

Understanding Faculty Go-Slow Behavior and its Effects on Teaching and Student Academic Outcome in Higher Education: Evidence from Nimba University

¹Melvin L. Yealu., ²Edwin Yeliky Gonquoi

¹Department of Administration, Nimba University, Liberia

²Department of Academic Affairs, Nimba University, Liberia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1307000049>

Received: 10 July 2026; Accepted: 16 July 2026; Published: 25 July 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the determinants of faculty go-slow actions at Nimba University and their implications for the teaching-learning process and student academic outcomes. Using a cross-sectional survey design, primary data were collected from 17 faculty members and 235 students, drawn from a target population of 92 faculty and 1,612 students. Descriptive statistics and a one-sample chi-square goodness-of-fit test were used to analyze responses. Findings revealed that go-slow actions are driven primarily by institutional and relational grievances rather than economic factors: near-unanimous agreement that such actions respond to unresolved grievances (94.1%, $\chi^2(1) = 13.24$, $p < .001$) and poor working conditions (88.2%, $p = .002$) reached statistical significance, whereas delayed salary payment did not ($p = .134$). Students reported substantial disruption to teaching and learning, including reduced lecture hours, delayed feedback, and limited lecturer-student interaction (all $p < .001$), alongside significant academic harm in the form of comprehension difficulties, knowledge gaps, and reduced motivation. However, effects on overall academic performance and academic experience were not statistically significant, indicating divided student perceptions. The study concludes that faculty go-slow behavior at Nimba University stems chiefly from institutional governance failures rather than compensation alone, and recommends improved working conditions, communication, shared governance, and grievance-resolution mechanisms to safeguard instructional quality.

Keywords: faculty go-slow action; teaching-learning process; student academic outcomes; higher education governance

INTRODUCTION

Higher education plays a pivotal role in national development through the preparation of skilled human capital, the advancement of knowledge, and the promotion of socio-economic transformation. In the context of developing countries such as Liberia, universities are expected to serve as engines of growth by producing competent graduates and supporting national development agendas. However, the effectiveness of higher education systems depends largely on the commitment, motivation, and productivity of academic staff. As noted by Altbach (2011), the quality of higher education is fundamentally shaped by the strength and stability of its academic workforce.

Despite this critical role, higher education institutions in Liberia have increasingly faced challenges related to faculty dissatisfaction and declining instructional commitment. One manifestation of this challenge is the emergence of faculty go-slow actions, a form of industrial behavior in which lecturers deliberately reduce teaching effort, limit classroom engagement, or temporarily withdraw instructional services in response to unresolved grievances.

The literature suggests that such actions are not arbitrary but are influenced by identifiable structural and behavioral factors. Economic conditions, particularly delayed salaries, inadequate remuneration, and limited incentives, are frequently cited as primary triggers of faculty dissatisfaction (Goeddeke & Mueller, 2010; Follo

& Huelskamp, 2023). In addition, institutional factors such as poor governance, lack of transparency, and limited participation in decision-making processes further exacerbate tensions between faculty and university administrations (Liberian Investigators, 2025). These challenges are particularly pronounced in resource-constrained environments where institutional support systems are weak.

Theoretical perspectives also provide insight into this phenomenon. Victor Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory posits that employee performance declines when there is a mismatch between effort, rewards, and expected outcomes. Similarly, studies on teacher effectiveness emphasize that motivation and working conditions are central to instructional quality (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2006). When these conditions are unfavorable, faculty members are more likely to withdraw effort, leading to reduced teaching effectiveness.

Faculty go-slow actions have significant implications for the teaching and learning process. They disrupt academic calendars, reduce lecturer-student contact hours, and often result in incomplete syllabus coverage. The importance of sustained interaction in promoting learning has been emphasized by Hattie (2008), who identifies faculty engagement as a major determinant of student achievement. Likewise, Lev Vygotsky (1978) highlights the role of continuous social interaction in cognitive development. Disruptions in teaching, therefore, create gaps in knowledge acquisition, reduce student engagement, and ultimately weaken academic performance.

