FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF AN IDEAL COLLEGE PRESIDENT IN OKLAHOMA'S PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

By

SEDIGHEH GHAEMMAGHAMI

Bachelor of Philosophy
National University of Tehran
Tehran, Iran
1974

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1979

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fullfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1984

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF AN IDEAL COLLEGE PRESIDENT IN OKLAHOMA'S PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer expresses appreciation to Dr. Robert B. Kamm, thesis advisor and the committee chairman, for his wise guidance, sound encouragement, and generous investment of time. Appreciation is also expressed to the dissertation committee members, Dr. Thomas A. Karman, Dr. E. Moses Frye, and Dr. Larry M. Perkins, for their counsel, support, and cooperation.

Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Patrick Forsyth, Dr. Ali Nazari Robati, and Ms. Iris McPherson for their concern and guidance. Appreciation is also expressed to Mrs. Betty Rutledge, the departmental secretary, for her assistance and to the faculty members of 12 four-year institutions in the State of Oklahoma, who willingly cooperated in the accomplishment of this study.

The writer gives special thanks to her youngest brother, Hamid, as well as her good friend Mrs. Maxine Weber, whose friendly assistance and encouragement greatly helped the writer during the preparation of this thesis. This study is specially dedicated to the writer's father, Mohamad Reza, and her late mother, Shomeiseh, whose constant support and dedication was of utmost importance to the long-term learning accomplishments of the writer.

Finally, special appreciation is extended to the writer's husband, Dr. Ali Rasool Javaheri for his support and encouragement in the worst situation when the time of the death of the writer's mother coincided with the last stage of fulfillment of her doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

With numerous changes in the system of higher education have come not only changes in the role of the president, but also increased frequency of faculty criticism of presidents.

According to Paxton and Thomas (1977), during the early years in higher education there seemed to have been little overt criticism of the college president compared to later times. Both the nature of the early institution and the president's elite position prevented verbal discontent. Prior to 1860, in most cases, the president was the most important person in the institution.

As Schmidt (1970, p. 111) suggested: "He (the president) was the balance wheel upon whose steadiness depended the smooth functioning of the entire mechanism." In the early years of higher education, open criticism of the presidential leadership was illogical and almost nonexistent.

Footlick (1976) summarized the present situation:

> At colleges all across the nation, noting that presidents are under more intense criticism than at any time since the student upheavals of the late 1960s, faculties, board of trustees, and an array of special interest groups are assaulting the presidents with lawsuits and votes of 'no confidence'--and turning what was once a cushy, prestigious role into one that many educators are beginning to shun (p. 74).

Coughlin (1976) stressed the extent of no-confidence votes by faculty members. This dissatisfaction with presidents has caused

increased tension which, in turn, has made achieving institutional goals very difficult with different segments working within the institution. Under such criticism and pressure, presidents have retorted by asking how they should lead effectively when they no longer have enough power to execute the leadership role they have been hired to perform. While everyone has agreed that presidents need to lead in an effective manner, there has been little agreement on how they should lead--while at the same time satisfying demands of conflicting interest groups. Some presidents, unable to resolve the inconsistency between expectations and means, have left office. Some institutions have not attracted the desired number of applicants, because some well-qualified candidates have been unwilling to accept the pressure, frustration, reduction of power, short tenure (oftentimes), and ill-defined role of the presidency.

Paxton and Thomas (1977) mentioned that those individuals who accept college presidencies cannot escape the frustration of the ill-defined role. They must accept the fact that the office has new expectations attached to it. The authors further stated that the situation was complicated because no formally accepted body of criteria exists that identifies the major dimensions of the president's role. This lack of role-specific information results from a failure to conduct research on the office of the president itself.

The lack of information about the presidents of institutions of higher education has been identified by many authors and researchers over the years, including Prator (1963), Lipham (1964), Walberg (1969), and Katt (1973). The administration of an educational institution requires leadership--the ability to get things done with and

through people. In reviewing the current literature on leadership in educational institutions, there appeared to be a need for continued research.

The call for study of the office of the president has come from numerous authorities in the field, as well as from individuals who hold or have held the office themselves. For example, Bennis (1972), past president of the University of Cincinnati, believed that universities were poorly run because they did not study their programs of administration.

Paxton and Thomas (1977, p. 342) insisted that: "To date, minimal research has been conducted in the area of presidential leadership, leaving a void where evidence should be an important source of information and support for the president."

According to Prichard, Buxton, and Sinter (1972), the college or university presidency increasingly has come to the forefront of the public's attention. For many years, the presidents of institutions of higher learning have worked very hard, but under conditions of relative consistency and stability. Those conditions no longer exist. Pressures from the student body, the faculty, the press, boards of control, and the general public increasingly have placed the office of the college or university president under the microscope, subject to thorough investigation.

Carbone (1982, p. 19) referred to the notion that presidents' attitudes revealed the feeling of uncertainty on the part of professors toward them by stating, "We are particularly uncertain about presidents. In our best moments we give them a kind of distant respect; in our worst, we delight in cutting them up." He later

referred to the professors' difficulties to perceive accurately "academic executives" because of seeing so little of them. "Presidents are not as visible as many of us would like them to be--the demands on presidential time these days make that an impossibility, even in small institutions" (Carbone, 1982, p. 19).

Carbone (1982) also referred to the one source of professorial misperception about presidents as the confusion about exactly what campus leaders should do:

> The president's role, in many institutions at least, is not clearly defined. Each group with whom the president must deal--trustees--faculty--students--alumni--townspeople--publications--views the role differently and not without some measure of self-interest. If the president responds favorably to group one, two, or three, there is no assurance that groups four, five, and six will stand and cheer. Most presidential actions, therefore, deserve to be judged in as broad a content as possible (p. 21).

The need for a clear understanding of presidential leadership is critical to the sound functioning of an institution of higher education, not only at present, but in the future.

With the current criticism of presidents by faculty, it seemed logical to start with faculty to determine what they see as essential dimensions of a president's role. The relationship between faculties and presidents is becoming a more important element in the smooth functioning of institutions of higher education, without which the institutions may not survive.

The chief executive officer, usually the president of an institution of higher education, must be concerned with the development of a collegial approach to institutional leadership.

As Mayhew (1971) pointed out:

> The traditional role of American college and university presidents is changing and seems to be moving toward an unknown station. While some incumbents in the past have denied it, the president did possess considerable power over institutions, their finances, faculties, and students. This power derived from a number of factors: frontier conditions of early colleges which allowed a tradition of presidential primary to develop; responsibility for institutional financing which allowed him who controlled the purse strings to govern; a professoriate content with presidential control so long as it could do the things it wished--research, gardening, or teaching classes--without interference; and consistency with other administrator-centered social institutions--public schools, corporations, and the military (p. 351).

As Mayhew (1971) indicated, such a role can no longer be sustained. Presidential authority has been challenged successfully by students, faculty, and political officers; and currently, presidents feel themselves lacking essential powers to govern.

According to Coughlin (1979):

> College and university professors, students, and governing boards in growing numbers are voicing dissatisfaction with the performance of their institutions' presidents. Many colleges and universities have had to suspend building plans, eliminate faculty positions, hold down expected pay raises, cut back academic programs, and increase tuition. Fairly or unfairly, the blame has often fallen on their presidents. As the executors of retrenchment, they are the ones who got the criticism--even though they seldom were solely responsible for the big decisions. . . . Faculty members in particular have become increasingly outspoken in opposition to their chief executives. On many campuses, faculty members have voted no confidence in their administrators, boycotted executive committees, and demanded presidential resignations (p. 1).

Doi (1965) commented on the need for further studies of institutions of higher education, stating:

> The organization and administration of colleges and universities are virgin territories for research. They have been explored in the past by reputable scholars and practicing administrators but with different con-

> texts from those now available. It is now needed in the content of current frames of reference--the theories and concepts developed by the behavioral scientists and students of public and business administration. The major barrier to the new explorations is the sensitivity of colleges and universities to intensive scrutiny of organizational values, of administrative behavior, and of patterns of authority, influence, and communciations (p. 357).

Statement of the Problem

Many factors, such as the changing of the traditional role of American college presidents, increased frequency of faculty criticism of presidents (as a result of their dissatisfaction with presidents), little agreement on the way that the president should lead to be effective, the ill-defined role of the presidency, the need for a clear understanding of presidential leadership, the importance of the relationship between presidents and faculties, and faculty demands confront higher education.

Clark Kerr, former chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, pointed out in Efficieny in Liberal Education that:

> Colleges and universities are pushed toward costly change on the one hand and retrenchment on the other. These pressures can, in turn, produce cleavages and misunderstanding between the president and the faculty unless their perceptions are generally in congruence (Bowen and Douglass, 1971, p. xi).

This made it necessary, even imperative, that the role of the president be carefully examined and understood. In other words, what is desirable and what is undesirable for the president's leadership roles, as perceived and evaluated by university faculty?

The problem with which this study dealt was the perception of faculty relative to the characteristics of the leadership behavior of the "ideal" college president.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty members' perceptions of what constitutes the ideal president of a publicly supported senior institution. In this regard, the study utilized two dimensions of the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (ILBDQ) studies which originated at Ohio State University in the early 1940s. The two dimensions were "initiating structure" (task-orientation) and "consideration" (people-orientation). Do college faculty perceive that the president should be ideally "task-oriented," or "people-oriented?" Related to this, a number of other questions were raised:

1. What proportion of the faculty desire an administrator who is high in initiating structure?

2. What proportion of the faculty desire an administrator who is high in consideration?

3. What proportion of the faculty desire an administrator who possesses both characteristics in relatively equal proportions?

4. Are there any demographic characteristics that are related to faculty perception of an ideal college president?

Significance of the Study

The need for research in the area of presidential leadership has not been explicitly dealt with in the literature. As stated by

Hillway (1973, p. 462), "Little attention has been given to the formal research and evolution of university administration."

University faculty play a major role in determining an effective college president, and their perceptions are important in the decision concerning an effective college president. Research in this area could serve to open the lines of communication between presidents and faculties, and in this way the means of improving the institution might emerge. Thus, the significance of the research study is:

1. To contribute to the literature in higher education administrative behavior;

2. To provide information which might serve to open the lines of communication between presidents and faculties, as well as to suggest ways for organizational development;

3. To add and synthesize evidence which relate to desirable leadership roles and organizational issues concerning the university president.

Assumptions of the Study

1. It was assumed that the measuring instrument and methodology chosen would be adequate for the purpose of this study.

2. It was assumed that minor modification of the questionnnaire would have no significant effect on the validity and reliability of the whole instrument.

3. It was assumed that responses to the questionnaire items would reflect the actual perceptions of the respondents toward an ideal college president.

4. It was assumed that faculty, as defined in this study, did play a major role in determining the effectiveness of the president, and thus their perceptions were important concerning the effective president.

Limitations of the Study

This research was concerned with faculty perception of an ideal college president and was limited only to the population of 12 public four-year institutions sampled in the State of Oklahoma. (Community colleges and private institutions were not included in the study.) The conclusions, therefore, are limited to the population sampled and should not be construed as necessarily applicable to other higher education institutions. The study was concerned only with the degree of effectiveness of college presidents as perceived by the faculty members. No attempt was made to pinpoint any specific president, or to include other aspects of their social lives.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Evolution of the College Presidency

According to Thiwing (1900), the presidency of the university in this country has been categorized into three types: clerical, scholastic, and executive. The first type grew out of the fact that the American college was dominated by the church, so it was suitable that the chief officer of the ecclestiastical society also be the chief officer of the educational society. As a result of this doctrine, the great presidents of the past were clergymen. During the early period, higher education was predominantly related or closely associated with religion. The college president was usually a minister, chosen as the most learned among his colleagues. In this case he was more involved in religious activities, teaching and preaching, rather than in administrative duties.

According to Thiwing (1900), as colleges ceased to be primarily ecclesiastical and became more educational in nature, the prevalence of the clerical type of president began to decline. As state universities sprang into existence, the clerical type was found to be inappropriate, for state universities were opposed to the earlier heavy emphasis on religion. As a result, gentlemen who were primarily clergymen and only secondarily scholars, were found ill-adapted to the newly-emerged educational and scholastic environment.

And, the gentlemen who were primarily scholars and secondarily ecclesiastical in their orientation, were found more fit to do educational work.

Prator (1963), in this regard, argued that:

> The professions from which college presidents have been recruited became more and more numerous after the Civil War. The trend away from clerical presidents, which began in the period after the Revolution, accelerated rapidly after the Civil War. A large number of the later presidents came from various fields of scholarship. Eliot, inaugurated in 1969, was a professor and a scientist, though he succeeded to the presidential chair at so young an age that he never really distinguished himself for scientific contribution. Harper of Chicago was a noted scholar of Hebrew. C. Stanley Hall, president of Clark University in 1889, was outstanding in philosophy and psychology (pp. 15-16).

Twining (1900) later referred to a third type, the executive, which grew out of the demands of the presidential office and out of the enlargement of the colleges. When the greatest colleges had only a few students, the work of the president could be done without difficulty by one who was also filling a professor's chair. But when a college served growing numbers of students in all of its departments, the duties of the executive officer could not be performed well by one who was also doing some teaching during the week. The increase in student enrollment was accompanied with an enlargement in all areas. These conditions were both the cause and the effect of the growing prevalence of the executive or administrative type of a college president in more recent years.

