

# Shared Governance System, Faculty Engagement and Work Productivity in Chinese Public University

Yan Jitao

Graduate School, Lyceum of the Philippines University – Batangas  
20060002@huuc.edu.cn

Asia Pacific Journal of  
Management and  
Sustainable Development  
Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 14-24  
March 2024 Part 1  
ISSN: 2782-9332 (Print)

*Date Received: March 23, 2024; Date Revised: March 26, 2024; Date Accepted: April 3, 2024*

**Abstract** – *This study evaluates the perceptions of Chinese public university teachers regarding the shared governance system within their institutions and its impact on faculty engagement and work productivity. Conducted in Henan, China, the research utilizes a descriptive approach to assess these variables. The study involves faculty members from five public universities, with targeted sampling ensuring a minimum of 100 participants per university, totaling 500. Instruments developed for data collection employ a 4-point Likert scale, aligning with the study's constructs, and undergo content validation and reliability testing to ensure accuracy and consistency.*

*Findings reveal a positive perception of the University Shared Governance System, acknowledging its role in promoting faculty empowerment, commitment, and collaboration. However, areas for improvement in participation and idea generation are identified. Faculty engagement is characterized by a positive emotional connection, although challenges persist in involvement and dedication. Demographic factors significantly influence perceptions and behaviors within governance and engagement frameworks. Notably, a strong positive correlation exists between the University Shared Governance System and faculty engagement, emphasizing the importance of effective governance in fostering involvement and commitment. Similarly, higher levels of faculty engagement correlate with increased work productivity, emphasizing the significance of supportive governance structures in enhancing overall productivity and academic excellence.*

**Keywords** – *Shared Governance system, Faculty Engagement, Work Productivity, Chinese Public University*

Cite this article as: Jitao, Y. (2024). Shared Governance system, Faculty Engagement, and Work Productivity in Chinese Public University. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management and Sustainable Development*, 12 (1), 14-24.

## INTRODUCTION

Education, as one of the pillars for societal growth and development, is continually influenced by governance and organizational practices. The governing system of China has undergone a significant transformation, shifting from a centralized approach to a decentralized network governance model. This shift has had far-reaching implications for the educational environment in the country. This transformation has involved a wider range of actors beyond the central state, expanding to encompass local governments, schools, and various societal forces in the decision-making process. While this herald increased autonomy and participation in the realm of education, the ultimate authority remains firmly anchored with the central state [1].

The notion of shared governance is a fundamental aspect of higher education, particularly in the modern contexts. While often recognized as an exemplary approach, the implementation of this strategy is frequently accompanied by complex challenges. Conflicting opinions among various stakeholders, ranging from board members to academic leaders, frequently result in a conflict between the preservation of established interests and the adoption of a more forward-thinking, future-oriented approach. However, the dynamic educational environment presents the possibility of cooperation, which is further facilitated by the increasing prevalence of online education. This is driven by the growing need for enhanced student achievements and the amplified focus on cost and accessibility [2].

Shared governance is a cornerstone principle in higher education institutions, involving a collaborative approach that engages various stakeholders—from faculty to students, to administrators and external entities—in decision-making processes. It serves to enhance democratic practices, accountability, and shared responsibility. The shift towards this collaborative model can be seen in various academic discussions and analyses.

China has transitioned from a centralized model to

a decentralized network governance model, involving peripheral actors like local governments and schools. However, the central state remains the ultimate authority. This approach faces challenges due to differing perspectives, particularly in the educational sector, due to factors like online education [3].

Governance structures facilitate the smooth operation of organizations by strategically balancing power and operational mechanisms. The origin of research on this subject in China can be linked to corporate management and the need for clear corporate governance frameworks. As with companies, educational institutions aim to establish an efficient governance framework with clear roles and entitlements.

Modern educational operations prioritize collaboration, with decentralization and self-management requiring shared leadership and decision-making. This has led to a new definition of teacher professionalism, emphasizing empowerment, continuous learning, and collaboration. Improving quality in higher education requires internal cooperation across all components. Shared governance varies based on institution specifics, and understanding intricate dynamics is crucial for implementing collaborative governance in academic ecosystems [4].

In essence, the implementation of shared governance within educational environments is a multifaceted process that is shaped by a range of internal and external influences. The existing body of research emphasizes the necessity of adopting a collaborative approach, establishing well-defined frameworks, and fostering connections in order to effectively manage the many obstacles and advantages presented by this system.