Empirical evidence further suggests that prolonged industrial actions in higher education negatively affect student outcomes and academic progression (Jacquemin et al., 2019). However, while these studies provide valuable insights, there remains limited empirical research examining the specific dynamics of faculty go-slow actions within the Liberian context, particularly in emerging rural universities such as Nimba University.

Against this background, this study seeks to examine the determinants of faculty go-slow actions and their implications for teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes at Nimba University.

Statement of the Problem

Despite ongoing efforts by the Government of Liberia to strengthen higher education through expansion policies and institutional reforms, significant challenges persist in ensuring effective teaching and learning within public universities. One critical yet underexplored issue is the increasing incidence of faculty go-slow actions, which continue to disrupt academic activities and undermine educational quality.

Existing literature provides substantial evidence on the determinants of faculty industrial actions, particularly within the broader framework of strikes and work stoppages. Economic factors have been widely identified as primary drivers of faculty dissatisfaction and industrial behavior. Studies by Goeddeke and Mueller (2010) highlight that perceived imbalances between effort and compensation often trigger strike-related militancy, while Follo and Huelskamp (2023) demonstrate that financial stress and job insecurity intensify faculty participation in prolonged industrial actions. These findings suggest that inadequate remuneration, delayed salaries, and insufficient benefits significantly undermine faculty motivation and commitment, thereby increasing the likelihood of go-slow actions.

Beyond economic concerns, institutional and governance-related factors also play a critical role. Liberian Investigators (2025) emphasizes that dissatisfaction with university administration - particularly in relation to poor governance, lack of transparency, and limited faculty participation in decision-making - predicts stronger union commitment and greater propensity for collective action. When institutional leadership is perceived as ineffective or unresponsive, faculty trust diminishes, fostering conditions conducive to go-slow behavior.

Psychological and attitudinal dimensions further explain faculty participation in such actions. Goeddeke and Mueller (2010) argue that individual perceptions of fairness, job satisfaction, and beliefs about the effectiveness of industrial action significantly shape participation. Faculty members experiencing low morale, perceived injustice, and unmet expectations are more likely to withdraw effort or engage in collective resistance.

In addition, social and collective dynamics have been shown to influence faculty behavior. Participation in go-slow actions is often reinforced by peer support, union strength, and shared grievances among academic staff. Goeddeke and Mueller (2010) note that collective solidarity increases the likelihood of engagement in industrial actions, indicating that such behavior is embedded within broader social and organizational contexts.

Contextual and environmental factors also contribute to the persistence of faculty industrial actions. Jacquemin, Junker, and Cubberley (2019) observe that many academic disruptions arise from structural challenges, including failed negotiations and inadequate funding. In developing countries, limited government investment in higher education exacerbates resource constraints, negatively affecting staff welfare and institutional effectiveness.

While these studies provide valuable theoretical and empirical insights, they are largely based on contexts outside Liberia and often focus on full-scale strikes rather than the more subtle and less documented phenomenon of faculty go-slow actions. In the Liberian context - and particularly at emerging rural institutions such as Nimba University - there is a notable lack of systematic empirical research examining the specific determinants of faculty go-slow actions, the extent to which these actions disrupt teaching and learning processes, and their impact on student academic outcomes.

This gap in context-specific evidence limits the capacity of policymakers and university administrators to design informed and effective interventions aimed at improving faculty motivation, stabilizing academic calendars, and enhancing instructional delivery.

This study therefore seeks to address this gap by investigating faculty go-slow actions at Nimba University, with a focus on identifying their key determinants, assessing their effects on teaching and learning processes, and examining their implications for student academic outcomes. By doing so, the study aims to contribute to evidence-based policy formulation and institutional reforms that promote the quality and sustainability of higher education in Liberia.

Research Objectives

The study sought to:

1. identify the factors contributing to faculty go-slow actions at Nimba University.
2. assess the extent to which faculty go-slow actions disrupt teaching and learning processes.
3. examine the impact of faculty go-slow actions on students' learning outcomes.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What factors contribute to faculty go-slow actions at Nimba University?
2. To what extent do faculty go-slow actions disrupt teaching and learning processes?
3. How do faculty go-slow actions affect students' learning outcomes?

METHOD

This study examined the causes and academic impact of faculty go-slow actions at Nimba University using primary data collected from both students and faculty members. The target population comprised 1,612 students and 92 faculty. Using Adams's (2020) sample size determination formula, a sample size of 324 was generated to provide relevant insights into the determinants and effects of faculty go-slow actions.

Thereafter, the proportional allocation of samples across the different strata per gender (students, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty) was carried out using the sampling procedure proposed by Nguyen, Shih, Srivastava, Tirthapura, and Xu (2021), ensuring adequate representation of each subgroup in the study. Table 1 presents the population and sample size of the study.

Table 1: Population and Sample Size of the Study

Strata	Population			Sample Size		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Students	837	775	1,612	159	148	307
Full-time Faculty	48	9	58	9	2	11
Part-time Faculty	32	2	34	5	1	6

Source: Fieldwork (2026)

The table indicates a proportionate stratified sample with strong representation of students and limited representation of faculty. While gender is fairly balanced among students, faculty - especially part-time staff - are predominantly male, leading to underrepresentation of female perspectives in the study.

Addressing the research questions involved the use of questionnaires to collect data from respondents. Two sets of questionnaires were employed: one administered to faculty respondents to identify the causes of go-slow action, and the other to students to assess the extent to which go-slow actions disrupt the teaching and learning process, and to examine the impact of go-slow actions on students' academic outcomes.

All ethical considerations were strictly observed, including obtaining ethical clearance and securing informed consent from participants. Respondents were informed of their right to voluntary participation and their freedom to withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences. Data collected were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 22. Descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were used to summarize demographic and questionnaire data, while a one-sample chi-square (χ^2) goodness-of-fit test was conducted for each questionnaire item to determine whether the observed distribution of Agreed and Disagreed responses differed significantly from an equal (50:50) distribution, with statistical significance set at $p < .05$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section of the study presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents and analyzes data on the causes of faculty go-slow actions, the relationship between go-slow actions and the teaching-learning process, and the effects of faculty go-slow actions on students' academic outcomes.

Demographic Characteristics of Faculty and Student Respondents

The demographic characteristics of respondents constitute a foundational dimension of any empirical inquiry, as they illuminate the representativeness of the sample and provide contextual background for interpreting findings. In this study, the demographic variables examined for faculty respondents include gender, employment status, and years of experience in the lecturer role at Nimba University. For student respondents, the variables encompass gender, year of study, and college of enrollment. Table 2 presents the results of the demographic characteristics of faculty and student respondents.

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of Faculty and Student Respondents

Variable	Category	f (%)
Faculty Respondents' Characteristics		
Gender	Male	15 (88.2)

	Female	2 (17.8)
Employment status	Full time	11 (64.7)
	Part time	6 (35.3)
Years performing lecturer role	1 - 5 years	4 (23.5)
	6 - 10 years	4 (23.5)
	11 - 15 years	6 (35.3)
	16 years and above	3 (17.7)
Students' Demographic Characteristics		
Gender	Male	120 (51.1)
	Female	115 (48.9)
Year of study	Year One	20 (8.5)
	Year Two	100 (42.6)
	Year Three	40 (17.0)
	Year Four	75 (31.9)
College	Agriculture and Food Sciences	40 (17.2)
	Business and Public Administration	55 (23.4)
	Engineering and GeoSciences	10 (4.2)
	Education and Social Sciences	70 (29.8)
	Health Sciences	50 (21.2)
	Natural Sciences	10 (4.2)

Source: Fieldwork (2026)

The results reveal a pronounced gender disparity among faculty respondents, with male faculty constituting an overwhelming majority, suggesting that the academic workforce at Nimba University remains significantly male-dominated - a pattern consistent with broader gender inequities in higher education across Sub-Saharan Africa. Regarding employment status, full-time faculty represent the majority of respondents, though the participation of part-time faculty is noteworthy, as it ensures that the experiences of both employment categories inform the study's findings on go-slow action. The distribution of years of experience indicates that the majority of faculty have served the institution for more than a decade, implying that respondents possess substantial institutional memory and are therefore well-positioned to provide informed perspectives on systemic challenges such as go-slow action.