According to Prator (1963), the traditional role of the college president in America could best be noted in relation to the first college, Harvard College, started in 1640. The title of president was bestowed upon Henry Dunster, the chief officer. The title has been

continued down through history with few exceptions. Prior to this time, the roots of colleges go back to England and Scotland, both of which had an influence on the total historical perspective and shaping of colleges. The heads of the early colleges in America ruled with power, dignity, authority, and rigidity. As Katt (1973) mentioned:

> From 1640, with the appointment of Henry Duster as the first president of Harvard, to the end of the ante-bellum period (over 200 years), the old-time college president represented higher education in American institutions (p. 12).

Schmidt (1930) introduced his study on the old-time college president by writing:

> An examination of conditions in American colleges before 1860 reveals the fact that in nearly all of them the most important person of the establishment was the president. He was the balance wheel upon whose steadiness depends the smooth functioning of the entire mechanism (p. 11).

As previously mentioned, the old-time college president most often was a clergyman. Schmidt (1930, p. 184) reported that "Two hundred sixty-two of two hundred eighty-eight pre-Civil War presidents, more than nine-tenths, were ordained ministers."

Stoke (1959) observed:

> The college president of a generation or two ago was the embodiment of dignity, respectability, and wisdom. Since higher education was dominated by, or closely associated with, religion, the college president was usually a minister, chosen as the most learned or the most zealous among his colleagues. His qualifications for handling chapel services or reaching moral philosophy, or for setting an example of personal dignity and department for the young were far more important than administration (p. 2).

The responsibilities of the presidents in all of the early colleges were essentially the same. Schmidt (1930), in his summary of these duties, reported that

> College heads presided at commencements and other ceremonies, arranging morning and evening prayers, as well as Sunday worship and very likely holding the service himself , conducting faculty meetings, lecturing on the 'evidences of Christianity,' visiting the classes of other instructors, attending the general superintendence, and, in general, promoting the interest and reputation of the college by every opportunity in his power (p. 2).

Kauffman (1980) described the most important function of the presidents of the earliest colleges in America as teaching, especially courses in ethics and moral philosophy. Kauffman observed:

> As a minister, he preached to his students in Chapel, and he promoted his college by establishing effective relations with denominational leaders, patrons, and parents. In many ways, the early college president was the college. Its identity became a reflection of his character, leadership, and personal success (p. 5).

Prator (1963) furthermore believed that:

> As the head of such a system, the president was patriarch as well as chief administrator. Besides the college head, he had responsibilities and liabilities beyond the patriarchal. He had to maintain good relationshp with the college's governing board and his relationship with that body was of key importance to successful administration (p. 10).

In many cases, the chief officer held a board membership, but this was by no means a universal arrangement. Prator (1963) later claimed that the president's relationship with his faculty was usually that of employer and employee. In this relationship, the president himself was dependent on the ultimate support of the board of control.

Rudolph (1962, p. 164) described the influence of the college president with the student as the "greatest single force in college life." During this period, the entering student was very young, normally 14 or 15 years of age. The colleges were patriarchal institutions and the president was the patriarch.

In comparing presidents of different periods, Rudolph (1962) wrote:

> But the greatest difference between the old-time president and the one who replaced him toward the end of the nineteenth century was that the old-time president lived at the college, was not absent for long periods of time, probably taught every member of the senior class, knew most of the students by name, indeed, probably made a practice of calling on them in their rooms (p. 165).

And Schmidt (1930) noted, in discussing the newer president, that:

> Not teaching, preaching, or discipline were his greatest problems, but devising means of rendering his school more attractive than others and thus securing its continued existence . . . to obtain funds was not infrequently the most urgent business of the head of the school (pp. 62-63).

As the president fulfilled these functions, he exercised a great deal of authority and power. The president's power was not confined to mere influence with the students, but with the faculty as well.

Rudolph (1962) asserted:

> The power of the president largely developed from the enormous distance between him and the tutors. As full-time instructors and professors were hired, the relationship originally established by the president and affirmed by the trustees remained (p. 165).

As Prator (1963) stated, since academic tenure, review of grievances, and faculty organizations to protect collective and individual rights were unknown in earlier times, the president could be arbitrary and despotic. It is obvious that in such conditions in the colonial period, with a frequently changing instructional staff made up largely of young tutors, the president could dominate the institution if he so desired. But in the better colleges, shortly after the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were signs that presidents consulted their faculties in institutional matters.

According to Schmidt (1930)

> It was the latter part of the nineteenth century that the old-time college presidency began to change. Educational historians suggested a variety of factors contributing to the expansion of higher education, and, in turn, the evaluation of the duties and functions of the college president. Included in these factors and indication of change were the industrial revolution, the secondary school movement, the establishment and growth of state universities, the Morrill Act of 1862, Johns Hopkins University and graduate education and re-emphasis on the sciences. During this period of profound change, the president as teacher and patriarch was giving away to the business executive (p. 222).

In comparing the presidents of his time to those of old times, Stoke (1959) noted that:

> The purpose of higher education became more secular than religious, and expanded in credibility, in volume, and variety. Its purposes and intellectual preoccupation are different and more numerous than they used to be, and the sheer bulk of its property, population, expenditures and responsibilities have become an inextricable part of national living. . . . This transformation of colleges and universities reflects itself in the position of the presidents, and has brought to that position men whose training, interests and skills are far different from those of their predecessors. According to him, the college president as the man of learning has been giving way to the man of management (pp. 2-7).

As Prator (1963) noted:

> A great deal of the difference between the activities of today's president and earlier presidents is explained by the fact that colleges in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were comparatively smaller institutions. In the period from Harvard's founding in 1636 to the end of the century, only 465 students graduated, and the total in attendance for that whole period did not exceed 6,000. In the late eighteenth century, Yale reached an enrollment peak of 415 (p. 7).

Prator (1963) later referred to the fact that the disappearance of college presidents in recent time, from the immediate scene of most

modern college activities, was a consequence of the great growth of enrollments and curricula.

Kauffman (1980) referred to the development of colleges in the latter half of the nineteenth century. He stated that:

> The latter half of the nineteenth century saw the development of colleges in the west, the land-grant colleges and the university modeled on the German concept of research and detached scientific study. At the turn of the century, business became involved in higher education as never before. Builders of great fortunes lent their names and fortunes to the creation of universities, and hired strong presidents to develop their institution. The clergyman president gave way to a more secular, sympathetic-to-science model, and a new generation of builders (p. 5).

According to Kauffman, at the beginning of the twentieth century the debates about the purpose of higher education took a different outlook. Business mentality, love of power, and growth of bureaucratic administration in colleges and universities were seen during these periods. Presidents of the many new colleges and universities were often criticized for their autocratic methods and for their departure from teaching and scholarly duties. Before World War I, most institutions had not established the present tradition of shared governance. Faculty complained frequently of their lack of power and their presidents' authoritative behavior.

As Katt (1973, p. 15) mentioned, "The role of the college president was increasing in burden and complexity. The term 'modern college or university president' was being used at the turn of the century" (p. 15). Katt referred to Ellis and Hollis (1962) in which they noted the following:

> 1905: Hence has arisen the modern college president--as being as different from the awe-inspiring clergyman

> of the eighteenth century . . . as is possible to imagine.
>
> 1914: In the old days the college president, though he usually taught, was supreme and autocratic and as leading institutions grew and he ceased to teach, the concentration of power in his hands became altogether excessive.
>
> 1916: It must be evident from all that has been stated that the position of the president is almost everywhere becoming less autocratic either as a result of legislation or of practice.
>
> 1920: This rapid change in personnel and policy is not surprising, for it is well known that the office of the university or college president is one of the most exacting in the world (p. 15).

Also, Katt (1973), in quoting Brubacker and Rudy, noted that it was during this period that the administrative staffs became permanent fixtures within the college organization. This was a period of "tremendous expansion and differentiation of the administrative function" (Katt, 1973, p. 15). Katt, also in comparing the presidents of a half a century before with those in 1950, referred to Gordon's idea:

> Changes correlative to the increase in demands upon the university president have not been in the type of chief executive or in the nature of his concern with higher education: the adjusting factors have been in the vertical and horizontal expansions of the organizational hierarchy and in delegations of authority (p. 15).

Kauffman (1980) referred to changes in presidential roles in the 1960s somewhat differently. In his opinion, the 1960s began with a different outlook in higher education. Higher education was growing, and it was rare to hear a negative word about its potency. In this period, much optimism was seen in the area. Knowledge was a resource eagerly sought by students, government, and industry. The enrollments in the 1960-1970 decade increased greatly. Most university presidents

in this period saw their primary responsibility as paving the way for academicians and preparing the most competent scholars that could be found.

As Prator (1963) noted:

> At this time, college institutions put great stores in their objective of adding to human knowledge. This research function generally is regarded as one of the college's most important goals. It is now asserted more frequently than ever before that effective teaching must be accompanied by research investigation, a function almost completely unknown in the early American colleges (p. 7).

As Scott (1975) noted:

> Literature of the early 1960s presented the college presidency as being among the coveted and well-paid positions in American education. However, even then the role in terms of performance presented many problems. In spite of the struggle, the president had unexcelled opportunities for educational leadership and for a permanent influence upon many phases of American life. Butler, president of Columbia University for over fifty years, identified the multiciplicity of activities of a president as social, economic, political, and educational (p. 11).

Scott also referred to the literature of the mid-1960s which indicated the college president performed his responsibilities in what was perceived as an authoritarian kind of relationship that was considered traditionally oriented and of colonial period. In this regard Scott noted that:

> He was specific and direct. The message from the president's office was of 'now hear this,' rather than calling a meeting to discuss what was to be done. The message left no doubt as to what the problem was and specifically what was to be done administratively. Roles were clearly defined, which is usually no longer the case (p. 13).

Concerning the present emerging role of the college president, Scott (1975) referred to Dodd's idea:

> Present emerging role of the college president is in need of clarification. The traditional pattern had a definite uniformity and was consistent in character, whereas today there appears to be little, if any, consistency in the role of the president. . . . Unless the presidential office retains the traditional character of leadership in education, there will be little hope for the future. The traditional role included qualities that command the respect and support of faculties, as well as laymen (p. 12).

The 1960s began with much optimism in higher education. It was in this context of the early 1960s that Clark Kerr contributed his idea of the multiversity. Kauffman (1980) referred to Kerr's idea of a multiversity with all of its diversity and inconsistency in the early 1960s. He observed:

> Kerr provides a brief and marvelous recapitulation of all role expectations that have ever existed for American college presidents. It is perhaps the most often quoted section of this volume of lectures. It begins with expected to be a friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, and on and on through the countless contradictions and absurdities we have held up as necessary for the effective president. After considering all the possible contradictory choices ever offered, leader - office holder, educator - caretaker, creator - inheritor, pump - bottleneck, Kerr concludes that the president of the multiversity is all of these. But he is mostly a mediator. . . . Kerr defined the first task of the mediator as establishing and maintaining 'peace' among all the constituencies and then competing claims on the multiversity (p. 16).

Kauffman (1980) observed additionally:

> In the latter 1960s and early 1970s, the crisis-manager, cool-under-fire, and similar role expectations became commonplace. As the situation changes, role expectations change. . . . By the mid-1970s, the public image of the president was of a harried, if energetic, executive type rushing through 'revolving door' positions (pp. 12-13).

Finally, Kauffman (1980) referred to the roles of the presidency in the recent years containing several dimensions and varieties. the

tasks are not all that different from what they had been over many years. Yet, as the situation changed, effective performance of those tasks required different skills and competencies. He referred to the president as the center of a vastly complex and complicated organization. Whatever the function of the president, he should be an effective person to prevent suffering of the institution.

Eaton's (1981) idea concerning the immediate future comparing that of the 1960s and 1970s was rather different. Eaton further mentioned:

> If presidents are successful and fortunate, they can retain trust and respect within the organization. Acceptance, respect, and leadership will be needed to grapple with the psychology of entitlement, changing demographics, unpredictable enrollments, increased accountability and regulations, computer technology, limited fiscal resources, limited energy resources, and an economy of significant unpredictability (p. 1).

As can be seen, higher education today has become more secular than religious. Its purposes and objectives are different and more varied than they used to be. Today, most presidents are having to learn techniques of business, computer programming, and fund raising activities. In our time, presidents are learning the art of delegation and are aided by deans, registrars, public relation staff, and secretaries. They have established offices separate from the faculty with functions separate from teaching. In this way, they have assured the functions of an administrator.

Definitions of Leadership

Definitions of leadership are almost as numerous as are the

researchers engaged in its study. The following definitions of leadership are typical examples:

Hoy and Miskel (1978) define the concept as:

> Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal-seeking and goal-achievement. To lead is to engage in an act that initiates a structure-interaction as part of the process of solving a mutual problem (p. 176).

Miller (1970, p. 304) pointed out that leadership is "the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas, and consideration of their feelings."

Richman and Farmer (1974) asserted that:

> Higher education effective leadership is providing an environment and structure that adequately satisfy important human needs on various personality factors, on mutual respect, trust, and confidence, on knowledge, information, and wisdom (p. 21).

Richards and Greenlaw (1966, p. 135) said that: "Leadership is an influence process, the dynamics of which are a function of the personal characteristics of the leader and his followers and the nature of the specific situations."

Merton (1969, p. 2614) contended that "Leadership involves an interpersonal relation in which others desire to comply rather than feel compelled to do so."