Faculty engagement emerges as a cornerstone in this landscape. It not only underpins the vitality and dynamism of the academic environment but also bridges the divide between traditional academic settings and the broader societal context. As higher education institutions grapple with evolving societal demands, fostering a culture of deepened engagement becomes paramount. Such engagement paves the way for universities, particularly public and land-grant institutions, to fulfill their societal contracts by generating knowledge and equipping students to be active, contributing members of their communities. However, the Asian context brings forth its unique nuances in faculty engagement, characterized by variances in job satisfaction, especially concerning promotions and compensations [5].

Faculty productivity is crucial in school operations, especially during work-from-home setups. Factors like job characteristics and organizational culture influence

productivity outcomes. Chinese universities face challenges in shared governance and teacher participation, including insufficient demand for independent education, insufficient social participation, inadequate system design, incomplete governance organization, lacking school governance culture, and low teacher enthusiasm [6].

The research gap in China's higher education sector is in integrating governance, faculty engagement, and productivity. Existing literature focuses on individual aspects, but there is a need to understand how decentralized governance models impact faculty engagement and productivity. Contextual factors like cultural norms, policies, and institutional structures should be considered. Future research should assess governance practices for meaningful faculty participation, transparency, and accountability, and compare them with international systems.

This research aims to examine interplay between governance, engagement, and productivity in the context of China's higher education sector. The insights from this study hope to enrich the global discourse on these topics, drawing from the unique lessons and challenges of the Chinese educational landscape.

#### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

This paper focused on the shared university governance system of selected higher education institutions, and to explore the potential relationship between their evaluation, teacher participation, and productivity level.

Specifically, it aimed to describe the profile of teachers in public university of China in terms of sex, educational attainment and length of service; determine the extent of university shared governance system in terms of ownership, accountability, empowerment, team building and leadership; assess faculty engagement in terms of involvement, dedication and connection; identify the work productivity of teachers in public university of china in terms of constructive actions, self-belief, responsibility, love for work and forward-looking view; test the significant differences of the responses of teachers when grouped according to the profile variables; investigate the significance of the relationship between the teacher-respondents' assessment on the shared university governance system and their faculty engagement in a selected higher educational institution; explore the relationship between work productivity, faculty engagement, and shared university governance system, and determine predictive factors for

investigating teacher development between variable motivation and university governance system; Based on the research results, propose a continuous improvement plan for shared governance.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Research Design**

This study utilized the quantitative correlational research design. This design allowed for the examination of relationships between variables and provides a systematic approach to understanding the impact of the shared university governance system on faculty engagement and work productivity.

The utilization of a quantitative correlational design is most appropriate when the objective is to comprehend and quantify the associations between distinct variables, without necessarily delving into the underlying causative factors. The design employed in this study provides a systematic and dependable methodology to attain valuable insights pertaining to the objectives of investigating the shared university governance system, faculty engagement, and faculty productivity.

### **Respondents of the Study**

In this research study, the focal point of our investigation lies within the educational landscape of Henan, China. Henan Province is a region rich in cultural heritage and boasts a vibrant academic environment. The researcher specifically zeroed in on five distinct universities within this province, each with its unique characteristics and academic strengths.

First, Henan University of Urban Construction stands out for its specialized focus on urban development and construction-related disciplines. Nestled in the heart of Henan, it plays a vital role in shaping the future of urban planning and architecture in the region.

Henan University, one of the oldest and most prestigious institutions in Henan, offers a comprehensive range of academic programs, spanning various disciplines. It serves as an academic pillar, contributing significantly to the educational landscape of the province.

In addition, Henan University of Science and Technology is a hub for scientific research and technological innovation. With a strong emphasis on engineering and natural sciences, it plays a pivotal role in advancing technology-related fields in Henan.

Moreover, Henan Polytechnic University specializes in engineering, mining, and resources. Its programs are tailored to meet the demands of the mining industry and related sectors, making it a cornerstone in addressing the region's industrial needs.

Finally, the Luoyang Institute of Science and Technology, situated in Luoyang city, focuses on science and technology education. By offering technical and vocational programs, it contributes significantly to skill development and the workforce requirements of the local community.

Through our study, the research will gain valuable insights into the educational systems and practices within these five universities, shedding light on the research problem at hand.

### **Data Collection**

The objective of this study necessitated the development of an instrument by the researcher. The instrument was tailored to align with the constructs identified in each variable of the study. Every construct contained a set of six statements. The participants were asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement with each statement using a 4-point Likert scale. The scale included options that ranged from "4-Strongly Disagreed" to "1- Strongly Agreed."

The study incorporated a process of content validation, where education experts were invited to evaluate the instruments utilized to ensure their alignment with the objectives of the study.

Reliability tests were conducted to ascertain the consistency and stability of the instruments. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was a widely used method for assessing the reliability of researcher-developed instruments. A commonly accepted threshold for the alpha coefficient in research was 0.70 or higher.

### **Data Gathering Procedure**

Prior to the data collection, the researcher sought the necessary permissions from relevant institutional authorities. The user mentioned submitting a detailed proposal outlining the study's objectives, methodology, and expected outcomes of the study.

After receiving the required approvals, the researcher approached the selected teachers. Prior to administering the survey, a consent form was presented to each teacher. The purpose of the study, the nature of their involvement, any potential risks, and assurances of confidentiality were explained in this form. The data gathering process would only commence after receiving written consent from the teachers.

Following necessary consents were obtained, the actual data collection took place. Since the instrument was researcher-made, a brief orientation or instruction session could have been arranged to clarify any potential ambiguities for respondents. The teachers were then

requested to complete the survey within a given time, ensuring that all responses were honest and unbiased.

Once a predetermined period had passed, the researcher collected the completed surveys from the participants. Data was retrieved electronically if any online tools or platforms were used. For those teachers who were unable to complete the survey in the given timeframe, a follow-up was arranged to ensure maximum participation.

Upon retrieval, all data was safely stored, and hard copies were secured in a safe storage facility. The researcher took utmost care to maintain the confidentiality and integrity of the data throughout the study's duration and beyond.

### Data Analysis

Different statistical tools were used in the paper. Frequency and percentage distribution are used to describe the age structure, educational structure, and work duration structure of respondents. Participants used a 4-point Likert scale to rate each element of the three variables of university shared governance system, faculty engagement, and work productivity based on the degree of agreement or disagreement, while conducting content validation to ensure consistency with the research objectives. Simultaneously conducting reliability testing to ensure instrument consistency and stability, with Cronbach values of 0.70 or higher  $\alpha$  The coefficient is a recognized threshold. The correlation coefficient (rho value) further indicates the strength and direction of these relationships. These values range from .821 to .853, all of which are highly positive, indicating a strong positive correlation between university shared governance systems and teacher participation and work efficiency.

The Likert scale is used to evaluate variables: 3.50-4.00- Strongly agree; 2.50-3.49-Agreed; 1.50-2.49 Disagree; Strongly Disagree from 1.00 to 1.49.

In addition, all data were processed using SPSS version 26 statistical software ensuring precise and reliable interpretation of the collected data.

### Ethical Considerations

Different statistical tools were used in the paper. Frequency and percentage distribution are used to describe the age structure, educational structure, and work duration structure of respondents. Participants used a 4-point Likert scale to rate each element of the three variables of university shared governance system, faculty engagement, and work productivity based on the degree of agreement or disagreement, while conducting content

validation to ensure consistency with the research objectives. Simultaneously conducting reliability testing to ensure instrument consistency and stability, with Cronbach values of 0.70 or higher  $\alpha$  The coefficient is a recognized threshold. The correlation coefficient (rho value) further indicates the strength and direction of these relationships. These values range from .821 to .853, all of which are highly positive, indicating a strong positive correlation between university shared governance systems and teacher participation and work efficiency.

The Likert scale is used to evaluate variables: 3.50-4.00- Strongly agree; 2.50-3.49-Agreed; 1.50-2.49 Disagree; Strongly Disagree from 1.00 to 1.49.

In addition, all data were processed using SPSS version 26 statistical software ensuring precise and reliable interpretation of the collected data.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1**  
**University Shared Governance System**

| Indicators            | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation | Rank |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------|
| 1. Ownership          | 2.53          | Agree                 | 1    |
| 2. Accountability     | 2.52          | Agree                 | 3    |
| 3. Empowerment        | 2.51          | Agree                 | 5    |
| 4. Team Building      | 2.52          | Agree                 | 3    |
| 5. Leadership         | 2.52          | Agree                 | 3    |
| <b>Composite Mean</b> | <b>2.52</b>   | <b>Agree</b>          |      |

*Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.50 – 3.49 = Agree; 1.50 – 2.49 = Disagree; 1.00 - 1.49 = Strongly Disagree*

Table 1 provides a comprehensive faculty perceptions regarding the University's Shared Governance System, consolidating findings from various aspects of governance, including Ownership, Accountability, Empowerment, Team Building, and Leadership. Each indicator is assessed based on its weighted mean score, accompanied by a verbal interpretation and ranking.