Among student respondents, the gender distribution is notably balanced, lending greater representativeness to the student data and reducing the risk of gender-biased responses. The predominance of second-year students in the sample, followed by fourth-year students, suggests a concentration of respondents in the early and terminal stages of their academic programs - a composition that may reflect varying degrees of exposure to the

disruptive effects of faculty go-slow action. The representation of students across all six colleges, with the College of Education and Social Sciences and the College of Business and Public Administration recording the highest participation, ensures institutional breadth in the student data, though the relatively marginal representation of the Colleges of Engineering and Natural Sciences warrants caution in generalizing findings to those units.

Causes of Faculty Go-Slow Action at Nimba University

Understanding the etiology of faculty go-slow action is indispensable to any effort aimed at addressing the phenomenon with institutional precision. Table 3 examines a range of organizational and motivational variables that potentially precipitate go-slow action among faculty, including delayed salary payment, poor working conditions, limited involvement in decision-making, poor administrative communication, lack of instructional support, unresolved grievances, reduction of lecture hours, limited student engagement, delayed grading and feedback, and the perceived impact of go-slow action on teaching quality and syllabus coverage. Together, these variables capture both the structural and relational dimensions of faculty dissatisfaction that may culminate in go-slow behavior. Descriptive results are reported alongside a one-sample chi-square goodness-of-fit test for each item.

Table 3: Causes of Faculty Go-Slow Action at Nimba University, with Chi-Square Test

Statement	Agreed f (%)	Disagreed f (%)	$\chi^2(1)$	p-value
Delayed salary payment contributes to faculty go-slow action.	5 (29.4)	11 (64.7)	2.25	.134
Poor working conditions affect motivation to teach effectively.	15 (88.2)	2 (11.8)	9.94	.002
Limited involvement in decision-making contributes to dissatisfaction.	11 (64.7)	6 (35.3)	1.47	.225
Poor communication with administration prompts go-slow actions.	13 (76.5)	4 (23.5)	4.76	.029
Lack of instructional support affects faculty's performance.	14 (82.4)	3 (17.6)	7.12	.008
Go-slow actions are responses to unresolved grievances.	16 (94.1)	1 (5.9)	13.24	<.001
Lecture hours are reduced due to dissatisfaction.	15 (88.2)	2 (11.8)	9.94	.002
There is limited students' engagement during go-slow action.	14 (82.4)	3 (17.6)	7.12	.008
Grading and feedback are delayed due to institutional challenges.	5 (29.4)	12 (70.6)	2.88	.090
Go-slow actions reduce the quality of teaching and learning.	16 (94.1)	1 (5.9)	13.24	<.001
Go-slow actions lead to incomplete syllabus coverage.	14 (82.4)	3 (17.6)	7.12	.008
Go-slow actions negatively affect students' understanding.	10 (58.8)	7 (41.2)	0.53	.467

Source: Fieldwork (2026)

Note: One-sample χ^2 goodness-of-fit test comparing observed Agreed/Disagreed frequencies against an expected 50:50 distribution, $df = 1$.

The findings presented in Table 3 provide empirically grounded insights into the organizational and motivational antecedents of faculty go-slow action at Nimba University. The pattern of responses across the twelve items reveals a consistent and theoretically coherent narrative: faculty go-slow actions at Nimba University are principally driven by relational, institutional, and structural grievances rather than by purely economic considerations. This finding, while context-specific, resonates with a significant body of scholarly literature on faculty industrial behavior and academic labor relations in higher education.

Most strikingly, the near-unanimous agreement (94.1%) that go-slow actions are responses to unresolved grievances constitutes the most theoretically significant finding in this table, and this pattern is statistically significant ($\chi^2(1) = 13.24, p < .001$). This result aligns directly with the conceptual framing offered by Goeddeke and Mueller (2010), who argue that individual perceptions of fairness, job satisfaction, and beliefs about the utility of industrial action fundamentally shape faculty participation in work stoppages. In the context of Nimba University, the overwhelming consensus that unresolved grievances precipitate go-slow behavior confirms that such actions are not capricious or arbitrary, but rather represent deliberate, calculated responses to systemic institutional neglect.