Bowers and Seashore (1966) offered a synthesis of apparent differences concerning leadership when they stated:

> It seems useful at the outset to isolate on a common sense basis certain attributes of 'leadership.' First, the concept of leadership is meaningful only in the context of two or more people. Second, leadership consists of behavior; more specifically, it is behavior by one member of a group toward another member or members of the group, which advances some aim. Not all

> organizationally useful behavior in a work group is leadership; leadership behavior must be distinguished from the performance of noninterpersonal tasks that advances the goals of the organizations on a common sense basis, then leadership is organizationally useful behavior by one member of an organizational family toward another member of the same organizational family (p. 240).

Selznick (1957) declared:

> Leadership creates and molds an organization's embodying in thought and feeling and habit--the value premises of policy--leadership reconciles internal striving and environmental pressure, paying close attention to the way adaptive behavior brings about changes in organizational character. When an organization lacks leadership, these tasks are inadequately fulfilled, however expert the flow of paper and however smooth (p. 62).

Fiedler (1967), in discussing the identification of the leader, stated:

> However, we shall here designate only one group member as leader; namely, the one who meets one of the following criteria: (1) he is appointed as the leader supervisor, chairman, etc., by a representative of the larger organization of which the group is a part; (2) he is elected by the group; or (3) if there is neither an elected nor an appointed leader, or if such a leader is clearly only a figurehead, he is the individual who can be identified as most influential by task-relevant questions on a sociometric preference questionnaire (pp. 8-9).

Leadership Theories

A brief review of leadership theory has been beneficial to the study of the university president's leadership behavior.

Trait Theories of Leadership

In describing the trait approach, Luthuns (1977) noted:

> The scientific analysis of leadership started off by concentrating on leaders themselves. The vital question that

> the theoretical approach attempted to answer was, 'What characteristic or trait makes a person a leader?' The earliest trait theories, which can be traced back to the ancient Greeks and Romans, concluded that leaders were born, not made. This 'great man' theory of leadership said that a person was born either with or without the necessary traits for leadership. Famous figures in history, for example Napoleon, were said to have had the 'natural' leadership abilities to rise out of any situation to be a great leader. . . . Eventually, the 'great man' theory gave way to a more realistic trait approach to leadership. Under the influence of the behavioristic school of psychological thought, acceptance was given to the fact that leadership traits are not completely inborn but can also be acquired through learning and experience. Attention returned to the search for universal traits possessed by leaders. Numerous physical, mental, and personality traits were researched from about 1930 to 1950 (p. 439).

The search is still underway for a set of traits which all leaders must possess.

In the first half of the twentieth century, the primary attempt in leadership studies was to determine the traits and characteristics of leaders. MacFadden (1974) referred to Cowley's research which tended to bring about general acceptance of the trait approach:

> Cowley's investigations were directed at answering two questions: (1) Do followers possess traits different from leaders in the same situation? and (2) Do leaders in different situations possess the same traits? Using a battery of twenty-eight psychological tests, Cowley's survey was conducted on a sample of 112 commissioned officers, privates, student leaders and followers, and criminal leaders and followers. He concluded that leaders did possess different traits than their followers, that it was not possible to identify specific traits, and that no single trait was identified as common to all leaders. However, the traits they tended to have in common were self-confidence, speed in reaching a decision, and regarding the finality of judgment (p. 11).

MacFadden also quoted Drake's findings regarding the trait approach:

> There tends to be a high degree of trait consistency in leadership which argues for the reality of the trait concept. He identified traits according to their positive

> and negative relationship to leadership. Those related in a positive manner to leadership were: aggressiveness, cheerfulness, emotional stability, humor, originality, trustworthiness, tact, and desire to excel. He found that a negative relationship existed between leadership and anger, conceit, excitability, introversion, selfishness, and occasional extreme depression (p. 14).

According to Gibb (1954, p. 914), such characteristics as "energy, self-confidence, intelligence, verbal fluency, persistence, and possession of insight" were identified.

White's (1965, p. 292) leadership study of educational administrators demonstrated that "Leaders' traits tended to include high self-confidence, and that they were practically-oriented introverts."

Davis (1972), in his review of research, found the following four traits which seemed to have an impact on effective organizational leadership:

1. Intelligence: research generally shows that the leader had higher intelligence than the average intelligence of his followers. Interestingly, however, the leader cannot be exceedingly much more intelligent than his followers.

2. Social maturity and breadth: leaders are emotionally stable and mature and have broad interests and activities. They have an assured, respectful self-concept.

3. Inner motivations and achievement derives: leaders have relatively intense motivational drives on the achievement type. They strive for intrinsic rather than the extrinsic rewards.

4. Human relations attitudes: a successful leader recognizes the worth and dignity of his followers and is able to emphathize with them. In the terminology of the Ohio State Leadership studies, he possesses 'consideration,' and in the Michigan studies' terminology, he is 'employee' rather than 'production'-centered (pp. 103-104).

Stogdill's (1948) exhaustive survey of leadership literature dealing with the trait approach was an illustration of the limitation of such

a concept. For example, "He listed six studies where leaders were found to be younger, ten whereby they were found to be older, two where there was no difference, and one claiming that age differed with the situation" (Stogdill, 1948, p. 35). As Gibb (1954) summarized:

> Early attempts at the description of leader behavior tended to concentrate upon the recognition of personality traits which could be said to characterize all leaders. A very wide variety of such traits was explored and while correlations are, in general, positive, they are rarely large, and it is clear that only a little of the variance in leader behavior can be accounted for this way (p. 916).

Gouldner (1950) also referred to some shortcomings in the trait approach:

> (1) the trait theory ignores the subordinates; (2) not all individuals possess the necessary combination of traits to become leaders; (3) the relative importance of the various traits have not been specified; (4) a leader in one situation is not necessarily a leader in another setting; and (5) the research evidence is inconsistent. . . . At this time there is no reliable evidence concerning the existence of universal leadership traits (pp. 31-35).

Situational Theories of Leadership

The more dominant approach in leadership theory which gained importance after World War II was the study of situational factors. The situational theories emphasized that leadership roles, skills, and behavior were dependent upon the situation under investigation. As Gibb (1945, p. 901) believed, "Leadership is always relative to situation."

LaPiere (1930) stated that:

> Situational theory is more generally accepted than trait theory. Self-confidence is a result of competence in the activities in which an individual engages. Similarly, regarding initiative, one is not likely to

> feel self-confident in a situation which he does not understand, nor does one tend to exhibit initiative in an unfamiliar field. This newer view of leadership stresses the performance of needed functions and adaptability to changing situations. This implies that effective leaders should be sensitive to the changing conditions of their groups (p. 75).

Hersey and Blanchard (1972) wrote:

> The focus of the situational approach to leadership is on observed behavior, not on any hypothetical inborn or acquired abaility or potential for leadership. The emphasis is on the behavior of leaders and their group members (followers) and various situations (p. 68).

Donnelly, Gibson, and Ivancevich (1971) relate situational theory as:

> The situational theory of leadership advocates an approach in which the leader understands his own behavior, the behavior of his followers, and the situation at hand before he utilizes a particular style. The emphasis is on the diagnostic skills of the leader to size up the situation and then adjust his style (p. 420).

A review of the research literature by Filley and House (1969) found the following situational variables to have an impact on leadership effectiveness:

1. the previous history of the organization, the age of the previous incumbent in the leader's position, the age of the leader, and his previous experience;
2. the community in which the organization operates;
3. the particular work requirements of the group;
4. the organizational climate of the group being led;
5. the kind of job the leader holds;
6. the size of the group led;
7. the degree to which group member cooperation is required;
8. the cultural expectations of subordinates;
9. group member personalities;

10. the time required and allowed for decision making (p. 409).

Wofford (1971) introduced five factors which represented the situational variables which have an important impact on the leadership effectiveness. The five factors were: centralization and work evaluation, organizational complexity, size of organization and structure of its task, structural attributes of the work unit, and organizational layering and communication. In concluding his study Wofford noted:

> The results indicate that it is possible to establish a conceptual framework to include situational variables and leader behavior dimensions, and to refute the position of theorists who contend that the study of (leader) behavior is futile because situatonal influences negate behavior effects (p. 10).

One of the most often quoted works in the area of leader effectiveness is Fiedler's (1972) contingency model. As Fiedler explained:

> This theory postulates a contingent relationship between leadership performance and a leadershp style score. Called the esteem for the least preferred coworker or LPC, this relationship is moderated by a situational 'favorableness' dimension, which is conceptually defined as the degree to which the leadership situation enables the leader to control and influence his group's behavior (p. 39).

Korman (1966) stated:

> What is needed, however, in future concurrent studies, is not just recognition of this factor of situational determinants, but, rather, a systematic conceptualization of situational variance as it might relate to leadership behavior and a research program designed to test derivations from such a conceptualization so that direction might be given to the field (p. 355).

Some writers believed that the emphasis on situations in leadership studies may have been carried too far. Future studies in this field may assume a middle ground between the personality of the leader

or the trait approach, and the recent, much emphasized situational approach. Halpin (1966) wrote:

> To say that leadership behavior is determined exclusively by situational factors is to deny the leader freedom of choice and determination. This violates common sense and experience. Even now within research circles, a gradual but growing counter-reaction is taking shape--drawing away from the extreme situational position, with increasing recognition that the truth probably lies in an area of middle ground (p. 48).

Behavioral Theories

The behavioral approach is based on the theory that management is largely a matter of developing good interpersonal relationships. As Ivancevich, Szilagyi, and Wallace (1977) stated:

> Dissatisfaction during the 1950s with the trait approach to leadership led behavioral scientists to focus their attention on the actual leader behavior--namely, what the leader does and how he or she does it. The foundation for the style of leadership approach was the belief that effective leaders utilized a particular style to lead individuals and groups to achieving certain goals, resulting in high productivity and morale. Unlike trait theories, the behavioral approach focused on leader effectiveness, not the emergence of an individual as a leader (p. 277).

Halpin (1956), in discussing the behavioral approach to the study of leadership, said:

> First of all, it focuses upon observed behavior, rather than upon a posited capacity inferred from this behavior. No presuppositions are made about a one-to-one relationship between leader behavior and an underlying capacity or potentiality presumably determinative of this behavior. By the same token, no a priori assumptions are made that the leader behavior which a leader exhibits in one situation will be manifested in other group situations. . . . Nor does the term . . . suggest that this behavior is determined either innately or situationally. Either determinant is possible, as is any combination of the two, but the concept of leader behavior does not itself predispose us to accept one in opposition to the other (p. 12).

Barnard (1938), as one of the first to address the behavioral approach, said:

> A person can and will accept a communication as authoritative only when four conditions simultaneously obtain: (a) he can and does understand the communication; (b) at the time of his decision, he believes that it is not inconsistent with the purpose of the organization; (c) at the time of his decision, he believes it to be compatible with his personal interest as a whole, and (d) he is able mentally and physically to comply with it (p. viii).

According to Ivancevich, Szilagy, and Wallace (1977):

> Although many terms were assigned to the different leadership styles, two factors were stressed in each approach: 'task orientation' and 'employee orientation.' Task orientation related to the emphasis the leader places on getting the job done by such action as assigning and organizing the work, making decisions, and evaluating performance. Employee orientation was the openness and friendliness exhibited by the leader, and his or her concern for the needs of subordinates (p. 277).

According to Halpin (1954), investigations into leadership were initiated at Ohio State University in 1947. The leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" were developed by Hemphill. Halpin identified two factors that most clearly described differences in leadership behavior, consideration, and initiating structure. Consideration was leader behaviors such as being friendly and approachable, treating subordinates as his equal, backing up the subordinates in their actions, looking out for their personal welfare, putting suggestions made by the subordinates into operation, mutual trust, and so on. Initiating structure had to do with such leader behavior as establishing well-defined patterns of organization, asking that subordinates follow standard rules and regulations, maintaining definite standards of performance, letting subordinates know what is

expected of them, and making his attitude clear to subordinates. These behaviors serve to define structure within the group, with regard to the accomplishment of group goals.

According to Halpin (1966, p. 39), "The two leader behavior dimensions parallel the two group goals of group maintenance and group achievement." As Katt (1973) noted:

> The significance of the Ohio State studies is more fully realized when noting that these two dimensions were considered separate and distinct. Previously, leader behavior was conceptualized and continuous, suggested by the Lewin studies, varying between autocratical democratic leadership styles (p. 30).

Hersey and Blanchard (1972, p. 74), in this regard, stated "Leader behavior was just plotted as two separate areas rather than as a single continuum."

According to Katt (1973), the quality of required leader behavior has been widely discussed with varying terminology. In addition to the Ohio State dimensions of "initiation of structure and consideration," there were Likert's "job centered" and "employee centered" dimensions, and White and Lippitt's dimensions of "autocratic" and "democratic" (Katt, 1973, p. 30). Also, other theorists have used labels, including "equalitarian" and "authoritarian," "likeability," "task-ability," "expressive," and "instrumental" (Katt, 1973, p. 30). Wofford (1971, p. 10) stated "These pairs differ in emphasis rather than in substance."

Faculty Relations With the President

Historically, according to Knapp (1962), the organizational structuring of the college placed the faculty in a servitude role to

administrators. This meant that administrative control was done by non-academic supervisory bodies (the board and the president) who were frequently unfamiliar with the vital problems of education. In recent years, due to faculty role clarifications in which the president lost some of his authority, the situation changed considerably. In this regard, many administrative functions have been taken over by an administrative bureaucracy of deans. Thus, faculty continued to struggle for any form of academic freedom. Politics, unions, and students were used by faculty to overcome this subservient role.

As Kauffman (1982) mentioned:

> From pious scholar to autocrat to hero-builder, we see that the role and concept of the presidency were changing. For the most part, professors were critical of all leadership styles and the exercising of any presidential authority. As Hutchins observed in 1956, the faculty really prefer 'anarchy to any form of government' (p. 4).

According to Blackburn (1977):

> With the founding of universities in the middle ages, faculties were the masters of the corporation. By the end of the last century, the pendulum had swung its full course. Professors were completely powerless. The last fifty or so years show an increase in the domain of their authority. However, what power faculty now have comes to them exclusively by delegation, seldom by any legal right (p. 18).

According to Kerr (1981):

> The professoriate in the last several decades has itself experienced a revolution in its own perception of masters. In an earlier time, faculty regarded themselves as serving institutions with which they affiliated themselves forever. When the histories of some of the chief academies are read, one often read about individual faculty members who served generations of students in addition to serving their discipline in a close mentorship that led to a sense of accomplishment in producing the enlightened contingency of the next generation (p. 15).

Kerr continued:

> Now increasingly for reasons that have been well documented, one sees a change in faculty perceptions of whom they serve. More and more one perceives faculty turning to themselves and to their discipline and to their scholarly work as the end and object of their service. Whole societies are lodged outside the academy, particularly for social scientists and scientists into which they can fit, than are focused on research and disciplinary identity (p. 15).

Jenks and Riesman (1977), concerning the conditions of faculty in the nineteenth century, referred to the fact that, at that time, faculty was not quite professionalized. The college instructor was, moreover, very much under the influence of the president and the trustees. Tenure seldom existed, and, in general, faculty were not considered independent professionals. Jenks and Riesman referred to the changes in the character of American society in the latter part of the nineteenth century and their effect on higher education. They believed the basic reason for these changes was the rise of the university. This has had many consequences. As a result of this movement the college instructors have become less and less preoccupied with institutional concerns and educating young people and more and more preoccupied with educating one another by doing scholarly research which will advance their respective careers. They also stated from the start that the professionalization of faculty brought conflict on many directions. Late nineteenth century and early twentieth century academic histories reported many conflicting situations in which the basic question was whether the president and trustees or the faculty would determine the matters of educational policy like the shaping of the curriculum, the content of particular courses, or the use of

particular books. Today, faculty control over these matters is rarely challenged, and conflict usually centers on other issues.

In this way, Riesman and Jenks (1972), in The Academic Revolution, devoted the first chapter to a discussion of transferring power to faculty. They stated that most university presidents see the primary responsibility as "making the world safe for academicians" and training the most competent scholars that can be found. Despite the knowledge that faculty use the administration as a scapegoat, Riesman and Jenks concluded that administrators are today more concerned with keeping their faculty happy than any other single group.

Kauffman (1982) also referred to the early 1960s, a time of the

> . . . 'academic revolution' in which faculty power asserted itself in perhaps its most arrogant period of American history. At this period of time, the shortage of qualified faculty was observed, and those who were outstanding were much sought after by government research funding agencies as well as other institutions (p. 15).

As Kauffman noted, for the most part, faculty criticized the presidents' autocratic method and their departure from teaching and scholarly duties. In this regard, Kauffman also reported:

> Professor James Cattell, whose father had been president of Lafayette College from 1869-1883, was one of the foremost critics of 'presidential autocracy.' As a professor of psychology at Columbia University, he led a campaign early in the twentieth century to change the governance of universities by weakening the role of trustees and severely diminishing the authority of presidents. Writing in 1912, he called for the curtailment of the 'autocratic powers of presidents,' limiting their tenure of office to terms not to exceed four or five years, and paying them salaries comparable to professors. He also opposed the provision of residences for presidents. Cattell's antagonies toward presidents was unusually harsh. Some Columbia University faculty members who agreed with Cattell helped to establish the New School for Social Research in New York City. It began without a president, leaving such

> duties to a committee of professors. This innovation was short lived (p. 14).

According to Kauffman (1982), in 1909 a Harvard faculty member wrote:

> The men who control Harvard today are very little else than businessmen running a large department store which dispenses education to the millions. Their endeavor is to make it the largest establishment of the kind in America (p. 13).

In a report by the American Association of Higher Education (1977) it was stated that:

> Faculty discontent recently has become evident in situations of higher education in the United States. . . . The main sources of discontent are faculty's desire to participate in the determination of those policies that affect its professional status and performance and in the establishment of complex statewide systems of higher education that have decreased local control over important campus issues. . . . Economic factors such as salary level and structure have contributed to faculty discontent, but appear of secondary importance (pp. 1-8).

The questions still remained as to whether college faculties should be delegated final authority to decide matters of educational policy, or whether they should serve as advisers to presidents and deans.

A review of the literature in this matter showed that not all agreed that faculty participation in decision-making was a good practice. As recently as 1960, several authorities on college and university governance contended that the faculty lacked the expertise and the desire to participate in institutional governance. They should have little or no voice in decision-making became the opinion of many. For example, Corson (1960) wrote:

> Faculty influence . . . in contributing to such decisions on governance and education policy is limited

> by the lack of analytical data on which to base objective and considered decisions, the limited interest of many faculty in higher education, their tendency to think about and act upon specific courses or requirements rather than policies, and their primary concern with their individual subject-matter field (p. 47).

Dodd (1962) spoke similarly:

> Faculties find the same difficulty in drawing the line between policy forming and administrative execution that trustees do. Too many individuals nourish the erroneous idea that the only way to keep control is to have a finger in every issue, to control the details and perhaps administer them as well (p. 99).

Not all authorities spoke to exclude faculty, however, For example, Henderson (1960, p. 239) stated: "A typical weakness of administrators is to make important decisions of policy without full discussions with their faculties."

As Bunzel (1970) stated:

> After years of struggle to achieve some degree of autonomy and power, faculties are right in jealously guarding their prerogatives. Further, a collaborative and comparative role for faculty and administration is the only sensible alternative to an increasingly fragmented institution subject to enlarging external and internal pressure. However, faculties should not seek to take on executive, legislative and judicial roles to the detriment of the round exercise of legitimate executive leadership (p. 12).

According to Bolman's (1970) point of view, faculty that were threatened by forces related to the job and salary cuts had unionized and demanded greater participation in the governance of the college in order to stabilize their positions.

Faculty demands for greater participation in governance have led, among other things, to an acceleration of unionization. As Birmingham and Borland (1977) noted:

> One of the most controversial issues in higher education today is that of faculty collective bargaining.

> The controversy in many geographical areas does not center on whether faculty collective bargaining should be permitted. The fact exists that in 24 states, faculty collective bargaining is now a legal process being utilized by faculty to improve their working conditions in public institutions of higher education. The controversy in these states tends to focus on contract negotiations and administration, grievance procedures, the effects of bargaining on institutional management, and the effects on instruction (p. 169).

As Baldridge et al. (1981) stated:

> Only recently have the effects of unionization on academic governance, faculty contracts, institutional innovation, and student power begun to emerge as longitudinal studies have been conducted on the impact of faculty unions. There are many factors that lead toward faculty unionization, including desire for higher wages, and greater benefits, fear of budget cuts, desire for job security, more influence in campus governance, more fair grievance procedures, and greater professional standing (p. 7).

Concerning the future of faculty, Kerr (1981) contended that:

> The challenge for the future of faculties as administrators undertake it is to care for, to reward, to look after in an institutional way, faculty who are fulfilling their scholarly objectives while at the same time insisting on institutionally recognized objectives; that is, student needs, in the form of good teaching and advising (p. 15).

Kerr further continued:

> Now, the faculty perceptions of administrators is that they are abetting the fall from grace, or the encroachment of darkness, and they are doing this by bringing in ever more difficult populations of students, housewives on weekends, street-wise older students who know how to caucus, part-time students, non-residential students, narrow-minded vocationalists. Administrators are bringing these populations in order to get up the number of FTE and keep their budget balanced. They are supporting as part of this objective the most pragmatic fields. . . . They are making influential educational decisions on solely financial grounds. They are interfering in the faculty right to respect, to promote,, to appoint their own number because of something known as affirmative action. They are pandering to student hedonism in order to avoid conflict. They are refusing to make

> decisions for which they must take responsibility by hiding behind committees that faculty are asked to serve on. They are selling out to technology, and in fact, their very language exhibits the preoccupation with programming and computers. They are abandoning the faculty in their quest for their own managerial advancement, and above all, they are worshiping a balanced budget while the hungry sheep look up and are not fed (pp. 16-17).

According to Eaton (1981):

> In the future there will be an increasing divergence of energy. Faculty will be more and more concerned with changes and developments in their respective career or discipline areas and less and less involved with institutional concerns. The new professionalism of faculty will reflect itself in increased demands for freedom to pursue individual career goals and a tolerance of an organization as the necessary but not necessarily desirable content of the achieving of individual objectives (p. 8).

Eaton further mentioned that:

> There is a shift in attitude whereby faculty realize that they are the center and focal point of educational activity rather than the object of decisions made by boards and presidents. The old pyramid format, with managers as the apex and faculty forming the base, will give way to a more complex diffuse structure. Staff development programs may take on the character of encouraging faculty to identify more closely with institutional profile and purpose as well as encouraging individual professional interest (p. 8).

In general, the literature shows that in the future the institutions of higher education will designate faculties who are more capable, independent, and goal-oriented. This greater faculty demand for individual determination of goals and objectives in the context of organizational functioning will encourage presidents to move in the direction for better management of the institutions and, as a result, will involve other individuals in the determination of the direction and the profile of the institution.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

As previously mentioned, this study was concerned with faculty perception of an ideal college president. According to Kerlinger (1964, p. 280), "A research design is, in a manner of speaking, a set of instructions to the investigator to gather and analyze his data in certain ways." This chapter discusses the research questions and hypotheses, defines the major terms, and identifies and describes the selection of the population, information about the instrument, method of data collection, and explanation of the statistical treatment of the data.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

The investigation utilized two dimensions of the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (ILBDQ). The research questions were related to the two dimensions of "initiating structure" and "consideration," which relate, respectively, to whether the president is "task-oriented" or "people-oriented." Several questions came to mind:

1. What proportion of faculty desire an administrator who is high in initiating structure?

2. What proportion of the faculty desire an administrator who is high in consideration?

3. What proportion of the faculty desire an administrator who possesses both characteristics in relatively equal proportions?

4. Are there any demographic characteristics that relate to faculty perception of an ideal college president?

Research Hypotheses

In light of the above, the following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no relationship (difference) between college faculty's age and perceptions of an ideal college president.

2. There is no difference between male and female college faculty's perceptions of an ideal college president.

3. There is no difference among the different faculty academic ranks in their perceptions of an ideal college president.

4. There is no difference between the tenured and non-tenured faculty perceptions of an ideal college president.

5. There is no difference between full-time and part-time faculty perceptions of an ideal college president.

6. There is no relationship (difference) between faculty educational levels and faculty perceptions of an ideal college president.

7. There is no difference among the faculty who belong to one of three major departments (physical science, social science, and humanities) in their perceptions of an ideal college president.

8. There is no relationship (difference) between faculty salary levels and faculty perceptions of an ideal college president.

9. There is no difference among the faculties from the different campuses in their perception of an ideal college president.

Definition of Terms

Senior or Four-Year College. The terms "senior college" and "four-year college" in this study were used synonymously. They refer to institutions authorized to offer programs leading to a bachelor's degree, and, in some cases, to a higher degree.

President. The chief administrative officer of the educational institution.

Faculty. Any person on the staff who holds a teaching contract and is engaged in teaching, and, in some cases, in research as well. A full-time faculty member in this study is a person who is employed 100% and is involved in full-time teaching and/or research. Another kind of full-time faculty member in this study is a person who is employed 100%, but who may also be involved in part-time administration along with teaching. A part-time faculty member in this study is a person who is employed less than 100% and is involved in part-time teaching.

Consideration. According to Gib (1972):

> Consideration reflects the extent to which the individual is likely to have job relationships with his subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and/or certain warmth between himself and them (p. 1115).

Initiating Structure. Gib (1972, p. 1115) noted: "Initiating structure reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to

define and structure his own role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment."

Physical Science. Any of the services included under the head of pure physics, or of the allied sciences such as chemistry, mineralogy, petrology, geology, astronomy, and meterology.

Social Science. One of a group of sciences dealing with special phases of human society, such as economics, sociology, and politics.

Humanities. The branches of learning concerned with human thoughts and relations, as distinguished from the sciences, especially literature, philosophy, and history.

Perception. As Verbeke (1966, p. 16) noted, perception is an "immediate or intuitive cognition or judgment." In this study, faculty members describe the leadership behavior of the president in terms of how he or she actually behaves as a leader.

Leadership. This is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation.

Leadership Behavior of the President. In this study, this is defined in terms of two dimensions: "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration." According to Toulyati (1981):

> Initiating Structure is the behavior of the president in determining the relationship between himself or herself and faculty members in attempting to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. For a given individual, his or her initiating structure is his or her total score in the Initiating Structure dimensions of the ILBDQ. Consideration is behavior-indicating friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the president and his or her faculty members. For a given individual, his or her consideration is his or her total score on the Consideration dimension of the ILBDQ (p. 7).

Identification of Population

This study was limited to a random sample of the population of faculty members in the 12 public institutions in the State of Oklahoma as listed in their school directories (1981-1982). An attempt was made to obtain a response from 10% of the teaching faculty on each campus who were both full-time and part-time for the academic year 1981-1982. The total population for the study was composed of 391 individuals. Because the sample selected to participate in this research effort was drawn from the population above, no attempt should be made to generalize the findings of this study to a broader population of other states, private institutions, community colleges, or individuals other than faculty members.

Selection of the Sample

To collect data for testing the hypotheses, approximately 10% of the total population on each campus was selected based on random sample selections. According to Gay (1976, p. 68) utilizing this method "All individuals in the defined population have an equal and independent chance of being selected for the sample."

In the process of sample selection, the school directories of the 12 schools were used to secure the samples of faculty members in the selected colleges and universities.

Instrumentation

Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

The ILBDQ was employed to collect data concerning the perception

of university faculty of an ideal college president. This instrument offers an objective and reliable means by which one can determine how specific leaders are perceived to differ in leadership style, in terms of two dimensions: initiating structure and consideration.

According to Halpin (1957), the ILBDQ provides a useful tool for acquiring group members' descriptions of the leader behavior, of their designated leaders in a formal setting. Measures are obtained by having group members rate their leader on items which describe a specific way in which a leader may behave. The descriptive items were factor analyzed by Halpin and Winer (1952), who identified two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior--consideration and initiating structure--which together accounted for 84% of the common variance in leader behavior. The two dimensions constitute key measures for college president behavior in this study.

The ILBDQ, used in this study, was originally developed by Hemphill and Coons (1950) and later refined by Halpin and Winer (1952). Hemphill et al. (1950) developed a list of approximately 1,800 items describing different aspects of leader behavior. These items were reduced to 150 items that were used to develop the first form of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Several analytic studies of item correlation produced two factors identified as "initiation of structure" in interaction and "consideration." The present form was developed by Halpin in 1957, to measure these two subscales.

The ILBDQ, composed of 40 Likert-type items, is divided into two specific dimensions--Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior--for measurement of expectations about what a university president's behavior ought to be. As Fleishman and Peters (1962)

stated:

> Consideration: Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinate's ideas, and consideration of their feelings. A high score is indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score indicates the supervisor is likely to be more impersonal in his relations with group members. Structure: Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his own role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension characterizes individuals who play a more active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, trying out new ideas, etc. (p. 130).

Only 30 of the 40 items on the ILBDQ were scored; 15 in each dimension of Initiating Structure Behavior and Consideration Behavior. As stated by Halpin (1957), the 10 unscored items have been retained in the questionnaire in order to keep the conditions of administrators comparable to those used in standardizing the questionnaire.

According to Halpin (1966), the respondents indicated the frequency with which the college president should engage in each form of behavior by checking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never. Each item is scored on a scale of 4 to 0, according to scoring keys provided by the authors. In this way never was scored 0, seldom was scored 1, occasionally was scored 2, often was scored 3, and always was given a score of 4. Consequently, the theoretical range of scores on each dimension is from 0 to 60.

Halpin (1957, p. 1) stated: "The reliability by the split-half method is 0.83 for Initiating Structure Behavior Scores, and 0.92 for the Consideration Behavior." Since the development of the ILBDQ, the instrument has been used in numerous studies, research projects, and

doctoral dissertations. Its reliability and validity have already been established by different authorities in the field.

Data Collection Method

Due to the large sample size considered in this study, the mail survey (questionnaire method) seemed the most appropriate procedure for data collection and was utilized in the study.

In support of this method of investigation, Good (1959) noted:

> As to uses and application, the questionnaire extends the investigator's power and techniques of observations by reminding the respondent of each item, helping to insure responses to the same item from all respondents and tending to standardize and objectify the observations of different enumerations . . . (p. 190).

To secure higher returns, under advisement of the researcher's dissertation adviser, it was decided the first mailing packages containing a letter, the instrument, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope be taken personally to college designated representatives, who consented to distribute the research material to their colleagues. This arrangement was accomplished by appropriate telephone calls to the college presidents of the 11 campuses by the researcher's dissertation adviser, with special concern of securing higher returns on the completed questionnaire.

In April of 1982, a trip was made to different campuses in the State of Oklahoma in order to deliver the research material to 391 participants, as shown in Table I. The research material was sent through the mail to only 1 of the 12 schools--the Panhandle State University--because of the distance involved. The letter explained the study and its significance and requested the participation and

cooperation of the respondents. The confidentiality of the responses was clearly assured in the letter. The instrument was simple, clear and concise, and properly coded.

After delivering and/or sending the research material, a total of 260 (66.5%) questionnaires were returned in April, 1982. In May, 1982, the first follow-up containing material similar to the first package was sent to about 121 subjects whose questionnaires were not returned. The second research material was coded in a way that was recognizably different from the first one. As a result of this follow-up, 30 (7.5%) additional questionnaires were returned. Thus, the cumulative responses after the follow-up were 290 (74%). Nine non-usable returns were not included in the total number. Because of the adequate rate of returns, it was decided not to send a second follow-up.

After the returned questionnaires were tabulated, the data were punched on cards, and computation of all statistics involved in the study was done on a computer in the Oklahoma State University Computer Center in Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Statistical Procedure

The major purpose of the study was to identify the significance of the differences among university faculty members' perceptions of the president's ideal leadership styles measured by the ILBDQ when tested against certain demographic characteristics. For sets of the research hypotheses, an attempt was made to determine if a significant difference existed between (independent variables), including: (1) age, (2) sex, (3) academic rank, (4) tenure, (5) full-time or

TABLE I

NUMBER OF SAMPLES DELIVERED AND RETURNED IN DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Institution	Samples Delivered		Number of Samples Returned			Total Returned
	Number	Percent	First Return	Second Return	First & Second Return	Percent
Oklahoma State University	107	27.4	68	12	80	27.6
Central State University	41	10.5	25	3	28	9.7
Langston University	13	3.3	10	0	10	3.4
Oklahoma University	86	22.0	50	9	59	20.3
East Central University	19	4.9	18	0	18	6.2
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma	12	3.0	8	0	8	2.8
Southwestern Oklahoma State University	22	5.6	16	0	16	5.5
Cameron University	20	5.1	11	5	16	5.5
Panhandle State University	13	3.3	10	0	10	3.4
Northwestern Oklahoma State University	16	4.1	10	0	10	3.4
Southwestern Oklahoma State University	15	3.8	11	1	12	4.1
Northeastern Oklahoma State University	27	6.9	23	0	23	7.9
Total	391	100	260[1]	30[2]	290[3]	100

[1] 66.5% of total samples delivered.

[2] 7.5% of total samples delivered.

[3] Nine nonusable returns are not included.

part-time, (6) education level, (7) different departments, (8) salary level, (9) different campuses, and dependent variables, including faculty members' perceptions as measured by the ILDBQ. Thus, the appropriate statistical technique for testing the research hypotheses of the study was recognized as the single classification, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Kerlinger (1964) noted that;

> The analysis of variance is not just a statistical method. It is an approach and a way of thinking from one point of view at least, modern statistical methods culminate in analysis of variance and factor analysis. Both methods are general. Both have aims of scientific data analysis hardly conceived of fifty years ago (p. 187).

According to Guilford and Fruchter (1973), this is a statistical analysis which uses the means and mean square of two or more groups as a basis of comparing the groups on some chosen dimension. A significant ratio reveals that the differences are between group sets and that the group sets are not similar in these dimensions which are being calculated.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Presentation and analysis of data are included in this chapter according to the procedures presented in Chapter III.

The data gathered from the questionnaires were analyzed from three distinct points of view: first, the demographic information; second, answers to research question; and, third, testing the research hypotheses.

Of the 391 faculty members of 12 public four-year institutions in the State of Oklahoma, 290 or 74.5% responded to the questionnaires and returned them during the two-month period, April 1, 1982-June 1, 1982. Nine returned questionnaires were incomplete or unanswered (with attached notes stating that they preferred not to participate in the study). Thus, nine non-usable questionnaires were not counted or included in the data analysis.

The 290 responses from the 12 institutions indicated that 229 (79%) of the respondents were male and 61 (21%) were female. (See Table II, page 50.)

Concerning age, 98 (33.8%) of the population had the average age of 44.5; 82 (28.3%) had an average of 34.5; 68 (23.4%) had the average age of 54.5; 26 (9%) had the average age of 65.5; and 16 (5.5%) had the average age of 24.5. (See Table III, page 51.)

In regard to professorial rank, 88 (30.3%) of the population were professors; 79 (27.2%) were assistant professors; 73 (25.2%) were

TABLE II

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLES IN RELATION TO DEMOGRPHIC VARIABLES - SEX

Demographic Variables	Number of Samples	Percent of Total
Sex		
a. female	61	21
b. male	229	79
TOTAL	290	100

TABLE III

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLES IN RELATION TO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES - AGE

Demographic Variables	Number of Samples	Percent of Total
Age		
a. 20-29	16	5.5
b. 30-39	82	28.3
c. 40-49	98	33.8
d. 50-59	68	23.4
e. 60-69	26	9
f. 70	0	0
TOTAL	290	100.0

associate professors; 39 (13.4%) were instructors, and 11 (3.8%) held other than the above professorial ranks (Table IV).

TABLE IV

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLES IN RELATION TO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES - PROFESSORIAL RANK

Demographic Variables		Number of Samples	Percent of Total
Professorial Rank:	a. instructor	39	13.4
	b. assistant professor	79	27.2
	c. associate professor	73	25.2
	d. professor	88	30.3
	e. other	11	3.8
	TOTAL	290	100.0

The answers also indicated that 168 (57.9%) of the total population were tenured, and 122 (42.1%) were non-tenured (Table V).

TABLE V

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLES IN RELATION TO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES - TENURE

Demographic Variables		Number of Samples	Percent of Total
Tenure:	a. yes	168	57.9
	b. no	122	42.1
	TOTAL	290	100.0

Regarding the population's full-time or part-time status, the answers indicated that 209 (72.1%) were employed 100% and engaged in full time teaching and research; 58 (20%) were employed 100% involving part-time administration and part-time teaching; and 23 (7.9%) were employed less than 100 % and involved in part-time teaching (Table VI).

TABLE VI

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLES IN RELATION TO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES - PART-TIME FULL-TIME STATUS

Demographic Variables	Number of Samples	Percent of Total
Part-time, Full-time Status		
a. 100% employed/full-time teaching	209	72.1
b. 100% employed/part-time administration, part-time teaching	58	20
c. less than 100% employed/part-time teaching	23	7.9
TOTAL	290	100.0

The answers indicated that 170 (58%) of the population held earned doctorates. It should be noted that of this number, 132 (45.5%) had earned Ph.D. degrees, and the balance had earned Ed.D. degrees; 83 (28.7%) had Masters; 7 (2.4%) had Bachelors, 2 (0.7%) had Associates, and 28 (9.7%) held other than the above degrees. (See Table VII, page 54.)

One hundred thirty-six (46.9%) of the sample belonged to a social science department; 88 (30.3%) belonged to a physical science department; and 66 (22.8%) belonged to a humanities department. (See Table VIII, page 55.)

TABLE VII

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLES IN RELATION TO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES - DEGREE

Demographic Variables	Number of Samples	Percent of Total
Highest Earned Degree		
a. A.A.	2	0.7
b. B.S. or B.A.	7	2.4
c. M.S., M.A. or M.B.A.	83	28.7
d. Ed.S.	0	0
e. Ed.D.	38	13.1
f. Ph.D.	132	45.5
g. Other	28	9.7
TOTAL	290	100.0

TABLE VIII

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLES IN RELATION TO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES - DEPARTMENT

Demographic Variables	Number of Samples	Percent of Total
Different Departments		
a. Physical Science	88	30.3
b. Social Science	136	46.9
c. Humanities	66	22.8
TOTAL	290	100.0

Concerning salary level, 215 (74.1%) of the population earned for the nine-month term $20,000 or above; 45 (15.5%) earned $15,000-$19,999; 16 (5.5%) earned $10,000-$14,999; 7 (2.4%) earned $5,000-$9,999; and 7 (2.4%) earned $4,999 or less. (See Table IX, page 56.)

TABLE IX

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLES IN RELATION TO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES - SALARY

Demographic Variables	Number of Samples	Percent of Total
Salary Level		
a. $4,999 or less	7	2.4
b. $5,000-$ 9,999	7	2.4
c. $10,000-$14,999	16	5.5
d. $15,000-$19,999	45	15.5
e. $20,000 or above	215	74.1
TOTAL	290	100.0

Concerning faculty from participating institutions, 80 (27.6%) of the population belonged to Oklahoma State University; 28 (9.7%) belonged to Central State University; 10 (3.4%) belonged to Langston University; 59 (20.3%) belonged to Oklahoma University; 18 (6.2%) belonged to East Central University; 8 (2.8%) belonged to the University of Science and Art of Oklahoma; 16 (5.5%) belonged to Southwestern Oklahoma State University; 16 (5.5%) belonged to Cameron University; 10 (3.4%) belonged to Panhandle State University; 10 (3.4%) belonged to Northwestern Oklahoma State University; 12 (4.1%) belonged to Southeastern Oklahoma State University; and 23 (7.9%) belonged to Northeastern Oklahoma State University. (See Table X, page 57.)

TABLE X

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLES IN RELATION TO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES - PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Demographic Variables	Number of Samples	Percent of Total
Participating Institutions		
a. Oklahoma State University	80	27.6
b. Central State University	28	9.7
c. Langston University	10	3.4
d. Oklahoma University	59	20.3
e. East Central University	18	6.2
f. Univ. of Science and Art of Oklahoma	8	2.8
g. Southwestern Oklahoma State University	16	5.5
h. Cameron University	16	5.5
i. Panhandle State University	10	3.4
j. Northwestern Oklahoma State University	10	3.4
k. Southeastern Oklahoma State University	12	4.1
l. Northeastern Oklahoma State University	23	7.9
TOTAL	290	100.0

The research question with which the study dealt was: Do college faculty perceive that the president should ideally be "task-oriented" or "people oriented?"

A number of related questions were also raised:

1. What proportion of the faculty desire an administrator who is high in initiating structure?

2. What proportion of the faculty desire an administrator who is high in consideration?

3. What proportion of the faculty desire an administrator who possesses both characteristics in relatively equal proportions?

4. Are there any demographic characteristics that are related to faculty perception of an ideal college president?

With regard to research questions 1, 2, and 3 above, the answers indicated that 226 (77.9%) of the sample were in favor of an administrator who is higher in the initiating structure dimension than consideration. Fifty-one (17.6%) of the sample were willing to have a president who is lower in the initiating structure dimension than in the consideration dimension. Finally, 13 (4.5%) indicated support of the president who posseses both characteristics equally. (See Table XI, page 59.)

Elaborating on the above statements, Table XI shows that 226 (77.9%) of the sample with the mean of 43.95 desired an administrator who is higher in the initiating structure dimension than in the consideration dimension. Similarly, 51 (17.6%) of the sample with the mean of 35.08 desired an administrator who is lower in initiating structure than in the consideration dimension. Finally, 13 (4.5%) of the sample with the mean of 40.62 desired an administrator who possess both characteristics equally.

With regard to research question number 4 raised previously, several

TABLE XI

RESULTS OF FREQUENCY ANALYSIS OF TWO DIMENSIONS OF INITIATING STRUCTURE AND CONSIDERATION

Initiating Structure Dimension		Consideration	Remarks
(1) Count	226 (77.9%)	226 (77.9%)	
Mean	43.95	37.52	43.95 > 37.52
Sum	9932.00	8480.00	
Stn Dev	4.96	4.09	
(2) Count	51 (17.6%)	51 (17.6%)	
Mean	35.08	39.75	35.08 < 39.75
Sum	1789.00	2027.00	
Stn Dev	4.18	3.54	
(3) Count	13 (4.5%)	13 (4.5%)	
Mean	40.62	40.62	40.62 = 40.62
Sum	528.00	528.00	
Stn Dev	4.07	4.07	

null hypotheses were stated to find if certain faculty demographic characteristics influenced the perceptions of faculty members toward an ideal college president.

Testing the Hypotheses

The analysis of variance, single classification, was used to test each of the nine null hypotheses at the 0.05 level of significance. For the values significant at the p = .05 level, two multiple range tests (Scheffe and Duncan) were utilized to locate the differences.

HO_1: There is no difference between college faculty's age and their perceptions of an ideal college president.

In order to test the hypothesis, the demographic variable of age was tested with two dimensions of the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Initiating Structure and Consideration. The F value of 4,285 = 0.34 for the five groups was not significant, meaning that differences among the perceptions of the five groups was not significant. Thus, the null hypothesis concerning age variable and initiating structure dimensions was not rejected. For such non-significant F values, neither Sheffe nor the Duncan test was needed, for the 290 subject values for the dimension of initiating structure ranged from 25.00 to 56.00, compared to a 42.24 average value.

Concerning the consideration dimension, at 0.05, the F (4,285 = 2.68) for the five groups (N = 16, 98, 26, 82, 68) was significant. Thus, the null hypothesis concerning the age variable and consideration dimension was rejected, indicating a significant difference among the mean scores of the five different groups. Besides Scheffe multiple range test, the Duncan multiple range test was used to locate the

difference among the mean scores of the five groups. The results of the Duncan test suggested that the mean perceptions score of group two, 36.90 (age group 30-39) was significantly different at P< . 05 from the means of group three, 38.32 (age group 40-49), group four, 38.63 (age group 50-59), and group five, 39.27 (age group 60-69). Values for dimensions of consideration ranged from 28.00 to 52.00 compared to a 38.05 average value. (See Table XII, which follows, and Table XIII, page 62.)

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE FACULTY AND AGE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Source		dF	SS	MS	F	P
Initiating Structure	Between group	4	47.60	11.90	0.34	N.S.
	Within group	285	9872.85	36.64		
TOTAL		289	9920.45			
Consideration	Between group	4	177.17	44.29	2.68	0.05
	Within group	285	4715.06	16.54		
TOTAL		289	4892.23			

HO_2: There is no difference between male and female college faculty's perceptions of an ideal college president.

TABLE XIII

MEAN SCORES FOR FIVE FACULTY AGE GROUPS

	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
Initiating Structure	1 (20-29)	16	41.94	5.96	1.49	33.00	54.00
	2 (30-39)	82	41.76	5.41	0.60	33.00	56.00
	3 (40-49)	98	42.74	5.46	0.55	28.00	55.00
	4 (50-59)	68	42.26	6.65	0.81	25.00	55.00
	5 (60-69)	26	41.96	6.65	1.30	30.00	53.00
	TOTAL	290	42.24	5.85	0.34	25.00	56.00
Consideration	1 (20-29)	16	37.87	4.60	1.15	28.00	44.00
	2 (30-39)	82	36.90	3.77	0.42	28.00	46.00
	3 (40-49)	98	38.32	4.27	0.43	29.00	52.00
	4 (50-59)	68	38.63	3.86	0.47	30.00	48.00
	5 (60-69)	26	39.27	4.36	0.85	31.00	51.00
	TOTAL	290	38.05	4.11	0.24	28.00	52.00

With 1 and 288 degrees of freedom for the two groups (N = 61 and 229), the obtained F values for initiating structure dimensions and consideration was 0.80 and 1.09, respectively. Considering p = .05, in each case the results indicated that the null hypothesis was not rejected, meaning the differences between the perceptions of the two groups were not significant either for initiating structure or for consideration. The results indicate that sex does not play an influential role in the perceptions of the four-year college faculty of an ideal college president. For such non-significant F values, neither Scheffe nor the Duncan test was needed. For the result of the analysis of variance and group mean scores for initiating structure and consideration, see Table XIV, which follows, and Table XV on page 64.

TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE FACULTY AND SEX DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Source		dF	SS	MS	F	P
Initiating Structure	Between group	1	27.59	27.59	0.80	N.S.
	Within group	288	9892.69	34.35		
TOTAL		289	9920.27			
Consideration	Between group	1	18.50	18.50	1.09	N.S.
	Within group	288	4873.70	16.92		
TOTAL		289	4892.20			

TABLE XV

MEAN SCORES FOR MALE AND FEMALE FACULTY

	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
Initiating Structure	1 female	61	42.84	6.38	0.82	25.00	56.00
	2 male	229	42.08	5.71	0.38	28.00	56.00
	TOTAL	290	42.24	5.86	0.34	25.00	56.00
Consider-ation	1 female	61	38.54	4.53	0.58	29.00	52.00
	2 male	229	37.92	4.00	0.26	28.00	51.00
	TOTAL	290	38.05	4.11	0.24	28.00	52.00

HO_3: There is no difference among the different faculty academic ranks in their perceptions of an ideal college president.

Concerning this null hypothesis with the degrees of freedom (4,285) for the five groups (N = 39, 79, 73, 88, and 11), the F value of F = 2.65 for initiating structure and F = 0.53 for consideration, the results were rather different, meaning that for initiating structure the F value of 2.65 was significant at the 0.05 level, while the F value of 0.53 for consideration was not significant at the 0.05 level. Thus, regarding initiating structure, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that different faculty rank is significant in perceptions concerning initiating structure dimensions.

The mean scores for 290 subjects in the five groups regarding initiating structure ranged from 25.00 to 56.00 compared to a 42.26 average value. The mean scores for consideration dimension ranged from 28.00 to 52.00 compared to a 38.05 average value. Table XVI, page 66, and Table XVII, page 67, show the data from the analysis of variance and mean scores for the third hypothesis.

HO_4: There is no difference between the tenured and non-tenured faculty's perception of an ideal college president.

This null hypothesis was not rejected since the F values (1,288) for initiating structure and consideration 0.36 and 2.86 are not significant at the 0.05 level. For such nonsignificant F values, the multiple range tests were unnecessary. The results indicate that tenure and non-tenure status do not play an influential role in the perception of an ideal college president. Information related to this analysis is shown in Table XVIII, page 68, and Table XIX, page 69.

TABLE XVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE FACULTY AND RANK DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Source		dF	SS	MS	F	P
Initiating Structure	Between groups	4	356.35	89.09	2.65	.05
	Within groups	285	9564.13	33.56		
TOTAL		289	9920.48			
Consider-ation	Between groups	4	36.45	9.11	0.53	N.S.
	Within groups	285	4855.77	17.04		
TOTAL		289	4892.23			

TABLE XVII

MEAN SCORES FOR FACULTY'S DIFFERENT SCORES

	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
Initiating Structure	1 instructor	39	43.72	5.95	0.95	34.00	56.00
	2 asst. prof.	79	41.82	5.43	0.61	29.00	56.00
	3 assoc. prof.	73	43.51	5.69	0.67	29.00	54.00
	4 professor	88	41.07	6.34	0.67	25.00	55.00
	5 other	11	40.91	2.98	0.90	36.00	44.00
	TOTAL	290	42.24	5.86	0.34	25.00	56.00
Consider-ation	1 instructor	39	38.18	4.81	0.77	28.00	52.00
	2 asst. prof.	79	37.77	3.95	0.44	28.00	48.00
	3 assoc. prof.	73	38.62	3.69	0.43	29.00	47.00
	4 professor	88	37.78	4.35	0.46	29.00	51.00
	5 other	11	38.00	3.69	1.11	31.00	44.00
	TOTAL	290	38.05	4.11	0.24	28.00	52.00

TABLE XVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE PERCEPTION OF TENURED AND NON-TENURED COLLEGE FACULTY

Source		dF	SS	MS	F	P
Initiating Structure	Between groups	1	12.57	12.57	0.36	N.S.
	Within groups	288	9907.69	34.40		
TOTAL		289	9920.26			
Consideration	Between groups	1	48.16	48.16	2.86	N.S.
	Within groups	288	4844.09	16.82		
TOTAL		289	4892.25			

HO_5: There is no difference between full-time and part-time faculty's perceptions of an ideal college president.

At 0.05, the F (2,287) = 1.32 and 0.49 for initiating structure and the consideration dimensions are not significant. Therefore, hypothesis No. 5 was not rejected, indicating that the mean differences among the groups were not significant. Obviously, with these results, no multiple range test was needed. The results indicate that faculty part-time and full-time status and their involvement either in teaching and research or administrative duties do not play a significant role in their perception of an ideal college president. The mean scores for 290 faculty members in the three different groups regarding initiating structure ranged from 25.00 to 56.00 compared to 42.24 average value. For the consideration

TABLE XIX

MEAN SCORES FOR FACULTY'S TENURED AND NON-TENURED STATUS

	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
Initiating Structure	1 tenured	168	42.06	6.20	0.48	25.00	55.00
	2 non-tenured	122	42.48	5.37	0.49	33.00	56.00
	TOTAL	290	42.24	5.86	0.34	25.00	56.00
Consideration	1 tenured	168	38.40	4.13	0.32	29.00	51.00
	2 non-tenured	122	37.57	4.06	0.37	28.00	52.00
	TOTAL	290	38.05	4.11	0.24	28.00	52.00

dimension, the mean scores ranged from 28.00 to 52.00 compared to 38.05 average value.

Table XX, which follows, and Table XXI, page 71, present the analysis of variance and scores related to hypothesis No. 5.

TABLE XX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE PERCEPTION OF PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME COLLEGE FACULTY

Source		dF	SS	MS	F	P
Initiating Structure	Between groups	2	90.35	45.18	1.32	N.S.
	Within groups	287	9829.98	34.25		
TOTAL		289	9920.33			
Consideration	Between groups	2	16.83	8.41	0.49	N.S.
	Within groups	287	4875.36	16.99		
TOTAL		289	4892.19			

HO_6: There is no difference between faculty educational levels and faculty perceptions of an ideal college president.

The analysis of variance indicated that F (5,284) = 1.68 and 2.05 for initiating structure and consideration, respectively, were not significant at the .05 level. The hypothesis was not rejected, indicating

TABLE XXI

MEAN SCORES FOR PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME FACULTY GROUP

	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
Initiating Structure	1 100% employed full-time teaching	209	42.22	6.09	0.42	25.00	56.00
	2 100% employed part-time teaching	58	42.95	5.71	0.75	30.00	56.00
	3 less than 100% employed part-time teaching	23	40.61	3.43	0.72	35.00	48.00
	TOTAL	290	42.24	5.86	0.34	25.00	56.00
Consideration	1 100% employed full-time teaching	209	38.20	4.08	0.28	28.00	51.00
	2 100% employed part-time teaching	58	37.64	3.98	0.52	30.00	46.00
	3 less than 100% employed part-time teaching	23	37.74	4.83	1.00	28.00	52.00
	TOTAL	290	38.05	4.11	0.24	28.00	52.00

that educational level plays no significant role in influencing the perceptions of college faculty toward the ideal college president. For the different groups, the range of mean scores was between 25.00 and 56.00, compared to 42.24, an average value for initiating structure, and between 28.00 and 52.00 compared to 38.28, an average value for consideration. These data are shown in Table XXII, which follows, and XXIII, page 73.

TABLE XXII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE FACULTY AND EDUCATIONAL LEVEL VARIABLES

Source		dF	SS	MS	F	P
Initiating Structure	Between groups	5	284.89	56.98	1.68	N.S.
	Within groups	284	9635.55	33.93		
TOTAL		289	9920.26			
Consideration	Between groups	5	170.83	34.17	2.05	N.S.
	Within groups	284	4721.40	16.62		
TOTAL		289	4892.23			

HO_7: There is no difference among the faculty who belong to three major departments (physical science, social science, humanities) in their perceptions of an ideal college president.

Since F values (2,287) = 1.53 and 0.89 for initiating structure and

TABLE XXIII

MEAN SCORES FOR FACULTY DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL LEVELS

	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
Initiating Structure	1 A.A	2	35.50	2.12	1.50	34.00	37.00
	2 B.S. or B.A.	7	42.57	6.60	2.50	35.00	56.00
	3 M.S., M.A., or M.B.A.	83	43.54	5.74	0.63	30.00	56.00
	4 Ed.S.	0					
	5 Ed.D.	38	41.89	5.66	0.92	28.00	54.00
	6 Ph.D	132	41.64	5.84	0.51	25.00	55.00
	7 Other	28	42.03	6.12	1.16	28.00	50.00
	TOTAL	290	42.24	5.86	0.34	25.00	56.00
Consideration	1 A.A.	2	36.00	1.41	1.00	35.00	37.00
	2 B.S. or B.A.	7	37.43	5.83	2.20	28.00	45.00
	3 M.S., M.A. or M.B.A.	83	38.91	4.67	0.51	28.00	52.00
	4 Ed.S.	0					
	5 Ed.D.	38	38.81	3.67	0.59	33.00	47.00
	6 Ph.D.	132	37.30	3.89	0.34	29.00	46.00
	7 Other	28	38.28	3.00	0.57	32.00	43.00
	TOTAL	290	38.05	4.11	0.24	28.00	52.00

consideration are not significant at the 0.05 level, this hypothesis was not rejected. This result suggests that belonging to different departments plays no significant role in influencing the perceptions of college faculty toward the ideal college president. The range of mean scores for initiating structure was between 25.00 and 56.00, compared to 42.24 average value. For consideration dimension, the mean scores ranged from 28.00 to 52.00, compared to 38.05 average value.

Table XXIV, which follows, and Table XXV, page 75, present the analysis of variance and mean scores for the 7th hypothesis.

TABLE XXIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE PERCEPTION FACULTY BELONGING TO THREE DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS

Source		dF	SS	MS	F	P
Initiating Structure	Between groups	2	105.00	52.50	1.53	N.S.
	Within groups	287	9815.48	34.20		
TOTAL		289	9920.48			
Consideration	Between groups	2	30.28	15.14	0.89	N.S.
	Within groups	287	4861.96	16.94		
TOTAL		289	4892.24			

HO_8: There is no difference between faculty salary levels and

TABLE XXV

MEAN SCORES FOR FACULTY BELONGING TO DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS

	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
Initiating Structure	1 Phys. Sci.	88	43.15	5.81	0.62	30.00	55.00
	2 Social Sci.	136	41.87	5.77	0.49	25.00	56.00
	3 Humanities	66	41.77	6.06	0.75	28.00	56.00
	TOTAL	290	42.24	5.86	0.34	25.00	56.00
Consider-ation	1 Phys. Sci.	88	37.79	4.14	0.44	28.00	51.00
	2 Social Sci.	136	37.93	3.98	0.34	29.00	48.00
	3 Humanities or M.B.A.	66	38.64	4.34	0.53	28.00	52.00
	TOTAL	290	38.05	4.11	0.24	28.00	52.00

faculty perceptions of an ideal college president.

The analysis of variance for this hypothesis resulted in F (4,285) = 1.60 and 1.30 for initiating structure and consideration, which are not significant at 0.05. Thus it was unnecessary to consider the multiple range test. With these non-significant F values, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It can therefore be concluded that faculty salary level does not play a significant role in the perceptions of college faculty toward the ideal college president. For the 290 subjects, values for the dimension of initiating structure ranged from 25.00 to 56.00, compared to a 42.24 average value. Values for the dimension of consideration ranged from 28.00 to 52.00 compared to a 38.05 average value. (See Table XXVI, which follows, and Table XXVII, page 77.)

TABLE XXVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE FACULTY AND SALARY DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Source		dF	SS	MS	F	P
Initiating Structure	Between groups	4	218.59	54.65	1.60	N.S.
	Within groups	285	9701.69	34.04		
TOTAL		289	9920.27			
Consideration	Between groups	4	87.52	21.88	1.30	N.S.
	Within groups	285	4804.73	16.86		
TOTAL		289	4892.25			

TABLE XXVII

MEAN SCORES FOR FACULTY AT DIFFERENT SALARY LEVELS

	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
Initiating Structure	1 $ 4,999 or less	7	39.86	4.30	1.62	34.00	44.00
	2 $ 5,000-$ 9,999	7	39.28	2.63	0.99	37.00	43.00
	3 $10,000-$14,999	16	42.06	4.88	1.22	36.00	56.00
	4 $15,000-$19,999	45	43.82	5.48	0.82	33.00	56.00
	5 $20,000 or above	215	42.09	6.06	0.41	25.00	55.00
	TOTAL	290	42.24	5.83	0.34	25.00	56.00
Consider-ation	1 $ 4,999 or less	7	38.14	7.42	2.81	28.00	52.00
	2 $ 5,000-$ 9,999	7	37.86	3.72	1.40	33.00	44.00
	3 $10,000-$14,999	16	35.87	3.79	0.95	31.00	45.00
	4 $15,000-$19,999	45	38.53	3.24	0.48	31.00	45.00
	5 $20,000 or above	216	38.12	4.17	0.28	28.00	51.00
	TOTAL	290	38.05	4.11	0.24	28.00	52.00

HO_9: There is no difference between the faculties from the different campuses in their perceptions of an ideal college president.

The values of F = 2.11 and 2.85 for initiating structure and consideration, respectively, were significant at the 0.05 level. Thus, the hypothesis number 9 was rejected, indicating a significant difference among the mean scores of the 12 groups for both dimensions. Yet, the Scheffe multiple range test indicated that no two groups for each dimension were significantly different at the 0.05 level. Due to these differences resulting from the ANOVA and Scheffe, the Duncan multiple range test, a more relaxed test, was used to locate the difference among the perceptions of 12 groups. The results of the Duncan test suggested that for initiating structure, the mean score of group 3, 47.70 and group 9, 47.30 were significantly different at $P < .05$ from the means of group 1, 41.46; group 2, 42.18; group 4, 41.08; group 7, 41.06, and group 8, 41.69. For consideration dimension, the results of the Duncan test indicated that the mean score of group 3, 40.40; group 9, 41.70; and group 10, 40.50 were significantly different at $P < .05$ from the mean of group 1, 37.34; group 4, 26.80; and group 7, 36.37. The range of mean scores for initiating structure was between 25.00 to 56.00 compared to 42.24 average value. For consideration dimension, mean scores ranged from 28.00 to 52.00 compared to 38.05 average value. These data are shown in Table XXVIII, page 79, and Table XXIX, page 80.

TABLE XXVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE FACULTY ON DIFFERENT CAMPUSES

Source		dF	SS	MS	F	P
Initiating Structure	Between groups	11	763.59	69.42	2.11	.05
	Within groups	278	9156.88	32.94		
TOTAL		289	9920.46			
Consideration	Between groups	11	495.64	45.06	2.85	.05
	Within groups	278	4396.63	15.81		
TOTAL		289	4892.28			

TABLE XXIX

MEAN SCORES FOR FACULTY BELONGING TO 12 DIFFERENT CAMPUSES

	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
Initiating Structure	1 O.S.U.	80	41.46	6.13	0.69	28.00	54.00
	2 Central State University	28	42.18	4.57	0.86	33.00	49.00
	3 Langston University	10	47.70	4.76	1.50	39.00	55.00
	4 University of Oklahoma	59	41.08	6.48	0.84	28.00	55.00
	5 East Central University	18	43.61	4.88	1.15	37.00	53.00
	6 U. of Sci. & Arts of Okla.	8	43.25	5.31	1.88	38.00	52.00
	7 Southwestern State Univ.	16	41.06	6.02	1.50	25.00	50.00
	8 Cameron University	16	41.69	6.44	1.60	30.00	56.00
	9 Panhandle State Univ.	10	47.30	4.32	1.37	41.00	54.00
	10 Northwestern Okla. State U.	10	42.30	5.85	1.85	36.00	56.00
	11 Southeastern Okla. State U.	12	42.58	4.29	1.24	33.00	47.00
	12 Northeastern Okla. State U.	23	42.96	4.92	1.03	33.00	52.00
	TOTAL	290	42.24	5.86	0.34	25.00	56.00
Consider-ation	1 Subjects at O.S.U.	80	37.34	4.08	0.46	28.00	46.00
	2 Subjects at Central State	28	38.75	3.88	0.73	33.00	49.00
	3 Subjects at Langson U.	10	40.40	3.02	0.96	36.00	45.00
	4 Subjects at U. of Okla.	59	36.80	4.07	0.53	29.00	47.00
	5 Subjects at East Central U.	18	38.22	2.65	0.62	33.00	42.00
	6 Subjects at U. of A&S	8	38.50	4.50	1.59	31.00	46.00
	7 Subjects at Southwestern U.	16	36.37	4.60	1.15	28.00	44.00
	8 Subjects at Cameron Univ.	16	39.31	4.06	1.01	29.00	46.00
	9 Subjects at Panhandle State	10	41.70	3.77	1.19	37.00	51.00
	10 Subjects at Northwestern U.	10	40.50	5.13	1.62	35.00	52.00
	11 Subjects at Southeastern U.	12	39.42	3.99	1.15	31.00	44.00
	12 Subjects at Northeastern U.	23	38.52	3.49	0.73	32.00	45.00
	TOTAL	290	38.05	4.11	0.24	28.00	52.00

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The previous chapter reported the statistical findings related to the research questions, the major hypotheses, and demographic information. The present chapter will include a summary of the study, conclusions based on the findings, implications deduced from the findings, and the recommendations for further research.

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine faculty members' perceptions of what constitutes the ideal president of a publicly supported senior institution in the State of Oklahoma. The main question dealt with college faculty perceptions of whether the president should be task-oriented or person-oriented. In this regard, two dimensions of the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (ILBDQ) were utilized. The sample was comprised of 290 faculty members of 12 senior institutions in the State of Oklahoma during the spring semester of 1982.

The research instrument used in this study was the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (ILBDQ). In addition, several demographic questions concerning certain information were asked.

This investigation was designed to answer the following research questions and to test the following null hypotheses at the 0.05 level:

1. What proportion of the faculty desires an administrator who is high in initiating structure?

2. What proportion of the faculty desires an administrator who is high in consideration?

3. What proportion of the faculty desires an administrator who possesses both characteristics in relatively equal proportions?

4. Are there any demographic characteristics that are related to faculty perceptions of an ideal college president?

Second, related to question number four, nine null hypotheses were developed and tested at the 0.05 level:

1. There is no difference between college faculty members' age and perceptions of an ideal college president.

2. There is no difference between male and female college faculty's perceptions of an ideal college president.

3. There is no difference among the different faculty members' academic rank in the perceptions of an ideal college president.

4. There is no difference between the tenured and non-tenured faculty members' perceptions of an ideal college president.

5. There is no difference between full-time and part-time faculty members' perceptions of an ideal college president.

6. There is no difference between faculty members' educational level and their perceptions of an ideal college president.

7. There is no difference among the faculty who belong to three major departments (physical science, social science, humanities) in their perceptions of an ideal college president.

8. There is no difference between faculty members' salary level and their perceptions of an ideal college president.

9. There is no difference among the faculties from the different campuses in their perceptions of an ideal college president.

The statistical techniques chosen for testing the research hypotheses were the single classification, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), Scheffe multiple range test, and the Duncan multiple range test. The F values provided the basis for explaining whether or not the differences between and among demographic variables and perceptions of various groups of participants were significant at the .05 level of significance. Also, the opinions of faculty groups regarding certain ILBDQ dimensions were analyzed by proportions of responses expressed as percentages.

Faculty members in the 12 senior institutions in the State of Oklahoma can be characterized as male, tenured, well-educated (a majority of subjects hold a doctorate degree); they had an average age of 45.5. The majority of the subjects belonged to social science departments; most hold the academic rank of professor; most were 100% employed and involved in full-time teaching and research; and the salary of the majority of the faculty for the nine months was $20,000 or above.

Concerning research questions 1, 2, and 3, the answers indicated that 226 (77.9%) of the population with the mean of 43.25 desired the administrator who was higher in initiating structure than consideration. Fifty-one (17.6%) of the population with the mean of 39.75 desired an administrator who was higher in the consideration dimension than the initiating structure dimension, and 13 (4.5%) of the population with the mean of 40.62 desired an administrator who possessed both characteristics equally.

Relating to question number 4 and its nine null hypotheses, the following was found:

1. Concerning the initiating structure dimension and age variable, there was not a significant difference among faculty of different age groups and their perceptions of an ideal college president, $F\ (4,285) = 0.34$, $P > .05$.

Concerning the consideration dimension and age variable, there was a significant difference between faculty different age groups and their perceptions of an ideal college president $F\ (4,285) = 2.68$, $P < .05$.

2. There was not a significant difference between male and female college faculty's perceptions of an ideal college president. For the initiating structure dimension, $F\ (1,288) = 0.80$, $P > .05$. For the consideration dimension, $F\ (1,288) = 1.09$, $P > .05$.

3. Concerning the initiating structure dimension and professional rank variable, there was a significant difference among faculty of different academic rank and their perceptions of an ideal college president, $F\ (4,285) = 2.65$, $P < .05$. In considering the consideration dimension and rank variable, there was not a significant difference among faculty of different academic ranks and their perceptions of an ideal college president. $F\ (4,285) = 0.53$, $P > .05$.

4. There was not a significant difference between the tenured and non-tenured faculty perceptions of an ideal college president. For the initiating structure dimension, $F\ (1,288) = 0.36$, $P > .05$. For the consideration dimension, $F\ (1,288) = 2.86$, $P > .05$.

5. There was not a significant difference between full-time and part-time faculty perceptions of an ideal college president. For the initiating structure, $F\ (2,87) = 1.32$, $P > .05$. For the consideration

dimension, $F\ (2,287) = 0.49$, $P > .05$.

6. There was not a significant difference among faculty educational levels and faculty perceptions of an ideal college president. For the initiating structure dimension, $F\ (5,284) = 1.68$, $P > .05$. For the consideration dimension, $F\ (5,284) = 2.05$, $P > .05$.

7. There was not a significant difference among the faculty who belong to three major departments (physical science, social science, humanities) in their perceptions of an ideal college president. For the initiating structure dimension, $F\ (2,287) = 1.53$, $P > .05$. For the consideration dimension, $F\ (2,287) = 0.89$, $P > .05$.

8. There was not a significant difference among faculty salary levels and faculty perceptions of an ideal college president. For the initiating structure dimension, $F\ (4,285) = 1.60$, $P > .05$. For the consideration dimension, $F\ (4,285) = 1.30$, $P > .05$.

9. There was a significant difference among the faculties from the different campuses in their perceptions of an ideal college president. For the initiating structure dimension, $F\ (11,278) = 2.10$, $P < .05$. For the consideration dimension, $F\ (11,278) = 2.85$, $P < .05$.

Implications and Recommendations

The major finding of the study indicates that faculty perceive an ideal president as more of a task-oriented individual, rather than as a person-oriented one. The initiating structure dimension plays a highly influential role in the perceptions of faculty of an ideal college president. It is apparent the faculty members in the 12 senior institutions in the State of Oklahoma are in favor of a president who is capable of establishing rules and regulations, determins the relationship

between himself and faculty members, and establishes a well-defined pattern of organization toward goal attainment. He is one who is capable of enforcing working procedures and maintaining good channels of communication.

As was mentioned earlier, faculty perception was measured by dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. With respect to the initiating structure dimension, the faculty members' perceptions of an ideal college president's leadership style are not significantly influenced by the following demographic characteristics: age, sex, tenured or non-tenured status, educational level, different departments (physical, social, humanities), full-time or part-time status, or salary level. In contrast, the perception of the faculty in the 12 senior institutions in the State of Oklahoma are influenced by academic rank and different campuses.

Considering the consideration dimension, perceptions of faculty in the 12 senior institutions in the State of Oklahoma are not significantly influenced by sex, academic rank, tenured or non-tenured status, part-time or full-time status, educational level, different departments (physical science, social science, humanities), or salary level. In contrast, perceptions of the faculty in the 12 senior institutions in the State of Oklahoma are influenced by age and different campuses.

Apparently only a few demographic characteristics are related to the perceptions of faculty of the ideal college president in the 12 institutions in the State of Oklahoma.

Participating faculty members did not emphasize the consideration dimension of leadership behavior in their perceptions of an ideal college president. One wonders, in view of these findings, if faculty

members are desirous of participative governance as some would have us to believe.

The results of the study indicated that faculty of the 12 institutions in the State of Oklahoma prefer a college president who is highly characterized by the initiating structure dimension of leadership behavior. Such a president will gain the support and consequent cooperation of the faculty through the encouragement of work efficiency and enforcement of policies and other measures identified as being consistent with such leadership behavior. Understanding the practical aspects of the initiating structure dimension of human behavior by presidents at the above institutions, and utilization of such leaderhsip behavior could enhance the management of these institutions.

Finally, it is suggested that the findings of this study might be of interest to governing boards in their searches for new presidents.

Recommendations for Future Research

In light of the findings of this study, recommendations for future investigations are as follows:

1. A replication of the present study employing a sample of graduate and undergraduate students would be useful.

2. A replication of the study employing a sample of university non-academic administrators would be beneficial.

3. Studies of this type should be extended to other higher educational institutions, such as doctoral degree granting institutions, comprehensive universities, two-year colleges, and private colleges in other geographical areas.

4. A similar study might be done on the national level.

5. A replication of the present study using a different leadership measurement instrument might serve to add to the findings.

6. Data application of the study could be helpful in the teaching of higher education administration and organizational theory courses.

7. With the controversial issue of collective bargaining, a replication of the study employing a sample of unionized faculty could be interesting.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: Faculty Participation in Academic Governance (1967).

Baldridge, Victor, Frank Kemerer, and Associates. Assessing the Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining. American Association for Higher Education Research Report No. 8 (1981).

Barnard, Chester I. The Function of the Executive. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press (1938).

Bennis, W. E. "The University Leader." Saturday Review, Vol. 55 (Dec. 1972), pp. 42-50.

Birmingham, Joseph C., and David T. Borland. "Collective Bargaining in the Future: A Study of Administrator Attitude." Community College Research Quarterly, Vol. 4 (1980), pp. 169-182.

Blackburn, Robert T. Research on Governing Boards and Some Problem Solving Tactics and Strategies Involving a Professor as a Trustee. Ann Arbor, Michigan: School of Education, University of Michigan (1977).

Bolman, Frederick Dew. How Presidents are Chosen. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education (19655).

Bowen, Howard R. and Gordon K. Douglass. Efficiency in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. (1971).

Bowers, David G., and Seashore, Stanley E. "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four-factor Theory of Leadership." Administrative Science Quarterly (1966), pp. 238-236.

Brown, Ronald M. "The Dissent Voting Patterns at Selected Public University Governing Boards." Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor (1971).

Bunzel, John A. "Answers From a Presidential Candidate." Educational Record, Vol. 51 (Winter, 1971), pp. 12-16.

Carbone, Robert F. "What Professors Ought to Know About Presidents." Academe, Vol. 68 (Jan. - Feb., 1982), pp. 19-21.

Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. (1960).

Coughlin, Eilen K. "Pressure Intensifies for College Presidents." Chronicle of Higher Education (1976), pp. 1-6.

Davis, Keith. Human Behavior at Work. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. (1960).

Dodds, Harold W. The Academic President - Educator or Caretaker? New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. (1962).

Doi, J. I. "Organization, Administration, Finance, Facilities." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 35 (October, 1965), p. 157.

Donnelly, James H. Jr., James L. Gibson, and John H. Ivancevich. Fundamentals of Management. Austin, Texas: Business Publications, Inc. (1971).

Eaton, Judith S. "Society 200: Presidents and Prophecy." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 52 (September, 1981), pp. 6-10.

Fiedler, Fred E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. (1967).

Fiedler, F. A., and M. M. Chemers. Leadership and Effective Management. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Comapny (1974).

Filley, Alan C., and Robert J. House. Managerial Process and Organization Behavior. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co. (1969).

Fleishman, Edwin A., and David R. Peters. "Interpersonal Values, Leadership Attitudes, and Managerial Success." Personnel Psychology, Vol. 15 (1962), pp. 127-143.

Foutlick, Jerrold K. "All the President's Woes." Newsweek, Vol. 87 (May, 1976), pp. 74-75.

Gay, L. R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Publishing Company (1976).

Gibb, Cecil A. "Leadership." In Gardner Lindzey (ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, Mass.: Addision-Wesley Publishing (1954).

Gibb, C. A. "Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire." In O. K. Buros (ed.) The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook (7th ed.). Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press (1972).

Good, Carter V. Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. (1959).

Gouldner, Alvin W. Studies in Leadership. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publisher (1950).

Guilford, J. P., and Benjamin Fruchter. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. (1973).

Halpin, Andrew W. "The Leadership Behavior and Combat Performance of Airplane Commanders." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. LXIX (January, 1954), pp. 19-22.

Halpin, A. W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University College of Education (1956).

Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: Macmillan (1966).

Halpin, Andrew W., and B. J. Winer. The Leadership Behavior of the Airplane Commander. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, Technical Report III prepared for Human Reseources Research Laboratory, Dept. of the Air Force (1952).

Hemphill, John K., and Alvin E. Coons, "Development of the Leader Behavior Questionnaire." In (Stogdill and Coons, eds.) Leader Behavior - Its Description and Measurement. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88 (1957).

Henderson, Algo D. Policies and Practices in Higher Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers (1960).

Hersey, Paul, and Kenneth H. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior. (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall (1972).

Hillway, Tyrus. "Evaluating College and University Administration." Intellect, Vol. 101 (1973), p. 462.

Hoy, Wayne K., and Cecil G. Miskel. Educational Administration, Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: Random House, Inc. (1978).

Ivancevich, John M., Andrew D. Szilagyi, and Marce J. Wallace. Organizational Behavior and Performance. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc. (1977).

Jenks, Christopher, and David Riesman. The Academic Revolution. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1977).

Katt, Donald C. "A Study of the Leader Behavior of the College and University President of the Four-year Units of the State University of New York as Perceived by Members of the Local College Council, Administrative Staff, Faculty and Student Body." Unpublished dissertation, State University of New York at Albany (1973).

Kaufman, Joseph F. At the Pleasure of the Board. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education (1980).

Kaufman, Joseph F. "The College Presidency: Yesterday and Today." Change, Vol. 14 (May-June, 1982), pp. 12-19.

Kerlinger, Fredrick N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. (1964).

Kerr, Clark. "Shall we Overcome?" AGB Reports, Vol. 23 (Jan. - Feb., 1981), pp. 9-17.

Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. New York: Harper and Row (1963).

Knapp, Robert H. "Changing Functions of the College Professor." The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1962).

Norman, Abraham K. "Consideration, Initiating Structure, and Organizational Criteria - A Review." Personnel Psychology (1966, pp. 349-361.

La Piere, Richard. Collective Behavior. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc. (1977).

Lipham, J. M. "Leadership and Administration." In D. Griffiths (ed.) Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Part II. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1964), pp. 119-141.

Luthans, Fred. Organizational Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. (1977).

Macfaden, Arthur R. "Faculty Reference of Leadership Behavior Characteristics of a Potential President of Public Community Colleges or Technical Institutes in Tennessee." Unpublished dissertation, The University of Tennessee (1974).

Mayhew, Lewis B. "Emerging Concept of the Presidency." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 42 (1971), pp. 355-367.

Merton, Robert K. "The Social Nature of Leadership." American Journal of Nursing, Vol. LXIS (1969), pp. 2614-2618.

Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: McKay (1970).

Paxton, Dan R., and Darwin L. Thomas. "College Presidents' Role Performance and Faculty Satisfaction." Research in Higher Education, Vol. 7 (1977), pp. 341-353.

Prator, Ralph. The College President. Washington D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, inc. (1963).

Prichard, Keith W., Thomas H. Buxton, and Ellen Sinter. "The Problems of College and University Presidents." School and Society (Feb. 1972), pp. 101-106.

Richards, Max D., and Paul S. Greenlaw. Management Decision Making. Homewood, N. J.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. (1966).

Richman, Barry M., and Richard N. Farmer. Leadership Goals and Power in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass (1974).

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Vintage Books (1962).

Schmidt, George P. The Old-time College President. New York: Columbia University Press (1930).

Scott, Thomas R. "The Role of the Illinois Public Community College President and Recent Changes Perceived by the President, the Board Member, the Administration, the Faculty, and the Student." Unpublished dissertation, Northern Illinois University (1975).

Selznick, Philip. Leadership Administration. New York: Harper and Row (1957).

Stogdill, Ralph M. "Personal Factors Associated With Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." The Journal of Psychology, Vol. 25 (1948), pp. 35-71.

Stoke, Harold, V. The American College President. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers (1959).

Thiwing, Charles F. College Administration. New York: The Century Company (1900).

Toulyati, Monsour. "The Leadership Behavior of the Academic Department Chairman: Expectations and Perceptions of Deans, Chairmen, Faculty Members, and Students at Selected Institutions of Higher Learning." