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Introduction

Various theories and models--such as the Weberian model of bureaucracy--have been proposed to describe and explain institutions of higher education. However, current theories fall short of adequately describing these institutions by failing to address their internal as well as external dynamics. This omission may be due to the fact that institutions of higher education are not organized systematically allowing scientists to investigate how these organizations "behave."

Organizational taxonomies are important for both applied and scientific purposes. The major practical benefit of a taxonomy is that colleges and universities may be better understood by those who participate in the governance of these institutions. In turn, those managing these institutions may be in a better position to assess the organizational effectiveness. A taxonomy not only provides a new way of looking at institutions, but it does provide a deeper understanding of the informal structure of an organization, which is revealed by the way these institutions are organized.

The benefits for research are equally important. Baker (1972) indicated that the scientific bases of any field are formulated by arranging its entities into some natural order so that their interrelationships may be understood. A taxonomy of institutions of higher education may provide for a better intraorganizational generalizability. Applying research findings to practice can be assured, reducing the gap between theory and
practice. This paper proposes and tests an organizational
taxonomy of institutions of higher education based on type of
academic organization.

Related Literature

The quest to explain organizations has generated a large
number of general theories and models in the organizational
sciences. Three major efforts are reflected in the literature.
To begin with, the work of Parsons (1956) grouped organizations
by role and societal function. Parson's work, however, has been
critiqued as being concerned with stability without regard for
the micro-level behavior (e.g., internal politics) that takes
place within the organization [37, 22].

Another major effort to analyze organizations came about
when open systems theory was proposed [22, 43] suggesting that
organizations have characteristics similar to physical entities
typically viewed as "systems." Thus, organizations may be viewed
as systems as well. The purpose of the open systems model was to
facilitate the analysis of the macro and micro levels of
organizations introducing communality of terms and concepts--
thereby eliminating the use of metaphors and analogies to study
organizations. This model dominated the thinking of scholars
interested in organizational theory for many years [41].

The third major effort to explain organizations has been
centered around contingency approaches. These approaches have
attempted to maintain the generality of the systems theory in
trying to make sense of most organizations [13, 24, 45]. The
contingency approach, nonetheless, has been accused of "compromising parsimony to gain more predictive accuracy and understanding of individual organizations..." [38, p. 100]. Yet, this model is general and lacks specificity.

Instead of relying on general theories, some scholars have proposed middle range theories to explain a subset of all organizational phenomena. Accordingly, each middle range theory makes different sets of assumptions, uses different parameters, and provides different descriptions for practice [29]. Two approaches to developing middle range theories include: 1) developing specific theories for a particular phenomena of interest (e.g., leadership) and 2) developing groups of organizations into subcategories for further analysis, namely typologies or taxonomies.

Early attempts to develop taxonomies were aimed at one or two variables which were consistent across organizations [28]. For instance, Etzioni (1969) clustered organizations around the concept of authority. Woodward (1965), Perrow (1967), and Thompson (1967) grouped organizations around their primary technology, while Blau and Scott (1962) used the concept of beneficiary served and Kanter (1977) used commitment to develop a typology of organizations. Curiously, empirically-based taxonomies of colleges and universities have been absent in the academic literature. A need exists to develop an empirical taxonomy which may be helpful to develop middle range theories that relate to colleges and universities.
The Taxonomy

The taxonomy proposed herein conceptualizes colleges and universities as organisms adapting to environmental pressures. It assumes that the main participants (faculty) in institutions of higher education have at their disposition various adapting mechanisms. These mechanisms are used to eliminate and select organizational behaviors which best fit environmental demands placed upon institutions, allowing these institutions to survive within their environmental boundaries. Furthermore, it is assumed that the adapting mechanisms or organizational behaviors that most higher education organizations exhibit are political, bureaucratic, and collegial.

The proposed taxonomy is based on three general models of governance. The first, is bureaucratic or rational model, which conceptualizes the college or university as academic bureaucracies or systems of consciously coordinated activities of two or more persons. Colleges and universities are viewed as formal organizations characterized by complex administrative hierarchy, prescribed limits on discretion set forth in a system of rules, impersonal behavior with regard to clientele, and separation of ownership and control [12, 17, 42, 46].

The college or university has been also described as a collegium in which collegial organization is defined as a system of loosely coordinated activities of two or more persons—as a kind of consensual organization characterized by shared decision making and professional authority held by faculty members. This
collegial system is further characterized by differentiation of functions in which specializations must be brought together. Coordination is achieved not through a structure of superordination and subordination of persons and groups but through a dynamic of consensus [5, 15, 32, 34, 35].

Finally, Karpik developed a model depicting colleges and universities as political systems. Political behavior is defined as a system that has powerful organizational actors and dominant coalitions that intentionally exert their respective ends on organization activities and in so doing, have impact on and even determine the larger strategies of the organization [21]. According to this model, conflict is the normal state of affairs [3, 4].

This taxonomy then uses the described models of academic governance to classify colleges and universities. Three fundamental structures of academic organization exist: Type III, II, and I. Type III institutions have the most complex system of organization among the three types and use collegial behavior as their most predominant mode of academic organization. (Such statement, however, does not imply that a type III institution is better than type II or I.) Actors within type III institutions are able to transform their responses to either political, bureaucratic, or collegial behavior at any point.

Key actors (such as faculty) eliminate the organizational behaviors which are not compatible with the environmental pressure at hand and select the most appropriate one to respond
to the demand. For example, if the environmental demand requires
the institution to respond in a political form, key actors
eliminate the bureaucratic and collegial behaviors as modes of
response in that particular instance. When other organizational
behavior is needed, the same process of elimination and selection
is followed.

On the other hand, type II institutions exhibit a more
limited range of organizational mechanisms. The most predominant
behavior used by this type of institutions is bureaucratic.
However, individuals within these institutions may transform
their behaviors along a bureaucratic and political continuum.
Even though present in some instances, collegial behavior as a
mode of organization is rarely used within this type of
institution. The process of behavior elimination (between
bureaucratic and political) is followed within these
institutions. Nonetheless, these types of institutions' predominant mode of organization is bureaucratic.

Finally, type I institutions use the political mode of
organization as the most predominant organizational style.
Bureaucratic and collegial modes of organization are also
present; however, these modes of organization are not as
frequently used as the political frame of reference. Therefore,
institutions of higher education may be classified into three
groups: 1) those whose predominant mode of organization is
colleagial (type III); 2) bureaucratic (type II); and 3) those
whose primary mode of organization is political (type I).
Methodology

Survey research methodology was used to explore the views of college presidents, deans, chairpersons and faculty from different colleges and universities regarding academic governance. Consonant with developing a typology based on governance, the researcher needed to define the construct of governance—a definition that would be inclusive of governing mechanisms of all types of colleges and universities. Therefore, a preliminary study was conducted to define the concept of governance and develop an instrument common to different types of colleges and universities. Information was needed from different colleges to develop an instrument that would measure the concept of governance, and be comprehensive and appropriate for different types of institutions of higher education.

Preliminary studies were conducted at seven midwestern colleges and universities. Five institutions were public and two were private, and their undergraduate enrollments ranged from approximately 800 to approximately 45,000. Two institutions were primarily research institutions (although of different caliber), two were former teachers' colleges (now state universities), two were private liberal arts colleges, and one was a 2-year college. All institutions were in or near cities with a population of 50,000 or more. Only the 2-year college had a unionized faculty.

Interviews to Develop the Instrument

Twenty-eight top administrators and faculty members at seven colleges in the Midwest were interviewed. The chancellor or
academic vice-president, a dean, a department head, and a faculty member from each campus were interviewed. Interviews ranged from 30 minutes to one hour. Emphasis was placed on criteria relating to the concept of governance. From analysis of interviews, and on an a priori intuitive basis, five dimensions of governance emerged: decision making, leadership, authority, organizational structure, and internal processes. These five dimensions were used in toto to measure governance.

The criteria used for identification of concepts were based on conceptual definitions of each construct. The researcher, a priori, developed a set of constructs which could potentially be related to academic governance, including, in addition to the concepts identified above, formal and informal power, group behavior, and sense of mission. The researcher then created categories to analyze the interviewee's answers. The categories then were used to develop questions for the survey instrument. 