Equally compelling is the high level of agreement (88.2%) recorded for both poor working conditions and the reduction of lecture hours as correlates of go-slow behavior, both statistically significant. These two findings, taken together, illuminate a motivational pathway that is theoretically explicable through Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory, which posits that employee performance declines when a perceived mismatch exists between effort expended, rewards received, and outcomes expected. When the working environment deteriorates below acceptable professional standards, the effort-reward calculus is disrupted, and faculty members rationally respond by reducing their instructional investment.

The strong agreement (82.4%) that lack of instructional support affects faculty performance further reinforces the structural interpretation of go-slow action. Hanushek and Rivkin (2006) emphasize that working conditions and motivation are central determinants of instructional quality. When these conditions are deficient, faculty effectiveness is fundamentally compromised, not merely as a form of protest, but as a natural consequence of inadequate professional infrastructure - suggesting that go-slow action at Nimba University is partly a deliberate response and partly an involuntary outcome of institutional under-provision.

The finding that 76.5% of respondents agree that poor administrative communication encourages go-slow actions ($\chi^2(1) = 4.76, p = .029$) speaks to the governance dimensions of faculty dissatisfaction, corroborating Liberian Investigators (2025), which argues that dissatisfaction with university administration - particularly poor governance, lack of transparency, and ineffective communication - predicts greater propensity for collective action. Relatedly, 64.7% of faculty agree that limited involvement in decision-making contributes to dissatisfaction, illuminating shared-governance concerns, although this item did not reach statistical significance ($\chi^2(1) = 1.47, p = .225$), suggesting more divided opinion on this particular driver.

By contrast, the finding that a majority of faculty (64.7%) disagree that delayed salary payment is the primary cause of their go-slow actions represents a theoretically significant departure from the commonly assumed economic determinism in explanations of labor unrest; notably, this split was not statistically significant ($\chi^2(1) = 2.25, p = .134$), indicating that faculty opinion on the role of salary delays is genuinely divided rather than consensus-driven. While Follo and Huelskamp (2023) document that financial stress intensifies faculty participation in industrial actions, the present data suggest that the weight of economic grievances may be less determinative than non-pecuniary factors at Nimba University, at least regarding the go-slow phenomenon specifically. This invites a more nuanced analytical framework that places institutional culture, administrative responsiveness, and professional dignity alongside economic conditions in explaining faculty industrial behavior.

Finally, the high agreement (94.1%) that go-slow actions reduce teaching quality, along with the 82.4% agreement that they lead to incomplete syllabus coverage and limit student engagement, suggests a degree of faculty self-awareness about the academic consequences of their actions. This reflexivity indicates that faculty are not indifferent to the pedagogical harm their industrial behavior causes, but appear to engage in go-slow actions as a last resort - a strategic withdrawal of effort aimed at compelling institutional response, even as

they acknowledge its costs. This awareness may represent an important entry point for constructive institutional dialogue aimed at resolving grievances before they escalate into sustained instructional disruption.

Go-Slow Action and the Teaching-Learning Process

The relationship between faculty go-slow action and the teaching-learning process constitutes the operational core of this study's inquiry. The variables examined in this table - drawn from the student perspective - include the frequency of missed classes, reduction of lecture hours, completeness of course outline coverage, quality of lecturer-student interaction, timeliness of assignment feedback, and the regularity of the academic calendar. Table 4 presents results of faculty go-slow action and the teaching-learning process, together with the corresponding chi-square goodness-of-fit test for each item.

Table 4: Go-Slow Action and the Teaching-Learning Process, with Chi-Square Test

Statement	Agreed f (%)	Disagreed f (%)	$\chi^2(1)$	p-value
Lecturers frequently miss scheduled classes during go-slow actions.	185 (78.7)	50 (21.3)	77.55	<.001
Lecture hours are often reduced when lecturers are involved with go-slow action.	200 (85.1)	30 (12.8)	125.65	<.001
Course outlines are not fully covered in semesters when go-slow actions occur.	120 (51.1)	75 (31.9)	10.38	.001
There is limited lecturer-student interaction during go-slow action.	198 (84.3)	37 (15.7)	110.30	<.001
Assignments and feedback are delayed when faculty are involved with go-slow action.	200 (85.1)	35 (14.9)	115.85	<.001
Academic calendar is frequently disrupted due to go-slow action.	119 (50.6)	116 (39.4)	0.04	.845

Source: Fieldwork (2026)

Note: One-sample χ^2 goodness-of-fit test comparing observed Agreed/Disagreed frequencies against an expected 50:50 distribution, $df = 1$.

The data presented in Table 4, drawn from student respondents, provide a student-centered empirical account of how faculty go-slow actions disrupt the teaching and learning process at Nimba University. The pattern of responses across the six variables is largely consistent and points to a broad, systemic disruption of instructional delivery during periods of go-slow action.

The near-unanimous agreement (85.1%) that lecture hours are reduced and that assignments and feedback are delayed during go-slow periods represents the most consequential finding in this table, with both patterns statistically significant ($\chi^2(1) = 125.65$ and 115.85 respectively, $p < .001$). These two variables, taken together, indicate that students experience a dual form of educational deprivation: a quantitative loss of instructional time and a qualitative degradation of pedagogical support - directly consonant with Hattie's (2008) argument that faculty engagement is a major determinant of student achievement.

The strong agreement (84.3%) regarding limited lecturer-student interaction during periods of go-slow action is particularly significant from a socio-constructivist standpoint ($\chi^2(1) = 110.30$, $p < .001$). The curtailment of lecturer-student interaction represents not merely a logistical inconvenience but a substantive compromise of the social scaffolding upon which meaningful learning depends. When faculty disengage from interactive

teaching, students lose access to the guided intellectual engagement that Vygotsky identifies as essential to higher-order cognitive development.

The finding that 78.7% of students agree that lecturers frequently miss scheduled classes during go-slow periods ($\chi^2(1) = 77.55$, $p < .001$) compounds the relational deficit identified above, representing the most fundamental form of instructional disruption - the complete removal of the teaching agent from the learning environment. This corroborates Jacquemin et al.'s (2019) finding that prolonged academic disruptions negatively affect student outcomes and academic progression.

The finding that 51.1% of students agree that course outlines are not fully covered during semesters when go-slow actions occur, while statistically significant ($\chi^2(1) = 10.38$, $p = .001$), reflects slightly more variability in student experience than the other variables in the table. By contrast, the near-even split on academic calendar disruption (50.6% agreed; 39.4% disagreed) was not statistically significant ($\chi^2(1) = 0.04$, $p = .845$), suggesting differential exposure across colleges, years of study, or the intensity of go-slow episodes, since - unlike full strikes - go-slow behavior is gradual and uneven, manifesting differently across departments and time periods.

Collectively, the data in Table 4 affirm that faculty go-slow action at Nimba University generates a pattern of pervasive and multi-dimensional instructional disruption. The convergence of reduced contact hours, limited interaction, class absenteeism, delayed feedback, and incomplete syllabus coverage describes an educational environment that is systematically compromised during periods of faculty industrial action.

Effects of Go-Slow Action on Students' Academic Outcome

The academic outcomes of students represent the ultimate measure of the educational impact of any disruption within the university system. Table 5 examines variables that capture the direct and indirect academic consequences of go-slow action on students, including comprehension difficulties arising from irregular teaching, deterioration of academic performance, knowledge gaps resulting from incomplete instruction, reduced learning motivation, exam preparedness, and the overall quality of the academic experience, together with the corresponding chi-square goodness-of-fit test for each item.

