u> |                           |                                   |                                           |                                            |                                                       |
| Yes               | 8.6                       | 0.4                               | 4.4                                       | 8.1                                        | 7.1                                                   |
| No                | 7.8                       | 0.0                               | 6.4                                       | 5.6                                        | 5.0                                                   |

Table 62 suggests that there is a significant difference in teaching loads among subgroups by academic rank. Full Professors appear to have an average load, but without seminar teaching, and an above average load in the supervision of graduate students. Associate Professors appear to be below average in most areas of teaching activities, but above average in seminar teaching and in the supervision of independent study students. Assistant Professors, on the other hand, seem to be above average in lecture hours and student teaching supervision, but below average in the supervision of graduate and independent study students.

TABLE 62

## Teaching Duties Averaged by Academic Rank

Derived from Table 14

| <u>Subgroups</u> | <u>Teaching Hours</u> | <u>Number of Seminars</u> | <u>Number of Student Teachers</u> | <u>Number of Graduate Students</u> | <u>Number of Indep't Studies Students</u> |
|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| <u>Average</u>   | 8.3                   | 0.3                       | 5.2                               | 7.2                                | 6.3                                       |
| <u>Rank:</u>     |                       |                           |                                   |                                    |                                           |
| Professor        | 8.6                   | 0.0                       | 4.3                               | 11.8                               | 6.5                                       |
| Associate        | 7.8                   | 0.4                       | 4.3                               | 5.0                                | 6.8                                       |
| Assistant        | 9.0                   | 0.3                       | 8.3                               | 5.3                                | 5.0                                       |

Observation 9:

It is generally perceived that minimum requirements, in the form of expectations, for the workload component of teaching are not the same for all faculty members, but allotments are fairly and equally distributed among all on the bases of experience and expertise.

9.1 Expectations for teaching appear based on some general trends, which suggest that:

a) Teaching hours tend to be heavier for males with fewer than six years experience at the Faculty, without tenure or doctorate, and at the rank of Assistant Professor.

b) Seminars tend to be taught by the younger faculty members with little experience at the Faculty, below the rank of Professor, but holding a doctorate. All are members of the departments of Educational Administration and Foundations, and Educational Psychology.

c) Student teacher supervision tends to be handled primarily by non-tenured, non-doctorate faculty members who are generally under 40 years of age and have fewer than six years experience at the Faculty. Many are female or Assistant Professors, and the majority belong to the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences.

d) Graduate student supervision tends to be done primarily by faculty members over 40 years of age, with more experience at the Faculty, who are male and tenured, and hold a doctorate degree. Many belong to the Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences.

e) Independent studies student supervision tends to be done mostly by faculty members over 40 years of age, with more experience at the Faculty, who are tenured and have a doctorate.

## WORKLOAD DETERMINATION

The determination of workloads has been discussed earlier and power perceptions of administrators and faculty members shown in a selection of Tables. These are analyzed in this section on the basis of selected administrative and faculty subgroups.

### Teaching

Information from the interviews has been used to design Table 63, which shows the power structure as it was perceived by administrators and faculty members in the selected subgroups.

There are significant perceptual differences between Deans and Department Heads in the powers of the Department Head, the collective faculty, and the individual faculty member. Note that the Deans viewed these power parties at 4.33, 2.32, and 3.00, while the Department Heads saw them at 3.75, 3.00, and 3.75 respectively.

The Deans then perceived the collective faculty to have less than average powers - in fact, to have the least power of all five parties, the Department Heads to have almost total power, and the individual faculty member to have strong influence. The Department Heads, on the other hand, perceived themselves and the individual faculty member to have equal, most, and very strong powers, and the collective faculty to have a strong influence.

TABLE 63

## Averages of Decision Making Powers - Teaching Duties

Perceptions of Fourteen Faculty Members  
and Seven Administrators  
in Designated Sub-Groups

|                              | <u>Dean</u> | <u>Assoc. Dean</u> | <u>Dept. Head</u> | <u>Coll. Fac.</u> | <u>Fac. Mem.</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| All Participants             | 2.26        | 2.10               | 3.78              | 2.72              | 3.50             |
| <u>Administrators</u>        | 2.36        | 2.50               | 4.00              | 2.71              | 3.43             |
| Deans                        | 2.51        | 2.66               | 4.33              | 2.32              | 3.00             |
| Department Heads             | 2.25        | 2.38               | 3.75              | 3.00              | 3.75             |
| <u>Faculty Average</u>       | 2.21        | 1.89               | 3.68              | 2.71              | 3.54             |
| <u>Department</u>            |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| EAF                          | 1.50        | 0.67               | 3.67              | 1.83              | 2.83             |
| EPs                          | 2.25        | 2.38               | 3.50              | 3.00              | 4.00             |
| HSS                          | 3.17        | 1.83               | 3.67              | 3.33              | 3.00             |
| MNS                          | 2.00        | 2.38               | 3.88              | 2.63              | 4.00             |
| <u>Age</u>                   |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| 40 and Less                  | 2.59        | 1.42               | 3.67              | 1.84              | 3.25             |
| More Than 40                 | 1.94        | 2.50               | 3.69              | 3.38              | 3.75             |
| <u>Sex</u>                   |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Male                         | 2.39        | 1.89               | 4.00              | 3.06              | 3.50             |
| Female                       | 1.90        | 1.90               | 3.10              | 2.10              | 3.60             |
| <u>Rank</u>                  |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Professor                    | 2.00        | 1.63               | 3.75              | 2.88              | 3.50             |
| Lesser Rank                  | 2.40        | 2.03               | 3.66              | 2.65              | 3.55             |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u> |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer             | 3.00        | 1.63               | 3.50              | 1.50              | 2.63             |
| 6 yrs. and More              | 1.90        | 2.00               | 3.76              | 3.20              | 3.90             |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>       |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Doctorate                    | 2.45        | 1.89               | 3.61              | 2.72              | 3.72             |
| No Doctorate                 | 1.80        | 1.90               | 3.80              | 2.70              | 3.20             |
| <u>Tenure</u>                |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Yes                          | 2.00        | 1.82               | 3.68              | 2.73              | 3.87             |
| No                           | 3.00        | 2.17               | 3.67              | 2.67              | 2.34             |

As noted earlier in the study, it appears that Deans may be more distant from the actual process of workload determination in teaching assignments and thus may more likely perceive the process in a theoretical manner. Department Heads are much more directly involved, as indicated during the interviews, and more likely to perceive the process as it would occur in practice. The Deans in a way suggested this themselves by seeing the Department Head as most powerful in workload determination, which in turn suggests they may also be the most knowledgeable in this matter.

This view may be strengthened somewhat by the fact that the Department Heads recognized the individual faculty member as having significant and equal powers to the Department Head, which is supported by the average perceptions of the faculty members. They also viewed the faculty peer groups as a strong influence, as indicated in the interviews with faculty members, although the Deans considered them to be fairly insignificant in influence.

Table 63 also indicates that among the faculty members in their subgroups almost all saw themselves as strong to very strong in the determination of teaching assignments. Only the members of Educational Administration and Foundations and faculty members who were non-tenured or had fewer than six years experience at the Faculty perceived themselves as less than strong.



Individual scoring of relative powers indicated that some individuals among the faculty members scored all parties involved in workload determination much higher or much lower than did others. Because this tendency may affect accurate comparisons between the perceived powers of various parties, Table 64 was designed to observe differences between scores rather than raw scores themselves. This Table shows the score differentials from the individual faculty members' scores for the Dean, the Associate Deans, the Department Heads, and the collective faculty, and quickly identifies major differences of perceptions among the subgroups.

TABLE 64

Score Differentials from Faculty Member's Scores -  
Teaching

|                              | <u>Dean</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Dean</u> | <u>Dept.<br/>Head</u> | <u>Coll.<br/>Fac.</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Faculty Average</u>       | -1.33       | -1.65                  | - .14                 | - .83                 |
| <u>Department</u>            |             |                        |                       |                       |
| EAF                          | -1.33       | -2.16                  | + .84                 | -1.00                 |
| EPs                          | -1.75       | -1.62                  | - .50                 | -1.00                 |
| HSS                          | + .17       | -1.17                  | + .67                 | + .33                 |
| MNS                          | -2.00       | -1.62                  | - .12                 | -1.37                 |
| <u>Age</u>                   |             |                        |                       |                       |
| 40 and Less                  | - .66       | -1.83                  | + .42                 | -1.41                 |
| More Than 40                 | -1.81       | -1.25                  | - .06                 | - .37                 |
| <u>Sex</u>                   |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Male                         | -1.11       | -1.61                  | + .50                 | - .44                 |
| Female                       | -1.70       | -1.70                  | - .50                 | -1.50                 |
| <u>Rank</u>                  |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Professor                    | -1.50       | -1.87                  | + .25                 | - .62                 |
| Other Ranks                  | -1.15       | -1.52                  | + .11                 | - .90                 |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u> |             |                        |                       |                       |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer             | + .37       | -1.00                  | + .87                 | -1.13                 |
| 6 yrs. and More              | -2.00       | -1.90                  | - .14                 | - .70                 |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>       |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Yes                          | -1.27       | -1.83                  | - .11                 | -1.00                 |
| No                           | -1.40       | -1.30                  | + .60                 | - .50                 |
| <u>Tenure</u>                |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Yes                          | -1.87       | -2.05                  | - .19                 | -1.14                 |
| No                           | + .66       | - .17                  | +1.33                 | + .33                 |

The following brief observations may be made about Table

64:

1. The Dean was perceived by almost all to have much less influence in the determination of teaching allotments than the individual faculty member. Exceptions are noted for the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences and for faculty members who have fewer than six years experience at the Faculty or who are not tenured. These subgroups saw the Dean as stronger than themselves. There are also notable differences of perceptions on the basis of age, sex, experience at the Faculty, and tenure status. The older, the female, the more experienced and the tenured perceived the Dean as much weaker than did the younger, the male, the less experienced and the non-tenured faculty members.
2. The Associate Deans were perceived by all faculty members as weaker than themselves. Only the non-tenured thought of them as close to their own power.
3. The Department Heads were perceived by all subgroups as having considerable power, and were seen to be strongest by the members of the departments of Educational Administration and Foundations, and Humanities and Social Sciences. This perception was shared by the younger, the male, the least experienced, and by those not holding a doctorate. They were perceived to have a great deal more power than themselves by the non-tenured faculty members. However, not all faculty members considered the Department Heads to be stronger than themselves. In particular this is evident with the older, the female, the more experienced, the doctorate, and the tenured subgroups.
4. The collective faculty was considered much weaker than themselves by the individual faculty members. Notable exceptions are the members of the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences and the non-tenured faculty members, who saw the collective faculty as stronger. The collective faculty is considered much weaker by the younger, the female, the lower ranked, the less experienced, the doctorate and the tenured than by the older, the male, the higher ranked, the more experienced, the non-doctorate and the non-tenured faculty members.

### Scholarly Work

Table 65 indicates the power perceptions of participants in the selected subgroups for the determination of the workload component of scholarly work.

It may be noted that the average scores of administrators indicate that the individual faculty member was perceived as the most powerful party (4.14) in the determination of this workload component, with the Dean (3.86) and the Department Head (3.71) being the next in power.

The perceptions of Deans and Department Heads are generally fairly uniform. Some differences can be observed, however, in that the Department Heads considered the Dean and the individual faculty member to be equally most powerful (4.00), while the Deans saw the faculty member as much stronger (4.33 as opposed to 3.67). As well, Department Heads saw the Associate Deans as very influential (3.63), while the Deans perceived them as weak (2.32).

TABLE 65

## Averages of Decision Making Powers - Scholarly Work

Perceptions of Fourteen Faculty Members  
and Seven Administrators  
in Designated Sub-Groups

|                              | <u>Dean</u> | <u>Assoc. Dean</u> | <u>Dept. Head</u> | <u>Coll. Fac.</u> | <u>Fac. Mem.</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| All Participants             | 3.07        | 2.52               | 3.24              | 2.71              | 3.81             |
| <u>Administrators</u>        | 3.86        | 3.07               | 3.71              | 2.79              | 4.14             |
| Deans                        | 3.67        | 2.32               | 3.66              | 2.68              | 4.33             |
| Department Heads             | 4.00        | 3.63               | 3.75              | 2.87              | 4.00             |
| <u>Faculty Average</u>       | 2.68        | 2.25               | 3.00              | 2.68              | 3.64             |
| <u>Department</u>            |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| EAF                          | 2.50        | 2.17               | 2.67              | 2.33              | 5.00             |
| EPs                          | 2.75        | 2.75               | 3.63              | 2.25              | 3.13             |
| HSS                          | 3.00        | 2.00               | 3.33              | 3.33              | 3.00             |
| MNS                          | 2.50        | 2.00               | 2.38              | 2.88              | 3.63             |
| <u>Age</u>                   |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| 40 and Less                  | 2.42        | 1.67               | 2.83              | 2.17              | 3.92             |
| More Than 40                 | 2.88        | 2.68               | 3.13              | 3.06              | 3.44             |
| <u>Sex</u>                   |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Male                         | 2.88        | 2.28               | 3.11              | 3.00              | 4.00             |
| Female                       | 2.30        | 2.20               | 2.80              | 2.10              | 3.00             |
| <u>Rank</u>                  |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Professor                    | 2.88        | 2.88               | 3.25              | 3.00              | 3.75             |
| Other Ranks                  | 2.60        | 2.00               | 2.90              | 2.55              | 3.60             |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u> |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer             | 2.63        | 2.00               | 2.63              | 1.25              | 3.38             |
| 6 yrs. and More              | 2.87        | 2.34               | 3.25              | 3.49              | 4.08             |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>       |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Yes                          | 2.67        | 2.33               | 3.17              | 2.50              | 3.89             |
| No                           | 2.61        | 2.18               | 2.73              | 2.92              | 3.15             |
| <u>Tenure</u>                |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Yes                          | 2.50        | 2.14               | 2.91              | 2.77              | 3.82             |
| No                           | 3.33        | 2.67               | 3.33              | 2.33              | 3.00             |

The differences in perceptions of the selected faculty member subgroups are shown in Table 66.

| TABLE 66                                                           |             |                        |                       |                       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Score Differentials from Faculty Member Scores -<br>Scholarly Work |             |                        |                       |                       |
|                                                                    | <u>Dean</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Dean</u> | <u>Dept.<br/>Head</u> | <u>Coll.<br/>Fac.</u> |
| <u>Faculty Average</u>                                             | - .96       | -1.39                  | - .64                 | - .96                 |
| <u>Department</u>                                                  |             |                        |                       |                       |
| EAF                                                                | -2.50       | -2.83                  | -2.33                 | -2.67                 |
| EPs                                                                | - .38       | - .38                  | + .50                 | - .88                 |
| HSS                                                                | 0.0         | -1.00                  | + .33                 | + .33                 |
| MNS                                                                | -1.13       | -1.63                  | -1.25                 | - .75                 |
| <u>Age</u>                                                         |             |                        |                       |                       |
| 40 and Less                                                        | -1.50       | -2.25                  | -1.09                 | -1.75                 |
| More Than 40                                                       | - .56       | - .76                  | - .31                 | - .38                 |
| <u>Sex</u>                                                         |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Male                                                               | -1.12       | -1.72                  | - .89                 | -1.00                 |
| Female                                                             | - .70       | - .80                  | - .20                 | - .90                 |
| <u>Rank</u>                                                        |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Professor                                                          | - .87       | - .87                  | - .50                 | - .75                 |
| Other Ranks                                                        | -1.00       | -1.60                  | - .70                 | -1.05                 |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u>                                       |             |                        |                       |                       |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer                                                   | - .75       | -1.38                  | - .75                 | -2.13                 |
| 6 yrs. and More                                                    | -1.21       | -1.74                  | - .83                 | - .59                 |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>                                             |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Yes                                                                | -1.22       | -1.56                  | - .72                 | -1.39                 |
| No                                                                 | - .54       | - .97                  | - .42                 | - .23                 |
| <u>Tenure</u>                                                      |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Yes                                                                | -1.32       | -1.68                  | - .91                 | -1.05                 |
| No                                                                 | + .33       | - .33                  | + .33                 | - .67                 |

The following brief observations may be made about Table

66:

1. Virtually all subgroups perceived the Dean as much weaker than the individual faculty member. Only the non-tenured saw him as stronger.
2. The Associate Deans were perceived to be much weaker than the individual faculty member by all subgroups.
3. The Department Heads were generally perceived as weaker than the individual faculty member, although in Educational Psychology and in Humanities and Social Sciences they were considered to be stronger. This is also the perception of the non-tenured faculty members.
4. The collective faculty was generally perceived as having only average influence. Only Humanities and Social Sciences saw it as stronger than the individual faculty member.
5. Many differences of perceptions between various subgroups may be noted, but because all are very similar to those observed for the teaching component, these are not recorded at this time.