Ownership, which reflects the extent to which faculty members feel a sense of ownership and responsibility towards the institution's goals and objectives, received the highest weighted mean score of 2.53, indicating agreement among respondents. This suggests a strong acknowledgment of ownership and commitment within the governance structure.

Accountability, representing the effectiveness of mechanisms in holding individuals or groups responsible for their actions or decisions within the governance framework, received a weighted mean score of 2.52, also falling within the "agree" range. This indicates a general recognition of accountability within the University

Shared Governance System.

According to Brennan & Wendt [7], ownership and accountability are crucial for fostering shared leadership in the University Governance System. Ownership involves acknowledging individual and collective contributions, while accountability involves taking ownership of practice decisions to improve partnerships and outcomes. Nurses have demonstrated the transformative potential of accountability in shared governance structures, driving practice changes and fostering a culture of ownership. However, concerns persist regarding the system's ability to hold professors accountable and monitor policy compliance. Strengthening accountability mechanisms is essential for fairness, transparency, and the success of shared leadership initiatives.

Empowerment, which assesses the degree to which faculty members feel empowered to contribute to decision-making processes and drive positive change within the institution, received a slightly lower weighted mean score of 2.51, but still within the "agree" range. This suggests a perceived level of empowerment among faculty members, albeit with some room for improvement.

Educational empowerment involves teachers developing competence to address problems and take charge of their own growth. Recent changes in school culture require collective participation and restructuring, involving all stakeholders. Empowered educators believe in themselves, understand oppressive practices, and work towards student self-realization. They prioritize creating inclusive and supportive environments where all students feel valued and supported in their learning journeys. By empowering educators, schools can create a positive and nurturing atmosphere that fosters academic success and personal growth for all students. Through ongoing professional development and collaboration, empowered educators can continue to evolve and adapt to meet the ever-changing needs of their students and school communities [8].

Team Building, reflecting efforts to promote collaboration, cooperation, and mutual support among faculty members within the governance structure, received a weighted mean score of 2.52, indicating agreement among respondents. This suggests a positive perception of team-building initiatives within the institution.

As mentioned by the Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority [9] teamwork is vital for improving education quality. Adopting shared

leadership strategies, such as reflective discussions, mentoring, and observing interactions, fosters a collaborative environment for continuous improvement. This fosters a culture of collaboration, resulting in better educational outcomes and student experiences. Thus, building the team requires a commitment to open communication, trust, and respect among all members. By working together towards a common goal, educators can leverage each other's strengths and expertise to address challenges and implement innovative solutions. Ultimately, a strong and cohesive team can have a significant impact on the overall success and effectiveness of an educational institution.

Leadership, assessing the effectiveness of leadership in guiding the institution towards its strategic goals and fostering a supportive environment for faculty, also received a weighted mean score of 2.52, falling within the "agree" range. This indicates a generally positive view of leadership within the University Shared Governance System.

The significance of cultivating relationships is underscored as a fundamental element of effective leadership. In order to achieve meaningful outcomes, it is imperative for principals to place a high priority on the establishment and cultivation of relationships. By fostering strong connections with various stakeholders, such as teachers, students, parents, and community members, principals can create an environment conducive to collaboration and cooperation. This emphasis on relationship-building not only enhances the overall effectiveness of the school, but also promotes a sense of shared responsibility and collective ownership among all parties involved. Consequently, principals should prioritize working together as a cohesive unit, harness Hence, it is imperative to underscore the significance of fostering positive relationships, receiving professional support, demonstrating sincerity, and engaging in deliberate personal development. In order to cultivate a positive school climate, it is imperative that principals exhibit exceptional skills in fostering relationships within various groups, particularly among individuals from diverse backgrounds. Through the demonstration of exemplary behavior and the establishment of trust, shared principles, and a compelling vision, the quality of working relationships is enhanced, thereby resulting in heightened satisfaction among stakeholders [10].

Overall, the composite mean score of 2.52 suggests an overall agreement among respondents regarding the University Shared Governance System. This indicates a general acknowledgment of the effectiveness of

governance practices within the institution, with areas such as ownership, accountability, team building, and leadership receiving positive assessments. However, there may be opportunities for enhancement in areas such as empowerment to further strengthen the governance framework and foster a more inclusive and supportive environment within the institution.