Table 5: Effects of Go-Slow Action on Students' Academic Outcome, with Chi-Square Test

Statement	Agreed f (%)	Disagreed f (%)	$\chi^2(1)$	p-value
I struggle to comprehend lessons due to irregular teaching.	210 (89.4)	25 (10.6)	145.64	<.001
Go-slow action negatively affects my academic performance.	118 (50.2)	117 (49.8)	0.00	.948
I experience gaps in knowledge due to incomplete teaching.	199 (84.7)	36 (15.3)	113.06	<.001
My motivation to learn is reduced by unusual breaks in teaching.	200 (85.1)	35 (14.9)	115.85	<.001
I feel less prepared for examinations when go-slow actions occur.	185 (78.7)	50 (21.3)	77.55	<.001
My overall academic experience is negatively affected by go-slow action.	120 (51.1)	115 (48.9)	0.11	.744

Source: Fieldwork (2026)

Note: One-sample χ^2 goodness-of-fit test comparing observed Agreed/Disagreed frequencies against an expected 50:50 distribution, $df = 1$.

The findings in Table 5 extend the analysis from process to outcome, situating students as the ultimate bearers of the academic costs generated by faculty go-slow action. These findings yield a theoretically coherent and empirically compelling account of how faculty-administration conflict translates into diminished student academic outcomes.

The near-universal agreement (89.4%) that students struggle to comprehend lessons due to irregular teaching represents the most decisive finding in the table ($\chi^2(1) = 145.64$, $p < .001$), connecting the episodic and uneven delivery of instruction to a fundamental breakdown in cognitive engagement. This finding reinforces the Vygotskian framework discussed earlier, underscoring that disruptions to continuity do not merely slow learning - they create fundamental obstacles to knowledge construction.

The strong agreement (84.7%) that students experience gaps in knowledge due to incomplete teaching is directly linked to the syllabus-coverage and class-attendance findings identified in Table 4 ($\chi^2(1) = 113.06$, $p < .001$). Incomplete instructional delivery creates selective lacunae in students' knowledge structures - gaps that may be difficult to identify and even harder to remediate outside the formal classroom environment, consistent with Jacquemin et al.'s (2019) findings.

The 85.1% agreement that students' motivation to learn is reduced by unusual breaks in teaching ($\chi^2(1) = 115.85$, $p < .001$) is among the most theoretically significant findings in the study. Hanushek and Rivkin (2006) emphasize that motivation and working conditions are central to instructional quality; when instructional continuity is disrupted, students are denied the regular, predictable academic engagement that sustains motivational commitment, eroding the psychological foundation upon which sustained academic effort depends.

The finding that 78.7% of students feel less prepared for examinations during periods of go-slow action ($\chi^2(1) = 77.55$, $p < .001$) adds a high-stakes dimension to the above discussion. Tinto (2012) underscores the critical role of academic integration and progression in preventing student attrition; when go-slow actions undermine examination preparedness, they jeopardize the conditions necessary for academic retention and degree attainment, with potentially long-term consequences for national human capital formation (Altbach, 2011).

Perhaps the most analytically nuanced finding in Table 5 is the near-even split in student opinion regarding the overall negative effect of go-slow action on academic performance (50.2% agreed; 49.8% disagreed) and on the broader academic experience (51.1% agreed; 48.9% disagreed); neither split reached statistical significance ($\chi^2(1) = 0.00$, $p = .948$ and $\chi^2(1) = 0.11$, $p = .744$, respectively), confirming that these two outcomes are genuinely contested among students rather than reflecting consensus. This stands in sharp contrast to the significant consensus observed for comprehension difficulties, knowledge gaps, and motivational decline, and suggests that while the proximate cognitive and motivational effects of go-slow action are broadly experienced, their ultimate translation into formal academic performance may be mediated by individual student agency, self-directed learning strategies, and differential institutional exposure. Future research at Nimba University would benefit from disaggregated analysis by college, year of study, and academic performance tier to fully illuminate the differential impact of go-slow action on student outcomes.

Key Findings

In synthesis, the findings articulate a clear institutional causal chain: structural faculty grievances rooted in poor working conditions, administrative unresponsiveness, exclusion from governance, and inadequate institutional support generate go-slow actions that systematically disrupt the teaching-learning process, which in turn produces measurable cognitive, motivational, and evaluative harm for students. This causal chain demands institutional intervention at multiple levels - from improving faculty working conditions and communication channels to strengthening shared governance mechanisms and ensuring the timely resolution of academic labor grievances - if the quality and sustainability of higher education at Nimba University are to be meaningfully advanced.

CONCLUSION

This study has revealed critical insights into the phenomenon of faculty go-slow actions at Nimba University and their detrimental effects on both teaching and student academic outcomes. As identified, faculty go-slow behavior is predominantly driven by unresolved grievances, poor working conditions, low administrative support, and little participation in institutional governance. The findings show a clear causal relationship wherein structural issues contribute to faculty dissatisfaction, leading to instructional disruptions that adversely affect student learning experiences and academic outcomes.

The implications of these disruptions are profound, with numerous students reporting difficulties in comprehension, knowledge gaps, reduced learning motivation, and decreased examination preparedness as direct consequences of faculty go-slow actions. This reflects a systemic challenge that not only hinders the quality of education but may also threaten the larger goal of human capital development essential for national progress in Liberia.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following stakeholders are urged to:

1. The university administration should prioritize improvements in the work environment for faculty members, including adequate resources and appropriate support mechanisms. Initiating periodic assessments and feedback channels regarding faculty working conditions may help identify further areas needing improvement.
2. Foster a culture of openness and trust, where university administration works to enhance communication with faculty members, including regularly updating them on institutional policies, decisions, and financial matters to mitigate feelings of neglect and unresponsiveness.
3. Increase faculty involvement in decision-making processes, including creating committees or forums where faculty can express their concerns and contribute to strategic planning and governance. An inclusive approach to decision-making can strengthen institutional cohesion and trust.
4. Establish programs designed to support faculty development, both professionally and personally, to help address underlying issues contributing to go-slow behaviors, including mentorship programs, workshops on effective teaching practices.
5. Universities should adopt efficient mechanisms for grievance resolution that prioritize the needs and feedback of faculty. A structured approach to addressing faculty complaints can minimize unresolved issues that lead to go-slow actions.
6. Future studies should continue to explore the dynamics of faculty go-slow actions within Nimba University and similar contexts. Longitudinal studies can provide deeper insights into the evolving relationship between faculty satisfaction, teaching performance, and student outcomes, and disaggregated analyses of different departments and disciplines may illuminate specific challenges unique to various academic contexts.

By implementing these recommendations, Nimba University can work towards addressing the concerns articulated by its faculty and improve the overall academic experience for students. These efforts will not only enhance the quality of education provided but will also bolster the university's role as a vital institution in contributing to national development in Liberia.

Ethical Issue

Ethical clearance was obtained from the ethical review board at Nimba University to enhance smooth conduct of the current study. Obtaining clearance implies that all ethical guidelines for writing this academic paper were observed.

Disclosure of Conflict of Interest

The paper has no conflict of interest that requires disclosure.

REFERENCES

1. Adam, M. A. (2020). Sample size determination in survey research. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 26(5), 90-97.
2. Altbach, P. G. (2011). The past, present, and future of the research university. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 65-73.
3. Follo, G., & Huelskamp, D. (2023). The experience of faculty strikers. *The Qualitative Report*, 28(12), 1-20.
4. Goeddeke Jr, F. X., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2010). Perceived support in a dual organizational environment: Union participation in a university setting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(1), 65-83.
5. Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2006). Teacher quality. *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, 2, 1051-1078.
6. Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
7. Jacquemin, S. J., Junker, E. N., & Cubberley, V. (2019). Does a prolonged faculty strike in higher education affect student achievement? *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(3), 1-9.
8. Liberian Investigators (2025). UL go-slow, demanding signing of collective bargaining agreement.
9. Nguyen, T. D., Shih, M. H., Srivastava, D., Tirthapura, S., & Xu, B. (2021). Stratified random sampling from streaming and stored data. *Distributed and Parallel Databases*, 39, 665-710.
10. Tinto, V. (2012). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. University of Chicago Press.
11. Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.