Service

Table 67 shows the average power perceptions of the selected subgroups for the workload component of governance and service activities.

In the determination of this workload activity the average scores assigned by all administrators indicate that the individual faculty member was considered to be the strongest party. Deans, however, perceived the individual faculty member to be very strong (4.00) and all other parties average or weak. The Department Heads, on the other hand, perceived the Dean to be strongest (3.75), the Associate Deans as very close to the Dean in power (3.63), and the Department Head and individual faculty member to be tied for third in power (3.25).



TABLE 67

Averages of Decision Making Powers - Governance and Service

Perceptions of Fourteen Faculty Members  
and Seven Administrators  
in Designated Sub-Groups

|                              | <u>Dean</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Dean</u> | <u>Dept.<br/>Head</u> | <u>Coll.<br/>Fac.</u> | <u>Fac.<br/>Mem.</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| All Participants             | 2.78        | 2.48                   | 3.12                  | 2.57                  | 3.45                 |
| <u>Administrators</u>        | 3.21        | 2.79                   | 3.07                  | 2.71                  | 3.57                 |
| Deans                        | 2.49        | 1.67                   | 2.83                  | 2.82                  | 4.00                 |
| Department Heads             | 3.75        | 3.63                   | 3.25                  | 2.63                  | 3.25                 |
| <u>Faculty Average</u>       | 2.57        | 2.32                   | 3.14                  | 2.50                  | 3.39                 |
| <u>Department</u>            |             |                        |                       |                       |                      |
| EAF                          | 2.00        | 1.17                   | 2.33                  | 1.67                  | 4.33                 |
| Eps                          | 2.88        | 2.75                   | 3.50                  | 2.63                  | 3.25                 |
| HSS                          | 2.33        | 2.00                   | 3.00                  | 2.50                  | 3.67                 |
| MNS                          | 2.88        | 3.00                   | 3.50                  | 3.00                  | 2.63                 |
| <u>Age</u>                   |             |                        |                       |                       |                      |
| 40 and Less                  | 2.00        | 1.42                   | 2.58                  | 1.67                  | 3.58                 |
| More Than 40                 | 3.00        | 3.00                   | 3.56                  | 3.13                  | 3.25                 |
| <u>Sex</u>                   |             |                        |                       |                       |                      |
| Male                         | 2.50        | 2.17                   | 3.11                  | 2.61                  | 3.56                 |
| Female                       | 2.70        | 2.60                   | 3.20                  | 2.30                  | 3.10                 |
| <u>Rank</u>                  |             |                        |                       |                       |                      |
| Professor                    | 3.13        | 2.88                   | 3.13                  | 2.88                  | 4.00                 |
| Other Ranks                  | 2.35        | 2.10                   | 3.15                  | 2.35                  | 3.15                 |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u> |             |                        |                       |                       |                      |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer             | 2.13        | 1.25                   | 2.63                  | 1.00                  | 3.50                 |
| 6 yrs. and More              | 2.75        | 2.75                   | 3.35                  | 3.10                  | 3.35                 |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>       |             |                        |                       |                       |                      |
| Yes                          | 2.33        | 2.06                   | 2.83                  | 2.39                  | 3.78                 |
| No                           | 3.00        | 2.80                   | 3.70                  | 2.70                  | 2.70                 |
| <u>Tenure</u>                |             |                        |                       |                       |                      |
| Yes                          | 2.55        | 2.41                   | 3.00                  | 2.68                  | 3.32                 |
| No                           | 2.67        | 2.00                   | 3.67                  | 1.83                  | 3.67                 |

The differences in perceptions of the selected subgroups of faculty members are shown in Table 68.

| TABLE 68                                                  |             |                    |                   |                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Score Differentials from Faculty Member's Score - Service |             |                    |                   |                   |
|                                                           | <u>Dean</u> | <u>Assoc. Dean</u> | <u>Dept. Head</u> | <u>Coll. Fac.</u> |
| <u>Faculty Average</u>                                    | - .82       | -1.07              | - .25             | - .89             |
| <u>Department</u>                                         |             |                    |                   |                   |
| EAF                                                       | -2.33       | -3.16              | -2.00             | -2.66             |
| EPs                                                       | - .37       | - .50              | + .25             | - .62             |
| HSS                                                       | -1.34       | -1.67              | - .67             | -1.17             |
| MNS                                                       | + .25       | + .37              | + .87             | + .37             |
| <u>Age</u>                                                |             |                    |                   |                   |
| 40 and Less                                               | -1.58       | -2.16              | -1.00             | -1.91             |
| More Than 40                                              | - .25       | - .25              | + .31             | - .12             |
| <u>Sex</u>                                                |             |                    |                   |                   |
| Male                                                      | -1.06       | -1.39              | - .45             | - .95             |
| Female                                                    | - .40       | - .50              | + .10             | - .80             |
| <u>Rank</u>                                               |             |                    |                   |                   |
| Professor                                                 | - .87       | -1.12              | - .87             | -1.12             |
| Other Ranks                                               | - .80       | -1.05              | 0.0               | - .80             |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u>                              |             |                    |                   |                   |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer                                          | -1.37       | -2.25              | - .87             | -2.50             |
| 6 yrs. and More                                           | - .60       | - .60              | 0.0               | - .25             |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>                                    |             |                    |                   |                   |
| Yes                                                       | -1.45       | -1.72              | - .95             | -1.39             |
| No                                                        | + .30       | + .10              | +1.00             | 0.0               |
| <u>Tenure</u>                                             |             |                    |                   |                   |
| Yes                                                       | - .77       | - .91              | - .32             | - .64             |
| No                                                        | -1.00       | -1.67              | 0.0               | -1.84             |

The following brief observations may be made about Table 68:

1. All but two of the faculty subgroups perceived the Dean as considerably weaker than the individual faculty member. No major significant differences in the perceptions of subgroups are evident.
2. The Associate Deans were almost uniformly perceived to be much weaker than the individual faculty member by all subgroups of faculty.
3. The Department Heads were perceived on the whole to be somewhat weaker than individual faculty members, but a number of subgroups saw them as stronger. These were the members of the Department of Educational Psychology, the older age group, the females, and those not having a doctorate.
4. The collective faculty was generally thought to be weaker than the individual faculty member by most faculty subgroups except the members of the Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences.
5. Many differences of perceptions between various faculty subgroups may be noted, but because all are very similar to those already observed for the teaching component, these are not recorded at this time.

Total Workload

Table 69 shows the average scores of selected subgroups for the determination of the total workload of a faculty member.

In this Table it is evident that the administrators perceived the Department Head as being the strongest party in the determination of total workload (3.71) and the individual faculty member as the next most influential (3.28). The main difference in perceptions by administrative subgroups was that Department Heads considered themselves and the individual faculty member to be equally most powerful (3.50), while the Deans saw the Department Head as very strong (3.99) and the individual faculty member as strong (2.98).

These perceptions are not shared by the faculty members who believe that they are individually stronger than the Department Head (3.75 as opposed to 3.43).

TABLE 69

## Averages of Decision Making Powers - Total Workload

Perceptions of Fourteen Faculty Members  
and Seven Administrators  
in Designated Sub-Groups

|                              | <u>Dean</u> | <u>Assoc. Dean</u> | <u>Dept. Head</u> | <u>Coll. Fac.</u> | <u>Fac. Mem.</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| All Participants             | 2.62        | 2.12               | 3.52              | 2.52              | 3.60             |
| <u>Administrators</u>        | 2.93        | 2.29               | 3.71              | 2.86              | 3.28             |
| Deans                        | 2.66        | 2.17               | 3.99              | 2.67              | 2.98             |
| Department Heads             | 3.13        | 2.38               | 3.50              | 3.00              | 3.50             |
| <u>Faculty Average</u>       | 2.46        | 2.04               | 3.43              | 2.36              | 3.75             |
| <u>Department</u>            |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| EAF                          | 1.83        | 1.50               | 3.17              | 1.67              | 3.33             |
| EPs                          | 2.88        | 2.63               | 3.13              | 2.63              | 4.00             |
| HSS                          | 3.00        | 1.83               | 3.83              | 3.00              | 3.17             |
| MNS                          | 2.13        | 2.00               | 3.63              | 2.13              | 4.25             |
| <u>Age</u>                   |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| 40 and Less                  | 2.58        | 1.83               | 3.67              | 1.50              | 3.75             |
| More Than 40                 | 2.38        | 2.18               | 3.25              | 3.00              | 3.75             |
| <u>Sex</u>                   |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Male                         | 2.50        | 1.88               | 3.56              | 2.61              | 3.72             |
| Female                       | 2.40        | 2.30               | 3.20              | 1.90              | 3.80             |
| <u>Rank</u>                  |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Professor                    | 2.50        | 2.25               | 3.75              | 3.13              | 3.75             |
| Other Ranks                  | 2.45        | 1.95               | 3.30              | 2.05              | 3.72             |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u> |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer             | 3.13        | 2.25               | 3.25              | 1.00              | 3.13             |
| 6 yrs. and More              | 2.20        | 1.95               | 3.50              | 2.90              | 4.00             |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>       |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Yes                          | 2.67        | 2.33               | 3.50              | 2.39              | 4.00             |
| No                           | 2.10        | 1.50               | 3.30              | 2.30              | 3.30             |
| <u>Tenure</u>                |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Yes                          | 2.23        | 2.00               | 3.41              | 2.45              | 4.09             |
| No                           | 3.33        | 2.17               | 3.50              | 2.00              | 2.50             |

Table 70 indicates the differences in scores of the four other parties as opposed to the perceived power of the individual faculty member by selected subgroups.

| TABLE 70                                                            |             |                        |                       |                       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Score Differentials from Faculty Member's Score -<br>Total Workload |             |                        |                       |                       |
|                                                                     | <u>Dean</u> | <u>Assoc.<br/>Dean</u> | <u>Dept.<br/>Head</u> | <u>Coll.<br/>Fac.</u> |
| <u>Faculty Average</u>                                              | -1.29       | -1.71                  | - .32                 | -1.39                 |
| <u>Department</u>                                                   |             |                        |                       |                       |
| EAF                                                                 | -1.50       | -1.83                  | - .16                 | -1.66                 |
| EPs                                                                 | -1.12       | -1.37                  | - .87                 | -1.37                 |
| HSS                                                                 | - .17       | -1.34                  | + .66                 | - .17                 |
| MNS                                                                 | -2.12       | -2.25                  | - .62                 | -2.12                 |
| <u>Age</u>                                                          |             |                        |                       |                       |
| 40 and Less                                                         | -1.17       | -1.92                  | - .08                 | -2.25                 |
| More Than 40                                                        | -1.37       | -1.57                  | - .50                 | - .75                 |
| <u>Sex</u>                                                          |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Male                                                                | -1.22       | -1.84                  | - .16                 | -1.11                 |
| Female                                                              | -1.40       | -1.50                  | - .60                 | -1.90                 |
| <u>Rank</u>                                                         |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Professor                                                           | -1.25       | -1.50                  | 0.0                   | - .62                 |
| Other Ranks                                                         | -1.27       | -1.77                  | - .42                 | -1.67                 |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u>                                        |             |                        |                       |                       |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer                                                    | 0.0         | - .88                  | + .12                 | -2.13                 |
| 6 yrs. and More                                                     | -1.80       | -2.05                  | - .50                 | -1.10                 |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>                                              |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Yes                                                                 | -1.33       | -1.67                  | - .50                 | -1.61                 |
| No                                                                  | -1.20       | -1.80                  | 0.0                   | -1.00                 |
| <u>Tenure</u>                                                       |             |                        |                       |                       |
| Yes                                                                 | -1.86       | -2.09                  | - .68                 | -1.64                 |
| No                                                                  | + .83       | - .33                  | +1.00                 | - .50                 |

The following brief observations may be made about Table 70:

1. Virtually all faculty subgroups considered the Dean to be much weaker than the individual faculty member in the determination of total workload. Only the non-tenured saw him as stronger than themselves.
2. The Associate Deans were almost uniformly believed to be weak in this area. Only the non-tenured considered them to be only slightly weaker than themselves.
3. The majority of subgroups perceived the Department Heads to be weaker than themselves; a few believed them to be of equal strength; but only the members of the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the less experienced and non-tenured faculty members thought them to be more powerful.
4. The collective faculty was generally perceived to be much weaker than the individual faculty member in the determination of total workload.
5. As was the case for the components of workload, many differences of perceptions between faculty subgroups may be noted, but because they are generally similar to those already observed for the teaching component, they are not recorded at this time.

The one faculty subgroup which most consistently assigned substantially different power value scores in all components as well as in total workload was the non-tenured group, consisting of three faculty members. These three hold positions in two different departments, fall into both age subgroups, both experience at Faculty subgroups, and both degree status subgroups. They are all males and hold the rank of Assistant Professor. The impact of the scores of these three individuals on all subgroups must be so substantial that their deletion from the sample may show significantly different results.

Table 71 indicates the average scores of all subgroups in the determination of total workload for the eleven tenured faculty members only.

| TABLE 71                                                        |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Average Scores by Subgroups of Tenured Faculty - Total Workload |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
|                                                                 | <u>Dean</u> | <u>Assoc. Dean</u> | <u>Dept. Head</u> | <u>Coll. Fac.</u> | <u>Fac. Mem.</u> |
| <u>Department</u>                                               |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| EAF                                                             | 1.25        | 1.25               | 2.75              | 2.00              | 3.50             |
| EPs                                                             | 2.88        | 2.63               | 3.13              | 2.63              | 4.00             |
| HSS                                                             | 2.00        | 1.00               | 5.00              | 4.00              | 5.00             |
| MNS                                                             | 2.13        | 2.00               | 3.63              | 2.13              | 4.25             |
| <u>Age</u>                                                      |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| 40 and Less                                                     | 1.88        | 1.75               | 3.50              | 1.50              | 4.13             |
| More Than 40                                                    | 2.43        | 2.14               | 3.36              | 3.00              | 3.86             |
| <u>Sex</u>                                                      |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Male                                                            | 2.08        | 1.75               | 3.58              | 2.92              | 4.33             |
| Female                                                          | 2.40        | 2.30               | 3.20              | 1.90              | 3.80             |
| <u>Rank</u>                                                     |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Professor                                                       | 2.50        | 2.25               | 3.75              | 3.13              | 3.75             |
| Other Ranks                                                     | 2.07        | 1.86               | 3.21              | 2.07              | 4.29             |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u>                                    |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer                                                | 2.25        | 2.50               | 2.50              | 0.50              | 4.00             |
| 6 yrs. and More                                                 | 2.22        | 1.89               | 3.61              | 2.89              | 4.11             |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>                                          |             |                    |                   |                   |                  |
| Yes                                                             | 2.63        | 2.38               | 3.44              | 2.56              | 4.13             |
| No                                                              | 1.17        | 1.00               | 3.33              | 2.17              | 4.00             |

A number of facts become immediately apparent from this Table.

1. All subgroups of tenured faculty members considered themselves to be more powerful in workload determination than the Department Heads. Only the members of the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, and Full Professors believed them to be equally strong.



2. Virtually all subgroups of tenured faculty members saw the Dean and the Associate Deans as average or below average in power.
3. All subgroups of tenured faculty members perceived the collective faculty to be less influential than either the Department Head or the individual faculty member.

Table 72 emphasizes these facts by showing score differentials.

| TABLE 72                                                 |             |                    |                   |                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Score Differentials from Tenured Faculty Member's Scores |             |                    |                   |                   |
|                                                          | <u>Dean</u> | <u>Assoc. Dean</u> | <u>Dept. Head</u> | <u>Coll. Fac.</u> |
| <u>Department</u>                                        |             |                    |                   |                   |
| EAF                                                      | -1.75       | -1.75              | - .75             | -1.50             |
| EPs                                                      | -1.12       | -1.37              | - .87             | -1.37             |
| HSS                                                      | -3.00       | -4.00              | 0.0               | -1.00             |
| MNS                                                      | -2.12       | -2.25              | - .62             | -2.12             |
| <u>Age</u>                                               |             |                    |                   |                   |
| 40 and Less                                              | -2.25       | -2.38              | - .63             | -2.63             |
| More Than 40                                             | -1.43       | -1.72              | - .50             | - .86             |
| <u>Sex</u>                                               |             |                    |                   |                   |
| Male                                                     | -2.25       | -2.58              | - .75             | -1.41             |
| Female                                                   | -1.40       | -1.50              | - .60             | -1.90             |
| <u>Rank</u>                                              |             |                    |                   |                   |
| Professor                                                | -1.25       | -1.50              | 0.0               | - .62             |
| Other Ranks                                              | -2.22       | -2.43              | -1.08             | -2.22             |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u>                             |             |                    |                   |                   |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer                                         | -1.75       | -1.50              | -1.50             | -3.50             |
| 6 yrs. and More                                          | -1.89       | -2.22              | - .50             | -1.22             |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>                                   |             |                    |                   |                   |
| Yes                                                      | -1.50       | -1.75              | - .69             | -1.57             |
| No                                                       | -2.83       | -3.00              | - .67             | -1.83             |

A comparison of this Table with Table 70 indicates some major differences of perceptions by subgroups after the non-tenured faculty members have been deleted from the sample.

1. All positive score differentials have changed to negative, showing clearly that the tenured faculty members in all subgroupings considered themselves to be the strongest in workload determination.
2. The Department Heads are more consistently scored nearly the same by all subgroups of tenured faculty members. They are generally perceived to be considerably weaker than the individual faculty member, although those with fewer than six years experience at the Faculty and the Associate Professors considered them to be very much weaker, and Full Professors thought them to be of equal strength.
3. As was the case frequently in previous Tables, a number of the subgroups still perceived the Dean and Associate Deans to be much weaker than they were seen to be by others.
4. This type of difference of perceptions is also evident for the collective faculty among a number of the subgroups.

A brief analysis of the levels of satisfaction with workload is also made at this time, using the values indicated in Figure 2 and the selected faculty subgroups. Table 73 lists by subgroups, in respect to total workload determination, the average power perceptions of individual faculty members for themselves, the average power differentials between the Department Heads and the faculty members, and the average levels of satisfaction.

This Table suggests that certain types of faculty members are much more satisfied with their personal workloads than others. Most pleased are the tenured, those with a

TABLE 73

## Power Perceptions and Satisfaction - Total Workload

Levels of Satisfaction by Subgroups  
with Power Perceptions of Individual Faculty Members  
and Power Differentials for Department Heads

| <u>Subgroups</u>             | <u>*<br/>Individual<br/>Faculty<br/>Members</u> | <u>**<br/>Department<br/>Head<br/>Differentials</u> | <u>***<br/>Average<br/>Level of<br/>Satisfaction</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Age</u>                   |                                                 |                                                     |                                                      |
| 40 and Less                  | 3.75                                            | - .08                                               | 3.67                                                 |
| More Than 40                 | 3.75                                            | - .50                                               | 5.50                                                 |
| <u>Sex</u>                   |                                                 |                                                     |                                                      |
| Male                         | 3.72                                            | - .16                                               | 5.22                                                 |
| Female                       | 3.80                                            | - .60                                               | 4.80                                                 |
| <u>Rank</u>                  |                                                 |                                                     |                                                      |
| Professor                    | 3.75                                            | 0.0                                                 | 5.75                                                 |
| Other Ranks                  | 3.72                                            | - .42                                               | 4.80                                                 |
| <u>Experience at Faculty</u> |                                                 |                                                     |                                                      |
| 5 yrs. and Fewer             | 3.13                                            | + .12                                               | 3.50                                                 |
| 6 yrs. and More              | 4.00                                            | - .50                                               | 5.70                                                 |
| <u>Doctoral Degree</u>       |                                                 |                                                     |                                                      |
| Yes                          | 4.00                                            | - .50                                               | 5.33                                                 |
| No                           | 3.30                                            | 0.0                                                 | 4.60                                                 |
| <u>Tenure Status</u>         |                                                 |                                                     |                                                      |
| Yes                          | 4.09                                            | - .68                                               | 5.27                                                 |
| No                           | 2.50                                            | +1.00                                               | 4.33                                                 |

\* From Table 69.

\*\* From Table 70.

\*\*\* Uses Figure 2.

doctorate, the more experienced, the male, and the older faculty members, as well as the Full Professors. In all cases the members of these subgroups perceived themselves to be very strong in workload determination. The tenured, those

with a doctorate, the more experienced, and the older faculty members also perceived themselves to be considerably stronger than the Department Heads.

Two subgroups rated themselves towards moderately dissatisfied on the scale of values, the younger (3.67) and the less experienced faculty members (3.50).

Table 74 was designed to list the correlation coefficients for various subgroups between the individual faculty members' power values and levels of satisfaction.

TABLE 74

Correlations - Personal Power and Satisfaction

Correlations between Perceived Personal Power of Individual Faculty Members in Total Workload and Levels of Satisfaction with Total Workload by Selected Subgroups of Faculty Members

|                                              |   |      |
|----------------------------------------------|---|------|
| r - experience, doctorate, tenure            | = | .772 |
| r - experience, doctorate, tenure, age       | = | .587 |
| r - experience, doctorate, tenure, rank      | = | .740 |
| r - experience, doctorate, tenure, rank, sex | = | .725 |
| r - all subgroups                            | = | .574 |

This Table suggests that there is a moderate direct relationship between perceptions of personal power in

workload determination and satisfaction with workloads for all subgroups, and that there is a fairly strong direct relationship between the same factors for the subgroups based on experience, doctorate status, tenure status, rank, and sex.

Table 75 lists the correlation coefficients for various subgroups between the score differentials of Department Heads and levels of satisfaction with workloads.

TABLE 75

## Correlations - Power Differentials and Satisfaction

Correlations between Perceived Power Differentials  
of Department Heads and Individual Faculty Members  
in Total Workload and Levels of Satisfaction  
with Total Workload  
by Selected Subgroups of Faculty Members

|                                              |   |       |
|----------------------------------------------|---|-------|
| r - experience, doctorate, tenure            | = | -.665 |
| r - experience, doctorate, tenure, age       | = | -.619 |
| r - experience, doctorate, tenure, rank      | = | -.565 |
| r - experience, doctorate, tenure, rank, sex | = | -.475 |
| r - all subgroups                            | = | -.448 |

This figure indicates that there appears to be a moderate inverse relationship between the perceptions of the relative powers of Department Heads in workload determination and the

levels of satisfaction with workload of the individual faculty members in all subgroups.

Observation 10:

There are significant differences in the average perceptions of subgroups of both administrators and faculty members about the relative powers of the parties involved in workload determination.

10.01 Deans consider the Department Head to be the strongest in the determination of total workload and teaching allotments. In the latter they consider him to have almost total control. They consider the individual faculty member to be the strongest in the determination of service activities and scholarly work. In the latter they consider the individual faculty member to have almost total control.

10.02 Deans consider the collective faculty to be a weak influence in the determination of teaching allotments, but Department Heads believe it is strong in this area.

10.03 Deans perceive the Associate Deans to play an important role in the determination of scholarly work, but Department Heads believe them to be weak in this field.

10.04 Department Heads consider themselves and the individual faculty member to be equal in power and the strongest forces in the determination of total workload and the components of teaching and service. They believe the Dean and the individual faculty member to be equal in power and the strongest forces in the determination of scholarly work.

10.05 No significant pattern emerges from the analyses by faculty subgroups on the relative power of the Dean.

10.06 All faculty subgroups consider the Associate Deans to be weaker than the individual faculty member in the determination of workload, with most subgroups believing them to be weak or very weak.

10.07 All faculty subgroups consider the Department Head to be a strong force in the determination of workload.

10.08 Full Professors, all of whom in this sample are tenured, consider the Department Head to have equal power to themselves in the determination of total workload. They perceive the Department Head to be slightly stronger than they are in the determination of teaching allotments and considerably weaker in the scholarly work and service components.

10.09 Non-tenured faculty members very consistently perceive the Dean and the Department Head to be stronger than themselves in workload determination.

10.10 Tenured faculty members consider themselves to be significantly stronger than all others in the determination of all components and of total workload.

10.11 The younger, less experienced, and non-tenured generally consider the collective faculty to have much less influence in the determination of workload than do the older, more experienced, and tenured faculty members.

10.12 Generally, among the tenured faculty members the older, the more experienced, the males, and the Full Professors perceive the collective faculty to be a strong force in workload determination.

10.13 The subgroups consisting of faculty members over 40 years old, with the rank of Full Professor, with more than five years experience at the Faculty, with a doctorate, and with tenure are most satisfied with their workloads, perceiving themselves on the average to be more than moderately satisfied.

10.14 The only subgroups of faculty members who are close to moderately dissatisfied are the younger and less experienced.

10.15 There is a moderate to fairly strong direct relationship between perceptions of personal power in workload determination and satisfaction with workload.

10.16 There is a moderate inverse relationship between a faculty member's perception of the relative power of the Department Head in workload determination and satisfaction with workload.

## Chapter VII

### STUDY RESULTS COMPARED WITH THE LITERATURE ON GOVERNANCE MODELS

The specific research question posed for this topic was:

9. How do the measured perceptions resulting from this research compare or contrast with the literature on university governance and its various theoretical models?

The governance models reviewed from the literature are compared here to the results obtained through the interviews.

#### THE BUREAUCRATIC MODEL

The twenty-one administrators and faculty members interviewed for this exploratory research indicated quite clearly that in the determination of total personal workloads the university does not operate on the bureaucratic model. The Dean, as the person placed at the highest level of the Faculty hierarchy, is perceived by administrators and faculty members as the greatest power by far in general faculty business (4.13). In workload determination, however, he is perceived to have only about average power (2.62) and less than either the Department Head or the individual faculty member.



The powers of the administration and the Faculty Council, consisting mostly of faculty members, are perceived by both administrators and faculty members as nearly equal with only slightly more power to the administration in both general business and workload determination.

All this shows that a normal hierarchical structure may exist in the Faculty but is not in operation for the determination of workloads.

#### THE COLLEGIAL MODEL

The model of collegiality in governance appears to be followed quite closely in the determination of workloads. The interviews indicated that all faculty members participate fully in all its aspects.

Through the Faculty Council they exert great influence in the setting of minimum requirements for the teaching component of workload, and through their union they negotiate for continuing vague and uncertain expectations in an indefinite number of the other components.

They appear to be very much involved in the determination of departmental needs and objectives, and are consulted as well on the best manner to achieve those. As Baldridge suggested, the collegiality concept still seems to be operating at the departmental level.'°

---

°° J. Victor Baldridge, ed., Academic Governance (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1971).

The interviews suggested that this is indeed true for workload determination. Committees, individuals, and the Department Head interact at the departmental level and eventually arrive at mutually acceptable workloads which also contribute towards meeting departmental needs and achieving departmental goals.

The study by Hill and French indicates that in 1971 the authority system of the university was not perceived as a "command system", primarily because of the collegial norms of academia limiting the influence of the administration.<sup>'1</sup>

The literature suggests, however, that the impact of the faculty union on relations between the administration and faculty may be so major that collegiality will be replaced by the business-industrial model of adversary master-servant relationships.<sup>'2</sup>

The University of Manitoba Faculty Association achieved union status in 1974 and signed a first collective agreement with the University in April, 1975. This faculty union then had been in existence for nine years at the time this study was carried out. The results indicate that no major changes in the collegiality norms observed by Hill and French are

<sup>'1</sup> Winston W. Hill and Wendell L. French, "Perceptions of the Power of Department Chairmen by Professors," in Academic Governance, ed. J. Victor Baldrige (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1971).

<sup>'2</sup> J. Victor Baldrige and Frank R. Kemerer, "Images of Governance: Collective Bargaining versus Traditional Models," in Governing Academic Organizations, eds. Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldrige (Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977).

noticeable after the introduction of this faculty union, at least as far as workload determination is concerned.

#### THE ANARCHICAL MODEL

In spite of the confusion that may be evident in the university proper, the anarchical model does not properly describe the relations among various individuals and groups in the determination of workloads. The faculty member must meet a certain set of expectations, however vague these may appear at times, and simply cannot "do his own thing" as suggested by the anarchical model of governance. The faculty member then may have a great deal of freedom in when and how he spends his time, but may teach only in designated timeslots, must teach one of his regularly scheduled courses in an evening slot, must teach the courses that have been negotiated in committee with his peers and approved by his Department Head, and so on.

Workload determination then may appear to have great freedoms but, in fact, is constrained by many physical factors and influenced by the responsibilities and demands of colleagues and Department Head.

THE PROFESSIONAL MODEL

The professional model also appears to depict some of the factors that contribute to the determination of workloads. The special knowledge of the professional was evident during the interviews. Some faculty members instructed very special courses that could not be taught by anyone else. Many of the courses offered at the Faculty have been specifically designed by a faculty member for his own specialty knowledge, and evidence was presented that such courses were dropped when that faculty member left the Faculty, or were not offered in a Spring or Summer session if the faculty member were unable or unwilling to teach at that time.

The professional nature of workload determination was also evident in the interviews with the administrators. They made it clear that faculty members were always fully involved in negotiations to set their own workloads and consulted before changes in workloads were made. Their professional knowledge in many matters and their professional status were not questioned by administrators.

The bureaucratic coordination, which is such a strong characteristic of the professional model, was also noted during the interviews. Such coordination was, for instance, provided by the central office of the Faculty to avoid course and timetable conflicts and to assure availability of space and special equipment for all courses. Faculty members commented that at times their wishes had to be set aside in

favour of the central office decisions resulting from the coordination of all workloads. This type of interference with personal workloads that had already been approved by the departmental committee and the Department Head was accepted by faculty members as necessary for the good of students and for the best operation of the Faculty.

#### THE POLITICAL MODEL

The interviews indicated that the political model is not very apparent in the determination of workloads. Some suggestions of the power struggles it portrays surfaced when UMFA and its role were discussed.

It appears that the political concept is present to the extent that unreasonable and unfair treatment of an individual by the administration in the setting of workload would most likely be carried through the grievance procedures of the collective agreement. Action of this nature would probably be taken by more than ninety per cent of faculty members and would lead to a power struggle between the two parties.

This would happen, of course, only if the collegial and professional relations which appear to be practised at present were to be disregarded in the case of one specific individual.

SUMMARY

The interviews appear to indicate that the methods employed in the determination of personal workload most closely resemble the collegial and professional models of the literature. This seems to be the case in spite of the nine-year existence of a faculty union and in spite of forecasts in the literature that collegiality and professionalism will disappear as a result of the adversary relationships established by that union.

Observation 11:

The collegial and professional models of governance are most evident in the practices employed in the determination of faculty workloads. Some aspects of the political model may come into play, but only if a faculty member were to receive unjust and unreasonable treatment not in keeping with the collegial and professional traditions of this institution.

## Chapter VIII

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The need for this study arose from a general lack of knowledge of the actual powers enjoyed by a university faculty member as an individual. A considerable body of theory exists on the powers of the collective faculty as well as on those of various administrators in the university setting, but the faculty member as an individual appears to be virtually ignored in the literature.

#### SUMMARY

The purpose of this exploratory research project was to determine if an individual faculty member has power and influence, as appears to be the case for the collective faculty. To this end an area of study was chosen in which a faculty member would likely exert such powers as he might have and one in which administrators as well would wish to give considerable direction for the good of the Faculty and the institution. The determination of workloads seemed to be an excellent specific area of great interest to both administrators and faculty members. Accordingly the explicit problem posed for this investigation was to ascertain the amount of influence an individual faculty member may have in the determination of his own workload.

To this end twenty-one interviews were held with seven administrators and fourteen randomly selected faculty members of the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. The questions employed during the interviews were semi-structured and open-ended to ensure free and open discussion while retaining objectivity. Each interview pursued the concepts of minimum requirements for the components of workload, actual workloads, and the methods employed to determine them. It was hoped that this approach would provide the insight and the data necessary to draw some preliminary conclusions from the study results.

The sample of administrators was determined by choosing only those academic administrators who could be expected to have substantial power in workload determination. It consisted of the Dean, the two Associate Deans, and the four Department Heads. Eliminated were the Director of Student Teaching and his assistant. It involved virtually all academic administrators (77.8 per cent) and thus could be considered highly representative of the population.

The faculty sample was chosen by proportional, stratified random sampling and consisted of four Professors, seven Associate Professors, and three Assistant Professors, for a total of fourteen faculty members (31.8 per cent of the population). This sample also could be considered large enough to provide reliable results.



It must be appreciated, however, that in spite of the foregoing, the findings reported here cannot be considered definite or final. Only one Faculty in one university was sampled and there is, of course, no possibility to estimate to what extent this Faculty is representative of this university, nor how it may illustrate a faculty member's power in workload determination in other universities. Therefore, the results obtained through this study are tentative and reflect only the situation as it is perceived to be at this one Faculty.

#### MAJOR FINDINGS

From the eleven main observations developed from the discussions of the study results a number of major findings may be abstracted.

1. The requirements associated with a faculty member's workload may be viewed more as expected rather than as mandatory. A faculty member seems expected to teach a number of hours per week conforming to guidelines established at the departmental committee level by the faculty member, his peers, and the Department Head, and to perform a certain number of other duties, largely left to his own interests and discretion.

This first major finding is reasonably consistent with the wording of the Collective Agreement which outlines four workload components and suggests that a faculty member shall include an appropriate combination of them in his workload. This leaves him considerable latitude and allows him to use

his own judgement on what activities are important to him and should be included in his workload.

It appears that all faculty members are expected to teach and that expectations for this activity are quite definite, although flexible to the extent that departmental needs and personal desires are accommodated. Specific classroom teaching hours are allotted, generally at nine lecture hours per week per term, while some specific additional duties may be incorporated in workloads. These include the teaching of a seminar or the supervision of student teachers. Faculty members may teach fewer than nine hours in exchange for additional duties in other fields or for special responsibilities.

Teaching related activities, however, are clearly expectations. Faculty members are not generally required to supervise graduate students, although this activity is seen as a job expectation. Faculty members can accept or reject students for independent studies as they see fit, although here as well it is expected that this activity will be accommodated. Faculty members are expected to counsel students, to keep regular office hours for that purpose, and to be available on a general basis. None of these and similar activities are required; all are expected.

In the other components of workload it is clear that virtually all work is no more than a job expectation. In most instances no record is kept of the work performed, no

routine is available for reporting such activities, and no mechanism exists to ensure that a certain minimum of work is accomplished.

The only penalties for failing to do expected work in most components are the denial of tenure and the withholding of promotion. It is clear, however, that once a faculty member has tenure and has attained a rank with which he is satisfied, there is no penalty for lack of work.

2. There is no consensus of opinion on the meaning of the term scholarly work and it seems that its meaning as designated in the Collective Agreement is not generally accepted.

Both members of the administration and the faculty differ on the concepts included in scholarly work. A minority of both groups favour the idea that it is primarily formal, published research, with the administrative minority insisting on a critical review of the work as well. The majority of both groups, however, believe that all work done by a university professor is scholarly and so, that all components of workload are closely interrelated and formal publication of scholarly work is not necessary.

The Collective Agreement, however, indicates rather specifically what constitutes scholarly work and implies that publication and critical review are virtually essential. This does not appear to be a generally accepted concept in this Faculty. Many of the publications reported for the previous year are in trade journals written for practising school teachers and administrators, but not for

critical review. This may explain why so many believe that formal publication is not essential.

3. There is no consensus of opinion on the meaning of the term community service.

The same confusion of views as expressed on the nature of scholarly work was also evident for community service. Participants concur only in that community service benefits the provider in many ways, including financially, that it is an intricate part of a professional's work, and it cannot be separated from teaching and scholarly work.

4. A definite order of importance for the components of workload appears to exist.

Although many members of this Faculty believe that the components of workload are so closely interrelated that none should be more important than the others, most do believe that teaching is the most important, followed by scholarly work, governance activities, and community service, in that order.

Teaching appears to be considered most important by the majority because the participants in this study belong to a Faculty of Education. Many believe, therefore, that in a Faculty that trains teachers, teaching should be the most vital activity of a professor. Scholarly work is, however, considered very important, although many feel that insufficient time is available to do proper research.

Governance work tends to be viewed as a bit of a nuisance beyond the departmental level, but nevertheless a necessary

evil. Community service is seen also as something that simply has to be done in a Faculty of Education where most services are provided to the professional community of teachers. It is seen, however, as the first workload component to be dropped if a faculty member's workload were to become too heavy.

The interrelatedness of all components seems an important view in this Faculty.

5. Expectations in workloads, however vague they may be, are met by faculty members in a professional manner.

Faculty members must be professionals to be able to function in this Faculty. The professional nature of their work and the responsibility of the professional, assumed when they enter the profession, appear to rule their lives so much so that there are very few work requirements. It is expected that faculty members counsel their students, hold regular office hours, assume additional duties through the supervision of graduate and independent studies students, carry out research, produce a certain amount of other scholarly work, serve in a governance capacity, and provide their professional services to the community.

Administrators generally believe that there is no need for requirements because all of the aforementioned duties, and many others, are expected to be part of a professional's life. On the whole this administrative faith in the faculty's professional attitude to workload appears well-founded. Faculty members seem to perform at or above the level expected of them by administrators.

6. Decisions in workload determination are made jointly by the Department Head, the individual faculty member, and the members of the department.

It appears there is little doubt that the Dean, the Associate Deans, and the Department Heads individually are not considered prime decision makers in workload determination. None of the administrators on the hierarchical ladder in the Faculty, in other words, appear to direct workload determination or to order specific assignments to be fulfilled.

The Department Head as an administrator is involved in workload determination to the extent that he works jointly with the faculty members. Decisions, however, are made on a consensus basis through discussion among the individual faculty member, the Department Head, and the faculty member's peers.

7. The Department Head appears to hold the most power in the determination of teaching allotments, but the individual faculty member has sufficient power to control the major portion of that determination.

Both administrators and faculty members perceive the Department Head and the individual faculty member to have the major powers in the decisions made in respect to teaching allotments. Administrators, however, believe the Department Head is considerably stronger than the faculty member, while on the average faculty members see him as only slightly stronger.

Whichever perception is a better reflection of reality, it is clear that in this Faculty the individual faculty

member has substantial power in the determination of his teaching load, and sufficient power to determine its major portion. The latter is no doubt true for several reasons.

First, only the Department Head and the individual faculty member are perceived as more than strong in determining teaching allotments; secondly, the difference in power between these two is perceived as minimal by faculty members; thirdly, the power of the Department Head, however great it may be, is perceived by administrators and faculty members alike as more latent than actually practised; and lastly, the Department Heads express great hesitancy at the thought of using their power, which they themselves seem to view as 'mostly theoretical' and 'largely untested'.

Thus it may well be possible that the individual faculty member in practice holds more power than the Department Head. Accordingly it is not unreasonable to suggest that the faculty member has substantial power which is certainly sufficient to permit him to determine the major portion of his teaching allotments.

8. The individual faculty member seems to have the most power in the determination of the scholarly work and community service components of his workload.

Although administrators consider the Dean and the Department Head to be strong forces, and faculty members also consider the Department Head to be strong in the determination of the non-teaching components of workload, there is no doubt that the faculty member controls almost entirely

the amount of work he performs and the extent of his own involvement in these activities.

9. The individual faculty member is probably the strongest factor in the determination of his own total workload.

Administrators appear to believe that the Department Head is most powerful in the determination of total faculty workload. Faculty members, on the other hand, believe the opposite. The facts that faculty members undoubtedly control fully two of the three main workload components, that faculty members are seen to be almost as powerful as the Department Head in the third, and that the Department Head's powers are largely latent and untested, lead to the conclusion that, on balance, the individual faculty member must have the most power over the determination of his total workload.

The contrary perceptions of administrators are probably caused by the Deans' assessments of the situation on the basis of teaching, the more readily visible part of workload, and on their tendency to take a more bureaucratic view of the procedures involved in workload determination.

10. Faculty members appear reasonably satisfied with their workloads, although administrators believe this not to be the case.

Faculty members generally appear reasonably satisfied with their workloads. In fact, 35.7 per cent are very satisfied and another 35.7 per cent are at least moderately satisfied. The remaining 28.6 per cent, who express moderate



to strong dissatisfaction, appear to have influenced administrators' perceptions to the extent that the majority of them could express no opinion or estimated faculty's feelings to balance out at neutral.

The reality as expressed by faculty members should be reasonably gratifying to administrators at this Faculty.

11. Teaching allotments tend to be distributed on the bases of experience and expertise.

There are sufficient differences among faculty subgroups to suggest that certain tasks in teaching, which might be considered more difficult, tend to be allotted to the more experienced and better qualified faculty members, while others, that could be considered less complex, tend to be given to the less experienced and less qualified. Although almost all faculty members appear to work in almost all teaching areas, some differences are evident.

This is shown through some of the analyses carried out, which suggest that the supervision of graduate and independent studies students are duties which are handled primarily by Full Professors, who are all tenured, hold doctorates, and are over 40 years of age with many years experience at the Faculty. Conversely there is a tendency for this category of faculty member to be less involved in undergraduate work.

The supervision of student teachers and the teaching of seminars are duties which tend to be handled primarily by faculty members who are not Full Professors, do not hold a

doctorate, and are under 40 years of age with little experience at the Faculty. Conversely there is a tendency for this type of faculty member to be less involved in graduate work.

Although differences between males and females, and between departments, are evident at times, these cannot be considered significant enough to suggest tendencies.

12. There appear to be significant differences in the average perceptions of Deans and Department Heads about the relative powers of the parties involved in workload determination. These differences suggest as well that faculty members may experience an increase in their own powers because some administrative powers appear to be left unclaimed.

Perceptual differences generally appear to be linked to administrative rank. Deans, being higher up the hierarchical ladder of authority, are more removed from faculty members and daily operational decisions made at that level. Also they may be much more involved in an actual hierarchy of power than either the faculty members or the Department Heads, and thus may have a tendency to think about decision making more in terms of the bureaucratic model of governance.

Differences of perceptions suggest that Department Heads are much closer to the reality as it is perceived by faculty members and that Deans, in fact, may be 'out of touch' with the day-to-day operational aspects of workload determination at the Faculty.

The trends in perceptual differences indicate that the Deans appear to overestimate the power of the Department Heads, and that the same applies to the latter's views of the Deans' powers. As a result, if the Deans believe the Department Heads to hold certain powers, and vice versa, neither group fully appreciates the restrictions in the powers of the other group. This absence of understanding implies some kind of power vacuum, so that much of the power thought to belong to the other administrators may well have become a "residual" power for the faculty members.

13. There are few significant differences of perceptions among faculty subgroups about the little power of the Dean and the Associate Deans in workload determination.

Almost all of the subgroup comparisons attempted in this study yield results similar to the average power values assigned by the whole sample of faculty members to the Dean and Associate Deans. Only in the evaluation of the Dean's power was there any significant difference in scores, with the non-tenured faculty members and those with fewer than six years experience at the Faculty perceiving the Dean as much stronger than he is seen by the tenured with more experience.

14. There appears to be a significant difference in perceptions of power between tenured and non-tenured faculty members.

The analyses of study results by subgroups of faculty members indicate that for all components of workload there are some subgroups that score individuals and groups

substantially differently from other subgroups. Those that show major differences most consistently were the ones based on tenure status.

Accordingly the three non-tenured faculty members were removed from the sample to check on the power perceptions of the subgroups of tenured faculty members only. Results of this test indicate that tenured faculty members consistently view the Dean and Associate Deans to have below average power in workload determination, and the Department Heads to be strong but to have considerably less power than the individual faculty member.

Non-tenured faculty members, on the other hand, see themselves as average in power, and the Department Head and the Dean as the power figures in workload determination. Because non-tenured faculty members are also in a large number of the other subgroups they created many of the score differentials that were noted for subgroups of the whole sample.

The results of tenured faculty members alone in their subgroups appear to suggest that these faculty members, who are the large majority in this sample, consider themselves to be the strongest in workload determination, supporting the earlier major finding that the individual faculty member is probably the strongest factor in the determination of his own total workload.

15. Satisfaction with workload appears to depend a great deal on the subgroup to which a faculty member belongs.

There appears to be a tendency for some types of faculty members to be much more satisfied with their workloads than others. Most satisfied appear to be the Full Professors and those over 40 years of age with six or more years experience at the Faculty, with a doctorate, and with tenure. Because the Full Professors in this sample belong to almost all of the other categories mentioned, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they most influence the results of those other subgroups.

It is equally reasonable to suggest that satisfaction with workload is probably closely related to security of position, because logically the faculty members feeling most secure are those who have attained the highest academic rank and thus the highest salary levels, the security of tenure, and the confidence resulting from age and experience.

Conversely, the faculty members feeling least secure would be those without tenure, with little experience at the Faculty, with the lower ranks, and in the younger age group. It is these latter subgroups that appear less satisfied with their workloads. In particular the younger and less experienced appear definitely dissatisfied.

16. Perceptions of personal power seem to be directly related to levels of satisfaction with workload, and perceptions of the Department Head's power in workload determination relative to the faculty member's appear to be inversely related to levels of satisfaction.

The correlation coefficients obtained in this study suggest that there is at least a moderate direct

relationship between the perceptions of the individual faculty member of his personal power in workload determination and his satisfaction with his workload. A significant direct relationship appears to exist between these two factors on the bases of experience, doctorate status, tenure status, and academic rank.

This leads one to suspect then that the more experienced, tenured faculty members, with doctorates, and of the rank of Full Professor perceive themselves to be most influential in workload determination and are also most satisfied with their workloads. Their counterparts are noticeably less pleased and also see themselves as much weaker in workload determination.

There is also a definite, although moderate, inverse relationship between the perceptions of the Department Head's relative strength in workload determination and levels of satisfaction with workload. If a faculty member then perceives his Department Head as stronger than himself in the determination of workload, he is likely to be less satisfied with his workload than if he were to see the Department Head as weaker than himself.

On the basis of this limited review it is, of course, impossible to determine causation. There is a likelihood that satisfaction with workload is caused by perceived power of self and perceived lack of power of the Department Head. The reverse, however, is equally logical. It is reasonable

as well to imagine a third factor to influence both perceptions of power and levels of satisfaction with workload. The presence or absence of a sense of security could be a possible third factor because those with tenure, the highest rank, and the greatest age and experience can be seen to feel most secure, while they also appear most satisfied with their workloads.

17. The collegial and professional models of governance are most evident in the practices employed in the determination of faculty workloads.

Faculty members at this Faculty appear to participate fully in all aspects of workload determination. They are involved in the setting of such basic requirements and expectations as were found to be associated with workload, they contribute through consensus-oriented discussions towards the setting of mutually acceptable departmental goals and methods to achieve them, and they negotiate with the administration on an individual and collective basis to establish their own specific teaching allotments.

The differences created by individual interests and abilities, as noted by Blackburn, appear recognized in the determination of workloads in this Faculty and strongly reflect the methods of the collegial model of governance.

It does not appear that in this Faculty the establishment of the Faculty Union has affected the traditional collegial relations between faculty members and administrators. Collegiality appears to be most evident between faculty members and Department Heads.

The professional nature of a professor's work is clear from the trust placed in him by the administrators. The almost total absence of workload requirements and the great dependence in this Faculty on workload expectations emphasize the concept of professionalism. The bureaucratic coordination practised by the administration is also a strong characteristic of the professional model.

By contrast, other models appear not to apply to workload determination so that, at least in this aspect, the Faculty can be seen to operate largely by the precepts of the collegial and professional models of governance.

18. Faculty power in general, as perceived in this Faculty, conforms to that seen in the literature, but in workload determination the collective faculty has far less influence.

The power of faculty appears historically to be based on tradition, the faculty members' professional expertise, their independence from direct managerial control, the all-encompassing nature of their work, collegiality, and the committee structure of governance. This power of the collective faculty is confirmed in this study in general faculty business in which all participants to the interviews perceive it to have only slightly less power than the administration. In the determination of workload a similar perception is evident, but both the collective faculty and the administration are perceived as having far less power in workload determination than in general faculty business.



Gonyea indicates that faculty members historically have controlled the determination of their own workloads. This self-oriented responsibility combined with administrative coordination has been found to be present in this study.

This points to the fact that the participants in this project perceived the collective faculty as a powerful force in the operation of the Faculty, as it is in the literature, but that in workload determination other groups become more important. This has been shown to be true particularly for the individual faculty member and the Department Head. This finding agrees with the literature from which was deduced that faculty members should have considerable power in workload determination.

19. The absence of consistent data gathering on faculty allocation of time and effort, as discussed in the literature, is evident in this Faculty.

No systematic data gathering technique is employed in this Faculty to permit the administration to know strengths and weaknesses of individual faculty members. This absence agrees with observations made in the literature and hinders the employment of faculty members to the best advantage of the Faculty.

20. The antithesis between research and teaching, widely discussed in the literature, and the general lightness of faculty workload, imputed by some authors, are not evident in this Faculty.

The antithesis between research and teaching, as discussed in the literature, does not appear to be an issue in this Faculty. Those who believed teaching to be most

important did not consider research to be unimportant, or either one to interfere unduly with the other. Those who wished to have more time for research did not believe that such time should become available at the expense of teaching.

The literature indicates that many theorists do consider research to be most important, contrary to the findings in this study. This, of course, may be because the Faculty in question is an Education Faculty in which it may be logical to consider teaching as most vital.

Service was considered by most participants to be the least important of the workload components, possibly supporting the contention of the general literature that it is time consuming and tends to detract from teaching and research.

Mandell's argument, supported at times by public opinion, that professors do very little work is not verified through the interviews. Although this was in a sense a peripheral issue, the data collected indicate that administrators believe faculty members to be working an average of 1831.5 hours while faculty members report working an average of 2174.6 hours per year (See Table 80 in Appendix C). On the basis of a 35 hour workweek, a four-week vacation, and regular statutory holidays, the average workman may be expected to enjoy a workyear of approximately 1600 hours. Estimates provided by both administrators and faculty

members indicate then that such an opinion of light workloads in universities is unfounded, at least for this Faculty.

### CONCLUSIONS

It is not possible to draw general conclusions about the influence of the individual faculty member in the determination of workload as these would be based on the perceptions of relatively few participants employed at one Faculty. The limitations of this case study demand that conclusions must be tentative for workload determination in general, although they may be considered more definite for the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba.

In answer to the specific research questions restated here, a number of tentative conclusions may be drawn from the major findings of this study.

#### I. Workload Requirements:

1. What are the perceptions of faculty members about the minimum requirements for the three components of workload: teaching, scholarly work, and community service?
  2. What are the administration's perceptions about these minimum requirements?
  3. How do the perceptions of faculty members and administrators compare and contrast on the perceived minimum requirements in workload?
- A. Administrative and faculty perceptions about the minimum requirements for workloads are remarkably uniform. Such perceptual differences as there may be appear mostly to be semantic and not a result of specific misunderstandings.
  - B. Workload requirements are almost uniformly perceived to

be minimal and are found mostly in the teaching component of workload. It appears that only the number of classroom hours to be taught per week, some basic timetabling or scheduling restrictions, and to some extent the type of courses to be taught may be viewed as requirements. All others are typically treated as expectations. Although a reward system is in effect, there appears to be no penalty system beyond the withholding of rewards. The latter is at any rate virtually meaningless once a faculty member has attained the security of tenure and is satisfied with such other rewards as he is already receiving.

- C. The concepts inherent in scholarly work and governance and service activities are not clear and are not agreed upon by most members of both administration and faculty. There is a strong feeling, however, that the components of workload are closely interrelated and, therefore, cannot and should not be separated from a faculty member's total workload.
- D. Teaching appears to be considered the most important component of workload. The belief in the interrelatedness of all components may possibly be traced to this feeling as a defence of the value of teaching.
- E. Faculty members on the whole meet the expectations associated with their workloads. Administrators, however, see their level of satisfaction with workload to be less than is actually the case. Satisfaction seems to be greatest among those faculty members who feel most secure in their positions.

## II. Workload Assignments:

- 4. What are the perceptions of faculty members on how the various parts of their workloads are determined?
  - 5. What are the administration's perceptions on how these various parts of workload are determined?
  - 6. How do the perceptions of faculty members and administrators compare and contrast on the issue of decision-making in workloads?
- F. Administrative and faculty perceptions differ very little on the methods employed to determine workloads, although major perceptual differences exist over the power held by various individuals and groups in that determination. There is general agreement that the Department Head and faculty members meet in departmental committees of some kind and reach a consensus on teaching allotments. Other components of workload are

largely left to the individual's discretion and sense of professional responsibility.

- G. The power of the individual faculty member, irrespective of the perceived influence of the Department Head, is considerably greater in workload determination than it is in the general operation of the Faculty. This difference is recognized by both administrators and faculty members and is so substantial that the individual faculty member appears to have almost complete control over his own workload. Faculty power in workload determination is much greater for the individual faculty member than it is for the collective faculty, whereas the reverse seems true for general faculty business.

### III. Comparison of Subgroup Perceptions:

- 7. Are the perceptions of administrators uniform or are there measurable differences among subgroups based on department, administrative or academic rank, age, sex, experience, and tenure status?
- 8. Are the perceptions of faculty members uniform or are there measurable differences among subgroups based on department, academic rank, age, sex, experience, and tenure status?
- H. Faculty members who appear to feel secure in their positions generally perceive themselves to be the most influential in the determination of their own workloads. Non-tenured faculty members, who appear to lack such a sense of security, generally tend to perceive the Department Head and the Dean to be more powerful than themselves.
- I. It appears that workloads are determined primarily through negotiations, with the Department Head having the most influence with the less secure faculty members, and the faculty member having the most if he feels secure. Full Professors, however, appear to have reached such a level of security that they more fully recognize the latent and untested powers of the Department Head than do those faculty members of lesser academic rank.
- J. There is a tendency for the younger, less experienced and lower ranked faculty members to perceive the administration much stronger, to feel less secure, and to be less satisfied with their workloads than is the case for the older, more experienced, Full Professors.
- K. There may be a moderate to strong direct relationship

between satisfaction with workload and perceptions of personal power. There may as well be a moderate inverse relationship between satisfaction with workload and the perceived power of the Department Head relative to that of the individual faculty member.

#### IV. Comparison with the Literature:

9. How do the measured perceptions resulting from this research compare or contrast with the literature on university governance and its various theoretical models?
- L. Workload determination most closely resembles the structures and methods depicted in the collegial and professional models of governance. The political model may be in play in other areas of power interaction, and may come into effect in workload determination in cases where methods depart from these two models for one particular individual. Faculty members generally appear to believe that they are treated fairly.
- M. The conclusion that the individual faculty member appears to have almost complete control over his own workload applies in particular to those secure individuals who are able to use their tenure status, rank, age and experience to advantage in the collegial and professional environment in which they work.
- N. The antithesis between research and teaching, so evident in the literature, does not appear to be a factor in workload determination.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

##### Implications

This exploratory case study has examined the power of the individual faculty member in the determination of his own workload. From the conclusions reached a number of implications arise for consideration.

1. It would seem important for all faculty members to accept standard interpretations of the terms scholarly work and service. As the situation appears to be today, a faculty member may be spending a great deal of time on what he considers to be scholarly

work but that his colleagues may view as mere lesson preparation or some other activity not considered scholarly by them. Policy must be difficult if not impossible to set and enforce without a firm and uniform understanding of what constitutes two-thirds of a faculty member's work. Administrators should probably make a very concerted and specific effort to attain consensus on the meaning of these two terms.

2. A reporting system should be instituted through which faculty members indicate their achievements in scholarly work and their contributions to community service. A system of this nature would have considerable benefits. Administrators would know the actual involvement of faculty members in these activities, thus laying to rest the present reaction of far too many faculty members that administrators do not care about such matters. This alone would improve morale among faculty members and improve feelings of satisfaction with workload. The information obtained would also assist substantially in providing knowledge about faculty activities and would contribute to a useful data base for workload inventories, the improvement of workload assignments, and better use of human resources.
3. Although faculty members are much more satisfied with their workloads than administrators on the whole believe, or fear, it would appear essential to the improvement of morale to identify dissatisfied instructors. After identification, programs may be instituted to attempt to remove dissatisfaction. However dedicated a professor may be, feelings of bitterness resulting from perceived unfair treatment are reflected in his teaching in general and in his relations with students, colleagues, and administrators. Identification and "treatment" would seem essential to improve satisfaction, morale, and service to the institution.
4. The plight of the untenured must be addressed. It is true that they cannot be granted the security of tenure, rank, experience, and age at the time they are untenured, but they may be granted other feelings of security. Administrators must practise good human relations with the non-tenured faculty members and should essentially employ with them some of the aspects of the human relations model of governance. Administrators must take time to work with them, to listen to their problems and concerns, to alleviate these whenever possible, and to remove all vestiges and appearances of arbitrariness in dealing with them. Administrators may be taking for granted that

the non-tenured need not be treated differently from the tenured, and as a result may appear arbitrary with the former while treating the latter with care and consideration. Much of the lack of security appears based on negative feelings and beliefs. These can be, and must be dispelled through the application of thoughtful and considerate human relations with the non-tenured.

5. Deans and Department Heads must become more aware of each other's powers and limitations in the determination of workloads. As long as each group of administrators believes the other group to control certain areas of decision making, power is left lying around loose as suggested in the anarchical model of governance. Such unclaimed power will inevitably be assumed by faculty. That this appears to happen may not necessarily be bad or have negative results, but may detract from administrative control for the bureaucratic coordination of Faculty business which is becoming so essential in the present times of budget restraints.

#### Recommendations for Further Study

A number of suggestions for further research are made at this time as a result of some of the major findings and tentative conclusions derived from this study.

1. Studies similar to this one should be conducted in other Faculties and at other universities to confirm or deny the tentative conclusions that have been reached here.
2. Because little is known about satisfaction with workload and the reward system associated with workload, and their relations to a faculty member's sense of security these appear areas of investigation worthy of further research.
3. A comparative study of the perceptions of power and feelings of satisfaction among various faculty subgroups should be undertaken. Tentative conclusions from the present study suggest that major differences may occur between tenured and non-tenured, older and younger, more and less experienced, and Full Professors and lesser ranked faculty members. A greater awareness of the relationships between these two factors may be of benefit to administrators and faculty members alike.



4. The latent and untested powers of the Department Head found in this study would offer an important field of investigation. To what extent Department Heads are unable or unwilling to use their latent powers, in what sense that power is real, and similar aspects of their powers are at present vague and certainly not fully understood through this study. A better understanding of the Department Head's real power would assist in the governance of a Faculty.
5. A review of the history of the faculty union at the University of Manitoba and a study of its impact on governance may be of benefit to all parties. The literature suggests that major changes in governance will probably occur after a faculty union has been introduced on campus. Conclusions in this study, however, suggest that this was not the case in workload determination at this Faculty. A full study of this topic would provide better insight into faculty unions and their impact on campus life.

## Appendix A

### INTERVIEW SCHEDULE - ADMINISTRATORS

#### Personal Data:

1. What is your name? department? age? sex? rank? marital status? years of experience at the Faculty? years of experience in this position?
2. What degrees do you hold? If you do not have a doctorate are you presently working on it?
3. Do you have tenure?
4. Do you have a teaching certificate?
5. Do you have experience as a grade school teacher?
6. If yes, how many years? How many years ago? What grades?

#### Teaching and Teaching Related Activities:

7. Which factors are considered in determining total staffing needs?
8. Is faculty involved in decision-making on total staffing needs? How?
9. How many half- and full-courses does a faculty member teach in one year?
10. If 'x' is the average teaching credit hour load, how is it decided who teaches more or less than the average?
11. On what basis are those decisions made? Who has the input into a decision of this nature? Who makes the final decision?
12. Do you expect faculty members to assume a minimum load of additional teaching duties for Spring/Summer Sessions as an overload for stipend?
13. How many hours per year do you think are spent by faculty members on out-of-class related tasks (prepa-

ration, evaluation, etc.)? What do you think is the ratio of out-of-class to in-class hours? Is this what you think should be the time spent? Should more time, less time be spent?

14. How do you decide about teaching related activities? Do you expect a certain minimum?
15. How are teaching assignments decided in respect to choice of courses, number of courses, number of teaching hours? By you, other administrators, the faculty member? If it is an agreed-upon decision, what percentage of the total decision-making do you attribute to each party?
16. If a faculty member disagrees with a teaching assignment, can changes be made? How? Does this actually happen? If not, why not?

Scholarly Work (Including Performing and Visual Arts):

Scholarly work includes only such research, study, and preparation as is published or produced, or as could be published or produced. It does not include work done for lesson preparation and similar teaching related activities.

17. Do you agree with this definition? If not, how would you define scholarly work?
18. Do you require scholarly work from faculty members? Why/Why not?
19. What happens if a faculty member does no research (etc.)?
20. What happens if a faculty member does research (etc.) but does not publish (etc.)?
21. How much research (etc.) do you think is actually done?
22. How much time do you think is spent on research (etc.) by the average faculty member in one year? Do you think this is sufficient? Insufficient?

Committee Work/Governance:

23. Do you require this from faculty? Why/Why not?
24. What happens if a faculty member is not serving on any committees?
25. What happens if a faculty member is on committees but never attends any meetings? Do you know whether or not a member is in attendance?
26. How much committee work is done on the average? How much time is spent in one year?

Community Service:

Community service are those activities which benefit the community outside of the institution and do not benefit a faculty member personally in any of his other professional activities.

27. Do you agree with this definition? If not, how would you define community service?
28. Do you require these from faculty? Why/Why not?
29. What happens if a faculty member provides no services to the community?
30. Do you know whether or not a faculty member provides those services?
31. How much community service is provided on the average? How much time is spent in one year?

Workload Tasks:

32. Which of the three workload components (teaching, research, and service) are perceived by the faculty as most important? Least important?
33. Which of these are perceived by your administrative colleagues to be most important? Least important?
34. Which do you perceive as most important? Least important?
35. How would you estimate in hours a faculty member's workyear?

36. Do you think faculty members are happy with their workloads as they are now and as they have been during the last few years? How would you describe their reactions to their personal workload - Very pleased, moderately pleased, moderately dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?
37. If they were unhappy, would they be prepared to discuss the matter with UMFA? ...to resort to the grievance procedures of the collective agreement?
38. Do you think they compare their workloads to those of others in their department?
39. Do you think they compare the workloads of members of their department to those of the members of other departments?

Power Structure:

In answering the following questions you must think in terms of the generic role of the position. In other words, describe or rate the position of Dean rather than the person who presently holds that position; describe or rate the position of Department Head rather than the person who is presently a Department Head; and so on.

40. How do you view the position of Dean?      Associate Dean?      Department Head?
41. Using the following table of relative powers (5 - extremely powerful/influential; 4 - very strong; 3 - strong; 2.5 - average; 2 - weak; 1 - very weak; 0 - no power at all) rate the groups and individuals listed:
  1. In the determination of general Faculty business (policy setting, daily operations, etc.) how would you rate the faculty, the Department Heads, the Associate Dean and the Dean?
  2. In the same area how would you rate the Faculty Council and the Administration?
  3. In the determination of teaching duties how would you rate each?
  4. In the area of scholarly work, how would you rate each?

5. In the area of governance and service, how would you rate each?
6. In the total control of faculty's workload activities, how would you rate each?

## Appendix B

### INTERVIEW SCHEDULE - FACULTY

Specific questions about individual workloads were designed to obtain the necessary background essential to an understanding of the influence of the faculty member in relation to workloads. These question merely formed the informative bases from which power distributions were deduced and verified.

#### Personal Data:

1. What is your name? department? age? sex?  
rank? marital status? years of experience at  
the Faculty?
2. What degrees do you hold? If you do not have a  
doctorate are you presently working on it?
3. Do you have tenure?
4. Do you have a teaching certificate?
5. Do you have experience as a grade school teacher?
6. If yes, how many years? How many years ago? What  
grades?
7. Are you a committee chairperson? If yes, of how many  
committees?
8. Are you active in UMFA? How active? Do you hold any  
special positions in UMFA?

#### Teaching and Teaching Related Activities:

9. Which factors do you think are considered by the  
administration in determining the total staffing  
needs of the Faculty?

10. Is the faculty involved in the decision-making concerning total staffing needs? If so, how?
11. How many half- and full-courses do you teach in first term? In second term?
12. Do you teach in Spring/Summer Sessions? If so, is this part of your regular load or for stipend? If for stipend, are you expected to teach a set minimum on a stipendary, overload basis?
13. Can you choose your own time in which to teach your courses? Why would you prefer certain times over others?
14. Are your courses undergraduate or graduate level? Both?
15. Do you teach other types of classes? Seminars? Workshops?
16. How much time do you spend on out-of-class, teaching related activities like evaluation, preparation, and so on? How many hours per week on the average? How many hours per year? What do you think is the ratio of out-of-class to in-class hours?
17. Do you supervise student teachers? If so, how many? How much time does this involve in one year?
18. Do you supervise graduate students? If so, how many? At what level? Are you the chief advisor? How much time per year do you spend on this?
19. Do you have independent study students? If so, how many and how much time do you spend on that activity in one year?
20. Do you have to spend time on assigned counselling? If so, how much time is involved in one year?
21. Are there any other teaching related assignments you perform, and, if so, what are these and how much time is involved in one year?
22. How are your teaching and teaching related assignments decided upon? In respect to your choice of courses, the number of courses you teach, and the number of hours you teach, who makes the decisions (the Dean, the Associate Dean, the Department Head, your colleagues or you yourself)? If it is a joint decision, what percentages of total decision-making would you assign to each?



23. If you disagree with your assigned teaching load, can you refuse to teach what has been decided upon? Can you appeal teaching assignments with which you are unhappy? Can changes be made? How would changes be made?

Scholarly Work (Including Performing and Visual Arts):

Scholarly work includes only such research, study, and preparation as is published or produced, or as could be published or produced. It does not include work done for lesson preparation and similar teaching related activities.

24. Do you agree with this definition? If not, how would you define scholarly work?
25. Are you required to do scholarly work? Why/Why not?
26. What happens if you do no scholarly work?
27. What happens if you do research (etc.) and do not publish (etc.)?
28. How much time do you spend in one year on scholarly work? In your opinion is that sufficient or insufficient?
29. How much research (etc.) have you published (etc.) last year?

Committee Work/Governance:

30. Are you required to serve on committees? Why/Why not?
31. What happens if you do not serve on any committees?
32. What happens if you are a member of several committees but do not attend any of their meetings? Do you think the administration would be aware of such continued absence by one individual?
33. To how many committees do you belong? How much time do you spend on this activity?
34. Do you do any other governance work? What does this involve and how much total time is spent on it in one year?

Community Service:

Community service are those activities which benefit the community outside of the institution and do not benefit a faculty member personally in any of his other professional activities.

35. Do you agree with this definition? If not, how would you define community service?
36. Are you required to provide services to the community? Why/Why not?
37. What type of services do you provide? Why these specific ones?
38. What happens if you provide no services? Do you think the administration is aware of such lack of service by an individual?
39. How much total time is involved in one year?

Workload Tasks:

40. Is the workload you have described so far typical for you or is it substantially different from previous years?
41. Can you refuse to do any governance or service activities and increase your teaching load and teaching related activities instead?
42. Which of the three workload components (teaching, research, and service) do you think are considered by the administration to be most important?  
Least important?
43. Which of these three components do you think are considered by your colleagues to be most important?  
Least important?
44. Which of these three workload components do you consider to be most important? Least important?
45. How would you describe your work in terms of hours per year?
46. Are you happy with your workload as it is now and as it has been during the last few years? How would you describe your reactions to your personal workload -

Very pleased, moderately pleased, moderately dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

47. If you were unhappy, would you be prepared to discuss the matter with UMFA? ...to resort to the grievance procedures of the collective agreement?
48. How do you compare your workload to those of others in your department?
49. How do you compare the workloads of members of your department to those of the members of other departments?

#### Power Structure:

In answering the following questions you must think in terms of the generic role of the position. In other words, describe or rate the position of Dean rather than the person who presently holds that position; describe or rate the position of Department Head rather than the person who is presently your Department Head; and so on.

50. How do you view the position of Dean? Associate Dean? Department Head?
51. Using the following table of relative powers (5 - extremely powerful/influential; 4 - very strong; 3 - strong; 2.5 - average; 2 - weak; 1 - very weak; 0 - no power at all), rate the groups and individuals listed:
  1. In the determination of general Faculty business (policy setting, daily operations, etc.) how would you rate the Dean, the Associate Dean, your Department Head, your colleagues, and yourself?
  2. In the same area, how would you rate the Faculty Council and the administration?
  3. In the determination of teaching duties, how would you rate the same individuals and groups?
  4. In the area of scholarly work, how would you rate each?
  5. In the area of governance and service activities, how would you rate each?
  6. In the total control of your personal workload activities, how would you rate each?

## Appendix C

### A REPORTING OF RELATED INTERVIEW RESPONSES

The responses to questions not directly pertaining to the study, but useful for a better understanding of the Faculty, are recorded in this appendix. Wherever possible the data have been tabulated. When both administrators and faculty members replied to the same or to a similar question, both sets of responses were recorded in the same table for ease of comparison.

It should be noted that all tables and comments in this appendix reflect the impressions of the participants. This fact, therefore, is not necessarily reflected in the title of every table employed. Comments on tabulated responses have been kept to a minimum.

For ease of reading, questions and groups of questions are started as much as possible at the top of a new page.

Which factors does the administration consider in determining total staffing needs?

| TABLE 76                                          |                        |                   |                        |                   |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Factors Considered for Determining Staffing Needs |                        |                   |                        |                   |
| <u>Factors Identified</u>                         | <u>Administrators</u>  |                   | <u>Faculty Members</u> |                   |
|                                                   | <u>Frequency Count</u> | <u>Rank Order</u> | <u>Frequency Count</u> | <u>Rank Order</u> |
| Budget                                            | 6                      | 1                 | 11                     | 1                 |
| Program Needs                                     | 6                      | 1                 | 8                      | 2                 |
| Enrollment                                        | 5                      | 3                 | 4                      | 4                 |
| Public Impression                                 | -                      | -                 | 5                      | 3                 |
| Scholarly Ability                                 | 1                      | 4                 | 4                      | 4                 |
| External Demands                                  | 1                      | 4                 | 1                      | 7                 |
| Graduate Student Needs                            | 1                      | 4                 | 1                      | 7                 |
| Dean's Bias                                       | -                      | -                 | 2                      | 6                 |
| Field Service Needs                               | -                      | -                 | 1                      | 7                 |

Comments (Table 76):

One administrator indicated that the Faculty for some years has been understaffed by 14 - 15 faculty members as a result of lack of provincial grants.

Faculty members observed that staffing appeared to be decided without regard to academic, scholarly, or programming needs of the Faculty; with budget considered more important than needs; and with replacement of existing staff being a priority. Several faculty members were vague in their answers and implied they did not really know, or

care, what factors were considered by administrators in determining total staffing needs.

Is faculty involved in the decision making on total staffing needs, and if so, how?

| TABLE 77                                          |                       |                |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Faculty Involvement in Determining Staffing Needs |                       |                |
| <u>Faculty Involvement</u>                        | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
| Yes                                               | 6                     | 9              |
| No                                                | 1                     | 5              |
| -----                                             | -----                 | -----          |
| Totals                                            | 7                     | 14             |

Comments (Table 77):

Of the six administrators who said "Yes", one indicated that, because budgeting restraints had prevented identified needs from being fulfilled, many faculty members were becoming reluctant to participate in identifying staffing needs.

The one administrator who basically said "No" in a sense reserved judgment. He felt that the faculty might collectively have some input through the Budget Advisory Committee, but that the Dean alone made the actual decisions related to staffing. He also felt that it was the

Department Head who advised the Dean more so than the faculty.

The five faculty members who said "No" felt that they had a great deal of input into the selection of a person to be hired on staff as a replacement, but no input at all into the actual determination of new positions. Three of them stated that a select few administrators made all the decisions.

On the other hand, of the nine faculty members who said "Yes", four felt that the administration was very reasonable and provided explanations if advice sought from the faculty were not followed. The other five had some reservations, saying "Yes", but modifying their answer with the note that, although they had input, their advice frequently was not followed, admittedly for budgetary reasons.

Are your courses at undergraduate, graduate or both levels?

Comments:

All faculty members appeared to be teaching a combination of both graduate and undergraduate courses. This was the case irrespective of a faculty member's rank, tenure status, degree status, experience as an instructor, and so on.

How many hours per year are spent by faculty members on out-of-class teaching related tasks? What would be the ratio of out-of-class to in-class hours?

TABLE 78

## Time Spent on Teaching Related Activities

| <u>Groups</u>      | <u>Average<br/>Yearly<br/>Hours</u> | <u>Ratio of<br/>Out-of-Class<br/>:in-Class</u> |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Deans              | 490.6                               | 2.43:1                                         |
| Department Heads   | 622.6                               | 3.13:1                                         |
| All Administrators | 565.4                               | 2.83:1                                         |
| Faculty Members    | 527.3                               | 2.64:1                                         |

Comments (Table 78):

Administrative opinions on the amount of time that should be spent on teaching related activities vary considerably. One suggested that somewhat less time than what is used now should be spent on this. Two felt that more time should be invested, while two others suggested that the time spent now is just about right. The other two expressed no opinion.

Administrative perceptions of time spent on teaching related activities are quite similar to the estimates made by faculty members.



Do you teach other types of classes? How much time per year do you spend on this?

Do you have to spend time on assigned counselling? How much time per year do you spend on this?

Are there any other teaching related assignments you perform? If so, what are these? How much time per year do you spend on this?

How much time per year do you spend on scholarly activities?

How much time per year do you spend on governance work?

How much time per year do you spend on community service?

How would you describe your work in terms of hours per year?

Included in Table 79 are the professional activities already reported in Chapter IV. This was done to present a complete overview of an average faculty member's total activities.

TABLE 79

## Professional Activities in Average Hours per Year and Percentages

|                                                                              | Average<br>Hours<br><u>per Year</u> | Percentages<br>of<br><u>Total</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Teaching-Regular Session                                                     | 191.7                               | 9.26                              |
| Teaching-Other Sessions                                                      | 95.5                                | 4.61                              |
| Teaching-Seminars, etc.                                                      | 8.3                                 | 0.40                              |
| Teaching Related Activities                                                  | 527.3                               | 25.48                             |
| Student Teaching Supervision                                                 | 122.5                               | 5.92                              |
| Grad. Student Supervision                                                    | 133.8                               | 6.46                              |
| Independent Study Supervision                                                | 76.3                                | 3.69                              |
| Research; Scholarly Work                                                     | 447.9                               | 21.64                             |
| Committee Work                                                               | 121.7                               | 5.88                              |
| Community Service                                                            | 159.5                               | 7.71                              |
| Other Professional Activities                                                | 186.3                               | 9.00                              |
| <hr/>                                                                        |                                     |                                   |
| Total                                                                        | 2069.8                              | 100.05                            |
| <br>                                                                         |                                     |                                   |
| All Professional Activities<br>(As per Question 24 in<br>Appendices A and B) |                                     | 2174.6                            |

Comments (Table 79):

The average hours per year as shown in Table 79 reflect the fact that some faculty members did not estimate the yearly hours spent on all their professional activities. In each category of activity an average was calculated for those who provided an estimate for that category. The total number involved in each case is shown in Table 12 in Chapter IV.

How much time is spent on committee work per year?

Comments:

Administrators estimated yearly hours spent on committee work to range from 60 to 230 hours for an average of 125.7 hours per year. Faculty members estimated these hours to range from 50 to 280 hours for an average of 121.7 hours per year. Three faculty members did not make an estimate.

Administrators then estimated only 3.29 per cent higher than faculty members for the time spent on this activity.

On the average how much time is spent on community service in one year by a faculty member?

Comments:

Time spent on community service appeared to be difficult to estimate because three administrators and five faculty members did not respond to this question. The remainder of the administrators estimated a range of 100 to 500 hours for an average of 237.5 hours per year. The remaining faculty members estimated a range of 20 to 500 hours for an average of 159.5 hours per year.

Administrators then estimated 48.90 per cent higher than faculty members for the amount of time spent on this activity.

How many hours per year does a faculty member spend on all professional activities?

| TABLE 80                                        |                       |                |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Total Hours of Professional Activities per Year |                       |                |
| <u>Ranges of Hours per Year</u>                 | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
| 1200 - 1399                                     | 1                     | 0              |
| 1400 - 1599                                     | 1                     | 0              |
| 1600 - 1799                                     | 1                     | 2              |
| 1800 - 1999                                     | 1                     | 1              |
| 2000 - 2199                                     | 2                     | 2              |
| 2200 - 2399                                     | 0                     | 4              |
| 2400 - 2599                                     | 1                     | 2              |
| 2600 - 2899                                     | 0                     | 1              |
| No Answer                                       | 0                     | 2              |
| <hr/>                                           | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                                          | 7                     | 14             |
| Average Estimates                               | 1831.5                | 2174.6         |

Comments (Table 80):

Administrators estimated the total hours per year worked by a faculty member in professional activities to be considerably less than was claimed by the faculty members. Note, for instance, that only one administrator thought that this workload would require more than 2200 hours per year, whereas nine faculty members claimed to work more.

The administrators' average estimate was 15.78 per cent less than what the faculty members claimed in average total workhours; the faculty's claimed hours were 18.73 per cent greater than the administrators' average estimate.

Which of the three workload components are considered most important and least important by the administration and the faculty members in the opinion of the individual interviewed?

TABLE 81

## Workload Components Considered Most Important

| <u>Workload Components</u>  | <u>Administrators' Perceptions of Faculty</u> | <u>Faculty Perceptions of Administrators</u> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Teaching                    | 7                                             | 9                                            |
| Research                    | 0                                             | 1                                            |
| Teaching & Research Equally | 0                                             | 2                                            |
| No Opinion                  | 0                                             | 2                                            |
| <hr/>                       | <hr/>                                         | <hr/>                                        |
| Totals                      | 7                                             | 14                                           |

TABLE 82

## Workload Components Considered Most Important by Colleagues

| <u>Workload Components</u>  | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Teaching                    | 7                     | 10             |
| Research                    | 0                     | 1              |
| Teaching & Research Equally | 0                     | 2              |
| No Opinion                  | 0                     | 1              |
| <hr/>                       | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals                      | 7                     | 14             |

TABLE 83

## Workload Components Considered Least Important

| <u>Workload Components</u> | <u>Administrators'<br/>Perceptions<br/>of Faculty</u> | <u>Faculty<br/>Perceptions of<br/>Administrators</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Research                   | 4                                                     | 5                                                    |
| Service                    | 2                                                     | 7                                                    |
| Research & Service Equally | 0                                                     | 0                                                    |
| No Opinion                 | 1                                                     | 2                                                    |
|                            |                                                       |                                                      |
| Totals                     | 7                                                     | 14                                                   |

TABLE 84

Workload Components Considered Least Important by  
Colleagues

| <u>Workload Components</u> | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Research                   | 2                     | 7              |
| Service                    | 2                     | 5              |
| Research & Service Equally | 3                     | 1              |
| No Opinion                 | 0                     | 1              |
|                            |                       |                |
| Totals                     | 7                     | 14             |

Comments (Tables 83 to 84):

A number of participants observed that research generally had been considered to be least important in the past, but that this view was now switching to service.

Do faculty members compare their workloads with those of their colleagues in the same department?

TABLE 85

## Workloads Compared in Same Department

| <u>Perceptions</u>  | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Yes                 | 6                     |                |
| No                  | 0                     |                |
| A Bit               | 1                     |                |
| I Have Heavier Load |                       | 8              |
| I Have Same Load    |                       | 6              |
| <hr/>               | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals              | 7                     | 14             |

Do faculty members compare the workloads in their own department with those of colleagues in other departments?

TABLE 86

## Workloads Compared with Other Departments

| <u>Perceptions</u>   | <u>Administrators</u> | <u>Faculty</u> |
|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Yes                  | 6                     |                |
| No                   | 0                     |                |
| A Bit                | 1                     |                |
| We Have Heavier Load |                       | 8              |
| We Have Lighter Load |                       | 2              |
| I Do Not Know        |                       | 4              |
| <hr/>                | <hr/>                 | <hr/>          |
| Totals               | 7                     | 14             |



How do you view the position of Dean?

| TABLE 87                                                 |                                  |                             |                                  |                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Perceptions of the Position of Dean                      |                                  |                             |                                  |                             |
| <u>Perceptions</u>                                       | Administration                   |                             | Faculty Members                  |                             |
|                                                          | <u>Frequency</u><br><u>Count</u> | <u>Rank</u><br><u>Order</u> | <u>Frequency</u><br><u>Count</u> | <u>Rank</u><br><u>Order</u> |
| Leadership                                               | 6                                | 1                           | 9                                | 1                           |
| Public, Internal<br>Relations                            | 5                                | 2                           | 4                                | 2                           |
| Budget Control                                           | 3                                | 3                           | 2                                | 3                           |
| Realistic Visionary                                      | 2                                | 4                           | 2                                | 3                           |
| Channels Decision<br>Making                              | 1                                | 5                           | 0                                | -                           |
| Good Office Manager                                      | 1                                | 5                           | 1                                | 5                           |
| Policy Guidelines -<br>Responsible to Faculty<br>Council | 1                                | 5                           | 1                                | 5                           |
| Deals Openly<br>with Issues                              | 1                                | 5                           | 0                                | -                           |
| Problem Solver                                           | 1                                | 5                           | 0                                | -                           |
| Definer of Job<br>Expectations                           | 1                                | 5                           | 0                                | -                           |
| Active Researcher                                        | 0                                | -                           | 1                                | 5                           |
| <hr/>                                                    |                                  |                             |                                  |                             |
| Total of Replies                                         | 22                               |                             | 20                               |                             |
| No Answer                                                | 0                                |                             | 3                                |                             |

Comments (Table 87):

On the four most frequently mentioned characteristics for a Dean administrators and faculty members were in complete agreement as to their order of importance. All appeared to view leadership and proper management of internal and public relations as the most crucial.

How do you view the position of Associate Dean?

| TABLE 88                                        |                                  |                             |                                  |                             |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Perceptions of the Position of Associate Dean   |                                  |                             |                                  |                             |
| <u>Perceptions</u>                              | Administration                   |                             | Faculty Members                  |                             |
|                                                 | <u>Frequency</u><br><u>Count</u> | <u>Rank</u><br><u>Order</u> | <u>Frequency</u><br><u>Count</u> | <u>Rank</u><br><u>Order</u> |
| No Guidelines Available<br>to Evaluate Position | 2                                | 1                           | 5                                | 1                           |
| Supports the Dean                               | 2                                | 1                           | 2                                | 3                           |
| Identifies Problems                             | 2                                | 1                           | 0                                | -                           |
| Leadership                                      | 1                                | 4                           | 3                                | 2                           |
| Organizer                                       | 0                                | -                           | 2                                | 3                           |
| Public Relations                                | 1                                | 4                           | 0                                | -                           |
| Detail Man                                      | 1                                | 4                           | 0                                | -                           |
| Makes "the Place Run"                           | 0                                | -                           | 1                                | 5                           |
| Grad.Studies & Research                         | 0                                | -                           | 1                                | 5                           |
| Committee Power Person                          | 0                                | -                           | 1                                | 5                           |
| <hr/>                                           |                                  |                             |                                  |                             |
| Total of Replies                                | 9                                |                             | 15                               |                             |

Comments (Table 88):

There was some agreement among administrators and faculty members on the most important characteristics for an Associate Dean. Faculty members, however, appeared to place great importance on leadership skills and organizational abilities, whereas administrators stressed the ability to identify problems.

How do you view the position of Department Head?

| TABLE 89                                       |                            |                       |                            |                       |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Perceptions of the Position of Department Head |                            |                       |                            |                       |
| <u>Perceptions</u>                             | Administration             |                       | Faculty Members            |                       |
|                                                | <u>Frequency<br/>Count</u> | <u>Rank<br/>Order</u> | <u>Frequency<br/>Count</u> | <u>Rank<br/>Order</u> |
| Leadership                                     | 4                          | 1                     | 5                          | 1                     |
| Quality of Instruction;<br>Program Development | 3                          | 2                     | 0                          | -                     |
| Coordinator                                    | 2                          | 3                     | 3                          | 2                     |
| Vague; No Real Power                           | 2                          | 3                     | 0                          | -                     |
| Budget Control                                 | 1                          | 4                     | 0                          | -                     |
| Must Be Forceful                               | 0                          | -                     | 3                          | 2                     |
| Planner; Decision Maker                        | 0                          | -                     | 2                          | 4                     |
| Encourager; Faculty<br>Supporter               | 0                          | -                     | 2                          | 4                     |
| Organizer                                      | 0                          | -                     | 1                          | 6                     |
| Negotiator; Compromiser                        | 0                          | -                     | 1                          | 6                     |
| <hr/>                                          |                            |                       |                            |                       |
| Total of Replies                               | 12                         |                       | 17                         |                       |
| No Answer                                      | 0                          |                       | 4                          |                       |

Comments (Table 89):

Both administrators and faculty members considered leadership as the most important characteristic of a Department Head, and coordinating ability as an important one. Administrators, however, felt that he holds a crucial position in program development and quality of instruction, whereas faculty members believed he must be a forceful

personality who is a planner and decision maker. Note that only administrators saw him as having no real power.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "A Proposal to Develop Faculty Workload Criteria."  
Washington, D.C.: National Association of State  
Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Workload Study  
Group, 1974.
- Adams, Walter H. "Faculty Load." Improving College and  
University Teaching 24 : 4 (Autumn 1976).
- Alworth, Robert M., and Reich, Dorothy. A Comparison of  
District and Statewide Faculty Loads, Fall 1973 - Fall  
1974. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Community College  
District, 1975. ERIC ED 114 135.
- American Association of University Professors. "Statement  
on Faculty Workload." AAUP Bulletin 56 (Spring 1970).
- Anderson, G. L., ed. Reflections on University Values and  
the American Scholar. College Park: Center for the Study  
of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, 1976.
- Argyris, Chris. Executive Leadership. New York: Harper  
and Row, 1967.
- Axt, R. G. "Assumptions Underlying Present Ways of  
Measuring Faculty Load." In Faculty Workload: A  
Conference Report, pp. 12-17. Edited by Kevin Bunnell.  
Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
- Balderston, F. E. Managing Today's University. San  
Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Baldrige, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University.  
New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.
- Baldrige, J. Victor, ed. Academic Governance. Berkeley,  
Ca.: McCutchan, 1971.
- Baldrige, J. Victor, and Kemerer, Frank R. "Images of  
Governance: Collective Bargaining versus Traditional  
Models." In Governing Academic Organizations, pp.  
252-71. Edited by Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldrige.  
Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977.

- Baldrige, J. Victor; Curtis, David V.; Ecker, George P.; and Riley, Gary L. "Alternative Models of Governance in Higher Education." In Governing Academic Organizations, pp. 2-25. Edited by Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldrige. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977.
- Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. 16th ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Benditt, Theodore, M. Law as Rule and Principle. Hassocks, Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1978.
- Benewitz, Maurice C., ed. Proceedings, First Annual Conference. New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, Bernard Baruch College, 1973.
- Bennis, Warren. The Unconscious Conspiracy. New York: Amacom, 1976.
- Bilyea, Cliff G. The Canadian Manager: Effectiveness in Action. Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1980.
- Birss, Fraser W., and Dunford, H. Brian. "Teaching Duties: Too Heavy or Too Light?" Chemistry in Canada (April 1982).
- Blackburn, Robert T.; O'Connell, Colman; and Pellino, Glenn. "Evaluating Faculty Performance." In Improving Academic Management, pp. 458-77. Edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Blau, Peter M., and Scott, W. Richard. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.
- Borg, Walter R. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay, 1965.
- Bowman, Claude C. The College Professor in America. New York: Arno Press, 1938.
- Brook, G. L. The Modern University. London: Andre Deutsch Ltd., 1965.
- Brooks, David W. "Faculty Evaluation by Formula." Journal of Chemical Education 57 : 4 (April 1980).
- Brown, Barbara, and Romoser, Richard. Full-time Instructional Load Policies in Selected Community-Junior Colleges. Cleveland: Cuyahoga Community College, 1976. ERIC ED 121 367.

- Bunnell, Kevin, ed. Faculty Work Load: A Conference Report. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
- Campbell, William Giles, and Ballou, Stephen Vaughan. Form and Style: Theses, Reports, Term Papers. 4th ed. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
- Carpenter, W. B., et al. Management by Objectives: An Analysis of Recommendations for Implementation. Charlottesville: Center for Higher Education, University of Virginia, 1973.
- Case, John. "Workers' Control: Toward a North American Movement." In Workers' Control. Edited by Gerry Hunnings et al. New York: Vintage, 1973.
- Centra, John A. Determining Faculty Effectiveness: Assessing Teaching, Research, and Service for Personnel Decisions and Improvements. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Organization and Authority." In Governing Academic Organizations, pp. 64-78. Edited by Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977.
- Cohen, M. D., and March, J. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Collins, Evan R. "The Impossible Imperatives: Power, Authority and Decision Making in Teacher Education." Address to the Twenty-third Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Chicago, Ill.: February 24, 1971.
- Colorado State University, Office of University Planning and Budgets. Comparative Staffing Units as a Measure of University Instructional Workload. Fort Collins: 1975. ERIC ED 139 367.
- Cornish, D. J. Faculty Workloads - A Critical Examination. Edmonton: Alberta Colleges Commission, 1972. ERIC ED 067 065.
- Craven, Eugene. "Evaluating Program Performance." In Improving Academic Management, pp. 432-57. Edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Davis, Kenneth Culp. Discretionary Justice: A Preliminary Inquiry. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

- Dimock, Marshall E. A Philosophy of Administration. New York: Harper and Row, 1958.
- Doi, J. I. "The Proper Use of Faculty Load Studies." In Studies of College Faculty. Berkeley, Ca.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1961.
- Dressel, P. L. Handbook of Academic Evaluation: Assessing Institutional Effectiveness, Student Progress, and Professional Performance for Decision Making in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.
- Drucker, Peter F. Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Drucker, Peter F. Managing in Turbulent Times. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.
- Dunford, H. B., and Harris, W. E. "Evaluation of Teaching Loads." Chemistry in Canada 29 (1977).
- Eble, Kenneth E. The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 1974.
- Eckert, R. E., and Williams, H. Y. College Faculty View Themselves and Their Jobs. Minneapolis: College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1972.
- Ellerman, David. "Capitalism and Workers' Self-Management." In Workers' Control. Edited by Gerry Hunnings et al. New York: Vintage, 1973.
- Enochs, J. B. "Problems of Defining Faculty Load." In Faculty Workload: A Conference Report. Edited by Kevin Bunnell. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
- "Faculty Activity Analysis." Seattle, Washington: Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Provost, University of Washington, 1974.
- Faculty Activity Analysis: Procedures Manual. Technical Report 44. Boulder, Colo.: the National Council of Higher Education Management Systems, 1973.
- Fenske, Robert H. "Setting Institutional Goals and Objectives." In Improving Academic Management, pp. 177-99. Edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Fitzgerald, J. A. "A Way Out of the Faculty Load Muddle." Community and Junior College Journal 45 : 8 (1975).



- Garbarino, Joseph W. Faculty Bargaining. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Gonyea, Meredith A. "Determining Academic Staff Needs, Allocation, and Utilization." In Improving Academic Management, pp. 364-72. Edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Greenwood, Ernest. "Attributes of a Profession." Social Work 2 : 3 (July 1957).
- Grosman, Brian A. The Prosecutor. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.
- Gross, E., and Grambsch, P. V. Changes in University Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Gross, Edward. "Universities as Organizations: A Study of Goals." In Academic Governance, pp. 22-57. Edited by J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1971.
- Gross, Edward, and Grambsch, Paul V. "Power Structures in Universities and Colleges." In Governing Academic Organizations, pp. 26-41. Edited by Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977.
- Hambrick, D. C. "The University as an Organization: How is it Different from a Business?" In Reflections on University Values and the American Scholar. Edited by G. L. Anderson. College Park: Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, 1976.
- Heydinger, Richard B. "Planning Academic Programs." In Improving Academic Management, pp. 304-326. Edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Hicks, J. W. "Faculty Workload - An Overview." In Faculty Workload: A Conference Report, pp. 4-11. Edited by Kevin Bunnell. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
- Hill, Winston W., and French, Wendell L. "Perceptions of the Power of Department Chairmen by Professors." In Academic Governance, pp. 208-33. Edited by J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1971.
- Hind, R. R. "Analysis of a Faculty: Professionalism, Evaluation and the Authority Structure." In Academic Governance, pp. 264-92. Edited by J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1971.

- Hodgkinson, Christopher. Towards a Philosophy of Administration. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978.
- Hodgkinson, H. L. "A Truer Calculation of Faculty Work Load." The Chronicle of Higher Education 7 : 33 (1973).
- Hunnings, Gerry, et al, eds. Workers' Control. New York: Vintage, 1973.
- Hurlbert, Bud. "Management Leadership." The Canadian School Executive 9 (March 1982).
- Jedamus, Paul. "Teaching Loads Over Time." New Directions for Institutional Research 2 (Summer 1974).
- Jedamus, Paul; Peterson, Marvin W.; and Associates. Improving Academic Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Kauffman, J. F. At the Pleasure of the Board. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1980.
- Keeton, Morris. "The Constituencies and Their Claims." In Governing Academic Organizations, pp. 194-210. Edited by Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldrige. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977.
- Kerr, C. The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Kinsella, Bernard W., et al. The Supervisor's Role in Negotiation. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.
- Kotter, John P. "Power Dependence and Effective Management." Harvard Business Review 50 : 3 (July - August 1977).
- Lam, Y. L. J. "Collective Bargaining: Present and Future Perspectives." The Canadian School Executive 1 : 5 (1981).
- Lawrence, Paul R.; Seiler, John A.; et al; eds. Organizational Behavior and Administration. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1965.
- Lee, C. B. "Whose Goals for American Higher Education?" In Whose Goals for American Higher Education? Edited by C. G. Dobbin and C. B. Lee. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

- Lewis, Lionel S. Scaling the Ivory Tower. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1975.
- Litchfield, Edward H. "Organization in Large American Universities: The Administration." In Academic Governance, pp. 150-68. Edited by J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1971.
- Locke, Michael. Power and Politics in the School System: A Guidebook. London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1974.
- Lombardi, John. Faculty Workload. Topical Paper No. 46. Los Angeles: California University, 1974. ERIC ED 097 925.
- Mandell, Richard D. The Professor Game. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977.
- Marmion, Harry A. "Unions and Higher Education." In Academic Governance, pp. 344-56. Edited by J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1971.
- Martin, Warren B. "The University as Community." The Educational Record (Fall 1967).
- Migliore, R. Henry. MBO: Blue Collar to Top Executive. Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1977.
- Miller, R. L. "Prescribing Faculty Workloads." Current Issues in Higher Education 26 (1971).
- Miller, Richard. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Miller, Richard I. "Appraising Institutional Performance." In Improving Academic Management, pp. 406-31. Edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Miller, Walter B. "Two Concepts of Authority." In Organizational Behavior and Administration. Edited by Paul R. Lawrence, John A. Seiler, et al. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1965.
- Millet, John. The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Millett, J. D. New Structures of Campus Power: Success and Failures of Emerging Forms of Institutional Governance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

- Millett, John D. "Relating to Governance and Leadership." In Improving Academic Management, pp. 495-509. Edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Mortimer, K. P. Accountability in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1972.
- Mortimer, K. P., and McConnell, T. R. Sharing Authority Effectively: Participation, Interaction, and Discretion. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Mouzellis, Nicos P. Organization and Bureaucracy. Chicago, Ill.: Aldine, 1967.
- Munitz, Barry. "Examining Administrative Performance." In Improving Academic Management, pp. 478-94. Edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- National Council of Teachers of English. Workload for English Teachers. A Report by the Ad Hoc Committee on English Teacher Workload in Secondary Schools. Urbana: 1973.
- National Education Association. Faculty Workload. Washington, D.C.: National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1970. ERIC ED 038 968.
- Orwig, Melvin D., and Caruthers, J. Kent. "Selecting Budget Strategies and Priorities." In Improving Academic Management, pp. 341-63. Edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Parsons, Gary, L. An Assessment of the Impact of Implementing Innovative Teaching Methods on Teaching Loads at Golden West College. Ed. D. Dissertation, Nova University. Fort Lauderdale, Fla.: 1976. ERIC ED 144 633.
- Parsons, Talcott. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960.
- Parsons, Talcott, et al, eds. Theories of Society. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- Perrow, Charles. Complex Organizations. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1972.
- Poster, Cyril. School Decision-Making. London: Heinemann, 1976.

- Randolph, Victor R. "Professors' Weekly Work Hours." School and Society 72 (1954).
- Richardson, H. D. "Faculty Workload Study and Analysis." College and University 43 (Fall 1967).
- Richman, B. M., and Farmer, R. N. Leadership, Goals, and Power in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Riley, Gary L., and Baldrige, J. Victor, eds. Governing Academic Organizations. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977.
- Ritchie, M. A. F. The College Presidency: Initiation into the Order of the Turtle. New York: Philosophical Library, 1970.
- Rogers, F. A., and Van Horn, R. L. "Goals-Oriented Resource Allocation for University Management." In Conflicting Pressures in Post-Secondary Education. Edited by R. H. Fenske. Tallahassee, Fla.: Association for Institutional Research, 1976.
- Romney, Leonard C. Faculty Activity Analysis. Technical Report 24. Boulder, Colo.: the National Council of Higher Education Management Systems, 1971.
- Rourke, Francis E., and Brooks, Glenn E. "The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education." Administrative Science Quarterly 9 (September 1964).
- Schmidtlein, F. A. "Decision Process Paradigms in Education." Educational Researcher 13 : 5 (1974).
- Script Reference Manual. Waterloo: Department of Computing Services, University of Waterloo, 1982.
- Seldin, Peter. Successful Faculty Evaluation Programs. New York: Coventry Press, 1980.
- Selznick, Philip. Leadership in Administration. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.
- Shay, J. E. "Coming to Grips with Faculty Workloads." Educational Record 55 : 1 (Winter 1974).
- Silverman, David. The Theory of Organizations. London: Heinemann, 1970.
- Smith, Ross E. Successful People Management: How To Get and Keep Good Employees. Toronto: MacMillan, 1978.
- Starr, F. S. "A Fair Measure for Faculty Workloads." Educational Record 54 : 4 (Fall 1973).

- Stecklein, John E. How to Measure Faculty Workload. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1961. ERIC ED 096 874.
- Stecklein, John E. "Approaches to Measuring Workload over the Past Two Decades." New Directions for Institutional Research 2 (Summer 1974).
- Stevens, Mary A. The Effect of the New Faculty Workload System on the Production of Student Credit Hours by Full-Time Faculty in One Department at Black Hawk College. Ed. D. Practicum, Nova University. Fort Lauderdale, Fla.: 1976. ERIC ED 125 719.
- Stewart, Michael O. Faculty Activity Analysis: Its Role in the Evaluation of Faculty. ERIC ED 088 321.
- Stroup, Herbert H. Bureaucracy in Higher Education. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Studies of College Faculty. Berkeley, Ca.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1961.
- Syspub User's Guide, Version 11.8. Waterloo: Department of Computing Services, University of Waterloo, 1981.
- Tierney, Michael L. "Administration: The Impact of Management Information Systems on Governance." In Governing Academic Organizations, pp. 211-27. Edited by Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1977.
- Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations. 4th ed. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- University of California. "Faculty Effort and Output Study." Berkeley, Ca.: Office of the Vice-President, Planning and Analysis, 1970.
- University of Manitoba / University of Manitoba Faculty Association: Collective Agreement. April 1, 1981 till March 31, 1983. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 1981.
- Voeks, V. W. "Publications and Teaching Effectiveness." Journal of Higher Education 33 : 4 (1962).
- Warden, S. A. "Socio-Political Issues of Faculty Activity Data." Journal of Higher Education 45 (1974).

- Wollett, Donald H. "Historical Development of Faculty Collective Bargaining and Current Extent." In Proceedings, First Annual Conference. Edited by Maurice C. Benewitz. New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, Bernard Baruch College, 1973.
- Young, L. G. "Is Collective Bargaining Compatible with Educational Objectives?" Alberta School Trustees 41 (April 1971).
- Young W. L. "Six Criteria Form a Composite Chart of Faculty Load." College and University Business 36 : 4 (April 1964).
- Yuker, Harold E. Faculty Workload: Facts, Myths and Commentary. ERIC/Higher Education Report No. 6. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1974. ERIC ED 095 756.