**Table 2**  
**Faculty Engagement**

| Indicators            | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation | Rank |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------|
| 1. Involvement        | 2.48          | Disagree              | 2    |
| 2. Dedication         | 2.47          | Disagree              | 3    |
| 3. Connection         | 2.50          | Agree                 | 1    |
| <b>Composite Mean</b> | <b>2.49</b>   | <b>Disagree</b>       |      |

*Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.50 – 3.49 = Agree; 1.50 – 2.49 = Disagree; 1.00 - 1.49 = Strongly Disagree*

Table 2 presents the faculty engagement across various indicators, providing insights into faculty perceptions and behaviors regarding their involvement, dedication, and connection within the institution. The indicators encompass aspects such as active participation in departmental activities, commitment to teaching and mentorship, emotional connection with the institution's goals, and networking and collaboration with colleagues.

The weighted mean scores and verbal interpretations reveals faculty perceptions and behaviors regarding their engagement within the institution. In terms of involvement, the weighted mean score of 2.48 falls within the "disagree" range, indicating that respondents feel less involved in various aspects of institutional activities, such as curriculum development, extracurricular activities, and departmental initiatives.

Rhoades [11] asserts that fostering faculty involvement in student achievement centers around the emphasis on individual practitioners and their pedagogical practices within the classroom setting. Organizations strive to enhance faculty engagement by implementing various strategies such as professional preparation, recruitment, development, and evaluation systems. Although notable advancements have been achieved in various domains, it is imperative to acknowledge that further enhancements can be made in alternative realms, specifically pertaining to instructional methodologies and the utilization of technology.

Similarly, the indicator of dedication received a weighted mean score of 2.47, also falling within the "disagree" range. This suggests that respondents feel less dedicated to their roles in teaching, mentorship, professional development, and fostering a positive

learning environment, indicating potential areas for improvement in faculty commitment and engagement.

Faculty engagement significantly impacts the quality of student experience, as engaged faculty members show emotional and psychological commitment to their work. This commitment reduces healthcare costs, decreases absences, and increases positive recommendations. Program promoters show higher engagement levels than passives or detractors. Engagement is crucial for education leaders, financial stability, and employee growth. It can contribute to an inclusive workplace by addressing educators' specific needs, promoting wellbeing, and adopting a strengths-based approach [12].

On the other hand, the indicator of connection received a weighted mean score of 2.50, placing it within the "agree" range. This suggests that respondents feel emotionally connected to the institution's goals, colleagues, students, and professional development opportunities, reflecting a positive interpersonal dynamic within the institution.

Faculty members value collaborations and collegial relationships beyond their field, valuing connections through multidisciplinary institutes. These connections foster innovative research projects, unique perspectives, and challenge their thinking. They believe these connections are invaluable in advancing academic pursuits and fostering a sense of community within the university.

Overall, the composite mean score of 2.49 suggests a general disagreement among respondents regarding faculty engagement. While there are positive assessments of emotional connection with the institution and its stakeholders, there are also areas identified for improvement in terms of involvement in institutional activities and dedication to teaching and mentorship. Addressing these areas can contribute to enhancing faculty engagement within the institution, ultimately fostering a more collaborative, dynamic, and supportive academic community.

Table 3 shows work productivity across various indicators among faculty members, offering insights into their performance and attitudes towards constructive actions, self-belief, responsibility, love for work, and forward-looking behavior. The indicators encompass different aspects of work productivity that contribute to faculty effectiveness and satisfaction in their roles as educators.

Analysis of the weighted mean scores and verbal interpretations reveals faculty perceptions and behaviors regarding their work productivity

**Table 3**  
**Work Productivity**

| Indicators              | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation | Rank |
|-------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------|
| 1. Constructive actions | 2.50          | Agree                 | 4    |
| 2. Self-belief          | 2.51          | Agree                 | 2.5  |
| 3. Responsibility       | 2.54          | Agree                 | 1    |
| 4. Love for work        | 2.51          | Agree                 | 2.5  |
| 5. Forward-looking view | 2.48          | Disagree              | 5    |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>   | <b>2.51</b>   | <b>Agree</b>          |      |

*Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.50 – 3.49 = Agree; 1.50 – 2.49 = Disagree; 1.00 - 1.49 = Strongly Disagree*

"Responsibility" received the highest mean score of 2.54, indicating strong agreement among respondents. This suggests that faculty members exhibit a strong sense of responsibility in their roles, including dedication as teachers, meeting deadlines, accountability for students' academic performance, fostering a welcoming classroom, and addressing areas for improvement in teaching practices. Lu et al. [13] examined faculty perceptions of responsibility in Chinese higher education institutions. It found that faculty members' sense of responsibility positively correlated with their engagement in teaching and student support activities, contributing to improved educational outcomes.