Instrument

Once the interviews were analyzed, an instrument was developed to measure the five dimensions of governance. Five items were developed per dimension and the answers to each item centered on three types of organizational styles: bureaucratic, collegial, and political. The items probed participants about the most predominant mode of academic organization, rather than probing the individuals on their personal preferences concerning governance. A representative sample of the items used in the survey is presented in Appendix A.
The instrument also was factor-analyzed using the principal component method with oblique rotation, which also affirmed the existence of the mentioned five dimensions of governance. The loadings for each factor averaged .70; the lowest loading was .49. This enabled the researcher to test the instrument for reliability. Table 1 shows the test-retest reliability coefficient by institution; information regarding subscale reliability is presented in Table 2. The subscale reliability coefficients were calculated using a test-retest method. Once the instrument's reliability was established, colleges and universities across the United States were selected for the study.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

In the current study, a stratified random sample of colleges and universities, based on the Carnegie Classification (1976), was used to select colleges and universities. Eleven colleges and universities were selected at random from each of nine different categories for a total of 99 institutions. At each of the selected institutions four respondents were chosen, including the president, an academic dean, a chairperson and a faculty member from the college of liberal arts and sciences. These members of the academy were selected because they are knowledgeable about academic organization. In institutions that did not have academic deans or presidents, a person who held similar responsibilities to those of the president and/or dean
was selected to participate in the study. Three hundred ninety-six participants made up the final sample for the study.

Almost all respondents from each institutional category returned the questionnaire. It can be assumed, therefore, that the actual respondents represented well each institutional category. The respondents were informed that the purpose of the study was "to identify the most predominant mode of academic governance within their institution." A total of 312 usable questionnaires were returned, including 78 from presidents, 93 from deans, 74 from chairs, and 67 from faculty, for an overall response rate of 79%.

**Data Analysis**

As indicated previously, the goals of this study were two-fold: (a) to create a classification of colleges and universities based on academic governance, and (b) to examine academic organization as characterized by members of the college or university. The president, a dean, a chair and a faculty member from each institution were used as the objects in the cluster analysis. These members of the academy were selected because they are knowledgeable about academic organization. The attributes considered in this study included three organizational styles: bureaucratic, political, and collegial modes.

Therefore, three clusters were chosen to taxonomize the data.

The researcher used the frequency with which each organizational style was selected as the sample responded to the survey items. A matrix was then developed, and standardized
values were calculated by dividing the unstandardized values by the sum of all values of the ith attribute over all t objects. In defining cohesive groups, I used the conservative 70% rule, which meant that in order to classify an institution within a particular organizational frame the respondents had to pick 70% of the items representing a specific organizational model, such as the bureaucratic.

The method used to cluster analyze the data was the complete linkage clustering method (CLINK), which is also referred to as "the furthest neighbor method" [40]. A 9x3 matrix and the number of presidents, deans, chairs and faculty indicated a governance model as the cell metric. That is, nine types of colleges and universities were assessed by three attributes. Finally, the similarity index or resemblance coefficient used was the Kendal's Tau coefficient. The computed resemblance coefficient is Cjk = 0.92. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSSx [33].

Results

This section presents the data analyses in two segments: first, the data are broken down and analyzed within institutional category; that is presidents, deans, chairs and faculty within institutional category (RIU) are analyzed as a group; second, the data are broken down by presidents, deans, chairs, and faculty as separate groups and each subset is analyzed.

Analyses by Institutional Category

Overall, the cluster analysis shows that comprehensive I, liberal arts I, and research universities I are classified as
using mostly the collegial model. On the other hand, doctorate
I, liberal arts II, comprehensive II, doctorate II, research II
institutions, and community colleges clustered around the
bureaucratic model. Exhibit one illustrates how colleges and
universities from different institutional categories clustered.
Based on these analyses, some generalizations are made regarding
each institutions most predominant organizational pattern; the
following classification is presented.

Insert Exhibit 1 about here

Collegial Organization

Three types of institutions used predominantly the collegial
model of organization: Research I Universities (RIU), Liberal
Arts Colleges I (LACI), and Comprehensive Universities and
Colleges I (CUCI).

Examples of RIU institutions include Stanford University,
University of Michigan, and the University of Arizona. Overall,
the majority of presidents, deans, chairs and faculty described
their institutions operating within a collegial frame of
reference. This runs counter to Baldridge's (1978) assertion
that the political model describes colleges and universities; at
least in these institutions the political model does not fully
apply. However, this finding supports some of the literature in
that RIU institutions are governed mostly through collegial
mechanisms [26].
Liberal arts colleges I (LACI) also belong in the collegial classification. These colleges are presumed to be the most selective, prestigious or "elite" colleges. Examples of these colleges are Oberlin, Swarthmore, Carleton, and Bryn Mawr. The role of these colleges is to prepare students in the traditional arts and sciences for further specialized graduate training. Some institutions, however, have recently modified their missions to include more applied fields in their curriculum. Reasons for these changes have been financial problems [47], decline in enrollments [25], and societal changes such as high technology [19].

Finally, comprehensive universities and colleges I (CUCI) (e.g., San Diego State University, and Portland State University) are described by the majority of respondents as collegial organizations. These findings are in concurrence with those of other institutions in that administrators and faculty have the collegial frame in mind as they operate within their college or university. Moreover, the fact that presidents, deans, chairs and faculty think similarly about governance is not surprising, especially in small institutions such as those analyzed here. In fact, in small institutions the president, the dean, the chair, and the faculty are likely to meet frequently throughout the school year [16]. It has been also said that the opposite may be true in large institutions [8].
Bureaucratic Organizations

Research II universities, as well as doctorate-granting I and II institutions, are organized mostly around the bureaucratic model. Research II universities were expected to exhibit the same behaviors as with Research I universities. It was assumed that Research II universities have a strong research orientation and that such an orientation plays an influential role in their governance styles. Examples of this type of institution are the University of Kansas, Vanderbilt University, and the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. The data analysis from research II institutions indicate that these institutions follow mostly the bureaucratic model. It should be noted that all respondents from these type of institutions were divided in two groups: slightly more than half the participants described governance bureaucratic while the rest described governance as collegial.

Doctorate-granting universities I (DGUI), unlike some RUI and RUII institutions, are not generally considered flagship universities; their academic quality, however, ranks fairly high reputationally. Among these institutions are the University of Denver, Boston College, and the like. The data revealed that these institutions are clustered around the bureaucratic model. Similarly, the overall analysis of (DGII) doctorate-granting universities II (e.g., Illinois State University and Baylor University) also provided evidence that these colleges are clustered around the bureaucratic model.
Colleges and universities representative of comprehensive universities and colleges II were primarily classified as bureaucratic organizations. Institutions representative of this category are University of Tampa and Winston-Salem State University. This finding may be explained by the fact that CUCII colleges are even more dependent upon revenues from the state than other colleges or universities. The state, in turn, has more control over these institutions.

Liberal arts colleges II are religiously-affiliated and small in size. These colleges differ from the first group in their "lack of success" [1, p. 13]. Examples of these colleges include Dallas Baptist College, Mount Marty College, and Viterbo College. The most dominant cluster of individuals described university governance in terms of the bureaucratic model.

Finally, because community colleges were always the last to join other clusters, the researcher decided to analyze in more detail this group. Community colleges were defined as only those institutions that do not have a 4-year liberal arts program or a religious program of instruction [9]. This category included institutions such as Pima Community College and San Antonio College. The analysis within the community college group revealed only one strong cluster of individuals. Most of the respondents described their governing mechanisms rooted in the principles of the bureaucratic model. The other group of individuals identified somewhat with the political model of governance.
Analysis by Constituency

The classification presented above holds generally across respondent groups. However, some differences are observed within each group. This section presents analyses within subgroups. The same 9x3 matrix was used to cluster-analyze each subgroup. That is, nine groups of presidents were analyzed across three governing styles.

The presidents' data base consisted of 78 observations across colleges and universities. The analysis of these data produced three major clusters (see Exhibit 2). In the first cluster community colleges were grouped strongly around the bureaucratic model. Presidents of community colleges selected almost unanimously the bureaucratic model of governance as their most predominant mode of organization.

The second discernible group of colleges which consisted of doctorate II, liberal arts II, and comprehensive II universities, clustered also around the bureaucratic model of governance. Finally, research I, liberal arts I, research II, doctorate I, and comprehensive I colleges and universities clustered around the collegial model of governance. These institutions were characterized by their presidents as using the collegial model as the predominant mode of academic organization.

Insert Exhibit 2 about here

Deans also described the predominant governance style of their college or university rather than their own governance
style. Ninety-three subjects from all institutional categories formed the deans' data base. A complete linkage analysis of these data yielded three clusters (see Exhibit 3).

The first group of institutions clustered around the collegial model of governance. Institutions in this group included research I, liberal arts I, comprehensive I, and doctorate I colleges and universities. Most deans described their college governance as being rooted in the principle of collegiality.

The second cluster included comprehensive II, liberal arts II, research II, and doctorate II colleges and universities. These institutions were clustered around the bureaucratic model of college governance. Nonetheless, comprehensive II, and research II colleges and universities displayed a strong political orientation in their governing characteristics. The third group—community colleges clustered strongly around the bureaucratic frame of reference.

Insert Exhibit 3 about here

The analysis of the chairpersons' data included 74 subjects across institution categories. Overall, they described their governance as being mostly bureaucratic. In fact, comprehensive I and II, community colleges, liberal arts colleges II and doctorate-granting institutions II clustered around the bureaucratic model (see Exhibit 4). Research I doctorate-granting I and liberal arts colleges I were clustered around the
collegial frame of reference. The only institutions not clustered in either group were research II universities. However, these institutions were described by chairs as mostly bureaucratic.

____________________________________________________

Insert Exhibit 4 about here

____________________________________________________

The complete linkage analysis on faculty members (N = 67) suggested three clusters. The first cluster included research I and liberal arts colleges I--institutions grouped under the collegial model of governance. The second cluster including research II, comprehensive I and II and liberal arts colleges II suggested that such institutions use predominantly the bureaucratic frame of reference as their governing model. Unlike presidents, deans, or chairs, faculty within doctorate II, community colleges, and doctorate I, described their governing mechanisms as following the principles of the political model. Exhibit five shows the cluster pertaining to this section.

____________________________________________________

Insert Exhibit 5 about here

____________________________________________________

Findings and Conclusions

This study was an exploratory comparative organization analysis of nine different categories of institutions of higher education. Presidents, deans, chairpersons and faculty were the main sources of information; the college or university was the unit of analysis. Analyses were done across and within institutional categories.
In summary, one of the objectives of this study was to test a taxonomy of institutions of higher education based on governing mechanisms. The taxonomy assumed that three levels of organization existed, including political, bureaucratic, and collegial. The outcome of this study revealed that a modified taxonomy is present. In the overall analysis, it was discovered that two basic categories are evident: collegial and bureaucratic. The political model was not as readily accepted as a predominant model of academic governance.

Still, there is enough evidence to conclude that the collegial category includes research I universities, liberal arts colleges I, and comprehensive universities and colleges I. Furthermore, the bureaucratic category included research II universities, doctorate-granting I and II institutions, liberal arts colleges II, and two-year colleges. It should be noted, however, that more research is needed to confirm further this taxonomy.

The overall classification appears to be intuitively correct on both research grounds and observed practices. For example, some research has demonstrated that research universities are governed using mostly the collegial model [26]. Moreover, it is common practice that in universities such as Stanford University, University of California-Berkeley, University of Michigan, and the University of Wisconsin the faculty are generally the policymakers for the university. It is also well known that these type of universities compete for and get grants and other
resources which make these universities less vulnerable to bureaucratic pressures from the political state.

On the other hand, universities classified as bureaucratic are mostly colleges and universities subject to more bureaucratic pressures from the state. Such institutions rely mostly on state subsidies for support and little grant money is obtained by the faculty. Furthermore, administrators tend to control the policymaking machinery more than faculty. In fact, in some institutions the dean handles faculty appointments and evaluations rather than consulting with his/her faculty. This administrative control, for example, is obvious in community colleges [39].

With regard to presidents across institutions, the predominant mode of academic organization described by presidents was the collegial governance model. This is evidenced even when within-category analyses were performed. They still have in their minds the utopian idea of a community of scholars governing their institutions [30]. Nonetheless, some presidents, mostly from two-year colleges and non-prestigious liberal arts colleges, indicated that institutional governance resembled mostly the bureaucratic model.

These findings reveal that presidents still perceive governance as being mostly collegial, which lends some support to the idea that presidents have little or no control over what goes on in academic areas [23]. Furthermore, the collegial view that presidents hold is in line with tradition, especially since the
American Association of University Professors (AAUP) declared that faculty members were more than simply employees of the university. Supposedly, decision making was largely in the hands of academic departments, and administrators were expected to serve the faculty by implementing faculty decisions [23].

The fact that presidents also perceive university governance as bureaucratic is in line with current pressures. Increasing demands for accountability and efficiency, the move toward state regulation and centralization of decision making, and the reduction of resources and student enrollment have had a tremendous impact on shared governance mechanisms [7]. These pressures may contribute to building more bureaucratic processes to govern and monitor the university closely.

As with presidents, deans across institutional categories revealed that the collegial frame of reference was the predominant model for academic organization. However, deans, unlike presidents, selected the bureaucratic and political models more frequently. Some institutions, primarily those which are heavily unionized, were clustered around the bureaucratic framework.

The historical evolution of the deanship may explain in part the bureaucratic view that deans hold. Deans were perceived to be an extension of the presidential role [27]. However, the responsibilities of the dean grew exponentially to include many other roles as colleges and universities expanded their missions and responsibilities [16, 31]. This growth of responsibilities
has led deans' positions to be considered as middle management positions [10]. Furthermore, deans do control budgets, they have veto power over appointments, they assign space, they approve proposals, they occupy hierarchical positions [26]. Therefore, deans may think that college governance is embedded in bureaucratic processes. The mere role of the office within organizational structures may contribute to this perception of college governance [14].

This study also provides evidence that generally chairs across institutions depicted college governance as being predominantly bureaucratic. Only research I, liberal arts I and doctorate-granting I institutions were depicted as predominantly collegial. This finding perhaps reflects on some of the responsibilities chairpersons handle. For example, academic departments are mostly affected by declining resources and those who chair departments have to cope with these problems [44]. Furthermore, chairs also manage the budget and paperwork which are monitored from the dean's office. They are not only budget managers but are leaders without authority. A chairperson is first among equals but a strong coalition of professors may make the chairperson's position unwanted.

On the other hand, faculty across institutions described their governance differently. Some depicted governance as following mostly the collegial principles of governance; while others saw governance as mostly bureaucratic. Nonetheless, faculty at doctorate I and II institutions and community colleges
described their governance as mostly political. These findings contradict the overall finding that collegiality was the most prevalent mode of college governance [18]. It does support the claim that the whole enterprise of higher education has become more costly and increasingly politicized [48].

Finally, studies should be conducted to investigate the specific organizational modes in which institutions were categorized. The sample size should be increased to obtain more reliable and generalizable results. A combination of survey and observational methods is advocated to study the academic governance of colleges and universities.
Exhibit 1

Cluster Analysis of Colleges and Universities Based on Presidents, Deans, Chairs and Faculty Descriptions of College Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE Label</th>
<th>Seq</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORAT2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPREHE2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORAT1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPREHE1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITI1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 2

Cluster Analysis of Colleges and Universities Based on Presidents' Views Across Institutions

Rescaled Distance Cluster Combine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE Label</th>
<th>Seq</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ART I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORATE I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPREHENS I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORATE II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ART II</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPREHENS II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY COLG</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Down) Number of Clusters (Across) Case Label and number
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Exhibit 3

Cluster Analysis of Colleges and Universities Based on Deans' Views Across Institutions

Rescaled Distance Cluster Combine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE Label</th>
<th>Seq</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPREHENS II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ART II</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORATE II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORATE I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPREHENS I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ART I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY COLG</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Down)* Number of Clusters  *(Across)* Case Label and number
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Down</th>
<th>Number of Clusters (Across) Case Label and Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>++-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liberal Art I
Doctorate I
Research I
Research II
Comprehens I
Comprehens II
Community Coll
Liberal Art II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>CASE SEFG</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rescaled Distance Cluster Combine

Complete Linkage Analysis of Chairs' Description of College Governance

Exhibit 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label Case</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Distance Cluster Combin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Linkage Analysis of Faculty's Descriptions of College Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1

**Reliability Coefficient by Type of Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research I</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral-Granting University I</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive-University I</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts I (Private)</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive-University I</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive-University (Private)</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Year College</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Composite coefficient .87

### Table 2

**Reliability Coefficients for Each Subscale Measured in the Survey Instrument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal processes</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

1. In describing faculty involvement in this institution, which of the following is the most accurate description.
   a. Coalitions of faculty with special interests have considerable influence in this institution; every attempt is made to satisfy their interests.
   b. This institution is run primarily by the administration; there is minimal faculty involvement in decision-making.
   c. Faculty and administration jointly run this institution; a representative kind of governance from both parties is usually worked out.

2. Circle the most accurate description of this institution's overall system of governance.
   a. The system of governance tends to be political; conflict among interests groups results in compromise.
   b. Governance of this institution is clearly in the hands of the administration.
   c. The system of governance is mostly collegial; governance is shared between faculty and administration.

3. Which of the following best represents institutional decision-making in your college or university?
   a. Formal decision making is limited by the political pressure and bargaining that groups can exert against institutional authorities.
   b. Decision-making processes are often highly bureaucratic.
   c. Decision-making processes are highly decentralized.
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