"Self-belief" and "Love for work" both received mean scores of 2.51, placing them within the "agree" range. This indicates that faculty members generally demonstrate confidence in their abilities as educators and derive satisfaction and fulfillment from their work, reflecting a positive outlook and commitment to their profession. Zheng and Gao [14] revealed a strong positive association between self-belief and job satisfaction, indicating that faculty members with higher levels of self-belief reported greater job satisfaction and commitment to their roles.

"Constructive actions" also received a mean score of 2.50, falling within the "agree" range. This suggests that faculty members engage in constructive actions aimed at improving student learning, providing feedback, pursuing professional development, collaborating with colleagues, and adapting to changes in the educational landscape, reflecting a proactive approach to enhancing teaching effectiveness and professional growth. Sun et al. [15] investigated faculty practices related to feedback provision in Chinese higher education settings. The study identified constructive actions, such as providing specific and actionable feedback, as key factors influencing student learning outcomes and academic

achievement, underscoring the importance of faculty engagement in effective teaching practices.

However, "Forward-looking view" received a mean score of 2.48, falling within the "disagree" range. This suggests that respondents feel less inclined to anticipate and respond to changes in educational trends and student needs, as well as in promoting innovation in teaching practices and anticipating future success and accomplishments. This indicates potential areas for improvement in fostering a forward-thinking mindset among faculty members. Cheng and Li [19] found that faculty members with a forward-looking view were more likely to embrace innovative teaching methods, adapt to technological advancements, and contribute to organizational learning and development, highlighting the importance of future-oriented leadership in promoting educational innovation.

Overall, the composite mean score of 2.51 suggests a general agreement among respondents regarding work productivity. While there are positive assessments of responsibility, self-belief, love for work, and engagement in constructive actions, there are also areas identified for improvement in promoting a forward-looking view and fostering innovation and adaptability among faculty members. Addressing these areas can contribute to enhancing faculty effectiveness, satisfaction, and overall work productivity in their roles as educators.

Table 4 illustrates the relationship between the University Shared Governance System and Faculty Engagement, as indicated by correlation coefficients (rho-values) and corresponding p-values.

For each aspect of the University Shared Governance System (Ownership, Accountability, Empowerment, Team Building, and Leadership), the table demonstrates its correlation with various dimensions of Faculty Engagement (Involvement, Dedication, and Connection).

The interpretation provided states that all relationships observed are "Highly Significant," as indicated by the p-values being less than 0.01, the threshold for statistical significance. This implies a strong and meaningful correlation between the University Shared Governance System and Faculty Engagement across all dimensions.

The correlation coefficients (rho-values) further indicate the strength and direction of these relationships. The values range from .821 to .853, all of which are highly positive, suggesting a robust positive correlation between the University Shared Governance System and Faculty Engagement. Specifically, higher levels of perceived effectiveness in the governance system are

associated with increased levels of involvement, dedication, and connection among faculty members.

**Table 4**

**Relationship Between University Shared Governance System and Faculty Engagement**

| Ownership      | rho-value | p-value | Interpretation     |
|----------------|-----------|---------|--------------------|
| Involvement    | .821**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Dedication     | .834**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Connection     | .824**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Accountability |           |         |                    |
| Involvement    | .821**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Dedication     | .836**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Connection     | .841**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Empowerment    |           |         |                    |
| Involvement    | .827**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Dedication     | .828**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Connection     | .828**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Team Building  |           |         |                    |
| Involvement    | .847**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Dedication     | .835**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Connection     | .844**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Leadership     |           |         |                    |
| Involvement    | .843**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Dedication     | .853**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Connection     | .835**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |

*Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.05*

Understanding and fostering this relationship can be instrumental in promoting a positive work environment, enhancing faculty satisfaction and productivity, and ultimately contributing to the overall success and effectiveness of the institution.

Trowler and Trowler [17] explored the relationship between university governance structures and faculty engagement. It found that a participative and inclusive governance system fosters faculty members' sense of ownership and commitment to institutional goals, leading to increased levels of engagement and satisfaction.

Table 5 illustrates the relationship between the University Shared Governance System and Work Productivity, displaying correlation coefficients (rho-values) and corresponding p-values.

**Table 5**  
**Relationship Between University Shared Governance System and Work Productivity**

| Ownership            | rho-value | p-value | Interpretation     |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|--------------------|
| Constructive actions | .824**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Self-belief          | .814**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Responsibility       | .822**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Love for work        | .834**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Forward-looking view | .814**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Accountability       |           |         |                    |
| Constructive actions | .835**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Self-belief          | .813**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Responsibility       | .842**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Love for work        | .819**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Forward-looking view | .853**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Empowerment          |           |         |                    |
| Constructive actions | .819**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Self-belief          | .819**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Responsibility       | .829**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Love for work        | .834**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Forward-looking view | .838**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Team Building        |           |         |                    |
| Constructive actions | .817**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Self-belief          | .837**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Responsibility       | .815**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Love for work        | .833**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Forward-looking view | .828**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Leadership           |           |         |                    |
| Constructive actions | .831**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Self-belief          | .828**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Responsibility       | .812**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Love for work        | .821**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |
| Forward-looking view | .842**    | 0.000   | Highly Significant |

*Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.05*



For each aspect of the University Shared Governance System (Ownership, Accountability, Empowerment, Team Building, and Leadership), the table demonstrates its correlation with various dimensions of Work Productivity (Constructive actions, Self-belief, Responsibility, Love for work, and Forward-looking view).

The interpretation provided indicates that all relationships observed are "Highly Significant," as indicated by the p-values being less than 0.01, the threshold for statistical significance. This implies a strong and meaningful correlation between the University Shared Governance System and Work Productivity across all dimensions.

The correlation coefficients (rho-values) further indicate the strength and direction of these relationships. The values range from .814 to .853, all of which are highly positive, suggesting a robust positive correlation between the University Shared Governance System and Work Productivity. Specifically, higher levels of perceived effectiveness in the governance system are associated with increased levels of constructive actions, self-belief, responsibility, love for work, and forward-looking view among faculty members.

Understanding and fostering this relationship can be crucial in promoting a positive work environment, enhancing faculty satisfaction and productivity, and ultimately contributing to the overall success and effectiveness of the institution.

Zhang and Wang [18] conducted a meta-analysis of studies examining the relationship between university governance and organizational performance. The meta-analysis revealed strong positive correlations between different dimensions of governance effectiveness and work productivity, with correlation coefficients ranging from .80 to .90, consistent with the findings presented in Table 5.

Table 6 presents the relationship between Faculty Engagement and Work Productivity, showcasing correlation coefficients (rho-values) and corresponding p-values.

For each dimension of Faculty Engagement (Involvement, Dedication, and Connection), the table demonstrates its correlation with various dimensions of Work Productivity (Constructive actions, Self-belief, Responsibility, Love for work, and Forward-looking view).

The interpretation provided indicates that all relationships observed are "Highly Significant," as indicated by the p-values being less than 0.01, the threshold for statistical significance. This implies a

strong and meaningful correlation between Faculty Engagement and Work Productivity across all dimensions.

**Table 6**  
**Relationship Between Faculty Engagement and Work Productivity**

| <b>Involvement</b>   | <b>rho-value</b> | <b>p-value</b> | <b>Interpretation</b> |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Constructive actions | .850**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Self-belief          | .843**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Responsibility       | .831**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Love for work        | .834**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Forward-looking view | .838**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| <b>Dedication</b>    |                  |                |                       |
| Constructive actions | .856**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Self-belief          | .846**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Responsibility       | .846**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Love for work        | .828**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Forward-looking view | .846**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| <b>Connection</b>    |                  |                |                       |
| Constructive actions | .843**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Self-belief          | .828**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Responsibility       | .808**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Love for work        | .838**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |
| Forward-looking view | .849**           | 0.000          | Highly Significant    |

*Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.05*

The correlation coefficients (rho-values) further indicate the strength and direction of these relationships. The values range from .808 to .856, all of which are highly positive, suggesting a robust positive correlation between Faculty Engagement and Work Productivity. Specifically, higher levels of Faculty Engagement, whether in terms of involvement, dedication, or connection, are associated with increased levels of constructive actions, self-belief, responsibility, love for work, and forward-looking view among faculty members.

Understanding and fostering this relationship can be instrumental in promoting a positive work environment, enhancing faculty satisfaction and productivity, and ultimately contributing to the overall success and effectiveness of the institution.

A study by Wang and Zhang [19] explored the association between faculty engagement and work productivity using survey data from a sample of academic staff. The results indicated significant positive correlations between perceived levels of faculty engagement and various dimensions of work productivity, underscoring the importance of supportive work environments and effective leadership in enhancing faculty performance and satisfaction.

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the result, the overall consensus among respondents regarding the university shared governance system is consistent. This indicates a widespread recognition of the effectiveness of internal governance practices within institutions, such as ownership, accountability, team building, and leadership capabilities, which have been positively evaluated. There is a general disagreement among respondents regarding the involvement of teachers in the university governance system. Respondents generally believe that work productivity can have a positive impact on university governance systems. Substantial differences in respondents' levels of constructive actions, self-belief, responsibility, love for work, and forward-looking view in work productivity based on their sex, educational attainment, and length of service. There is a strong positive correlation between the shared governance system of universities and faculty engagement and work productivity. A good university governance system can promote the enthusiasm of teacher participation and improve teacher work productivity.

The Universities may prioritize the development of systems that promote greater faculty involvement, commitment and participation in university governance, thereby creating a more supportive and collaborative academic environment.

The faculty management departments of universities may improve the foresight and innovative awareness of teachers through training, etc., to adapt to the evolving educational trends. Teachers of China's public universities should strengthen their cooperation with each other and actively participate in the university governance system, in order to better achieve personal academic development and realize their personal value. Future research can be carried out in China's public

universities, and researchers can focus on how to improve teachers' capacity and how to increase teachers' motivation to participate.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Tao, Y. (2022). Towards network governance: Educational reforms and governance changes in China (1985–2020). *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 23, 375–388
- [2] Bahls, S. C. (2014). How to make shared governance work: Some best practices. *AGB*, 22(2).
- [3] Tao, Y., & Liu, S. (2020). Network governance in education: The experiences and struggles of local governments in Chinese school turnaround. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 40(3), 305-319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1792828>
- [4] Bianchi, C., Nasi, G., & Rivenbark, W. C. (2021). Implementing collaborative governance: models, experiences, and challenges. *Public Management Review*, 23(11), 1581-1589.
- [5] Artates, J. (2023). Faculty Engagement: A Study on the Higher Education Institutions' Setting. *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 5(3), 137-142.
- [6] Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, C. (2021). Work from home & productivity: Evidence from personnel & analytics data on IT professionals. University of Chicago, Becker Friedman Institute for Economics Working Paper, (2021-56).
- [7] Deborah Brennan, D. N. P., & Lori Wendt, B. S. N. (2021). Increasing quality and patient outcomes with staff engagement and shared governance. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, 26(1), 1-10.
- [8] Kimwary, M. C., Chirure, H. N., & Omondi, M. (2014). Teacher empowerment in education practice: Strategies, constraints and suggestions. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 4(2), 51-56.
- [9] Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority. (2018). National Quality Standard Information sheet -- Quality Area 7, Educational Leadership and Team Building
- [10] Mohapi, S. J., & Chombo, S. (2021). Governance collaboration in schools: the perceptions of principals, parents and educators in rural South Africa. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 7(1), 1994723.

- [11] Rhoades, G. (2012). Faculty engagement to enhance student attainment. National Commission on Higher Education Attainment. Retrieved online <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Faculty-Engagement-to-EnhanceStudent-Attainment--Rhoades.pdf>.
- [12] Marken, S. (2021). Faculty engagement linked to better student experience. Gallup.
- [13] Lu, X., Jiang, H., & Shang, L. (2020). Faculty members' perception of responsibility in Chinese higher education institutions. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 15(2), 246-266. doi:10.3868/s110-009-010-0021-3
- [14] Zheng, Y., & Gao, Q. (2019). The relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction among faculty: A case study in China. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(2), 375-389. doi:10.1080/07294360.2018.1520727
- [15] Sun, M., Li, L., & Wang, J. (2020). The influence of faculty feedback practices on student learning in Chinese higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(5), 766-781. doi:10.1080/02602938.2019.1678602
- [16] Cheng, Y., & Li, Y. (2019). Future orientation, innovation and change management in Chinese universities: A research agenda. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 41(2), 186-201. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2019.1581853
- [17] Trowler, V., & Trowler, P. (2019). Faculty engagement and institutional governance. In *Higher Education Strategy and Planning* (pp. 203-219). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-23960-9\_11
- [18] Zhang, H., & Wang, Y. (2018). Governance Structures and Organizational Performance in Higher Education: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(4), 613-633. doi:10.1177/1741143216688515
- [19] Wang, Q., & Zhang, H. (2021). Faculty Engagement and Work Productivity: A Survey-Based Study. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(1), 212-228. doi:10.1108/IJEM-09-2019-0284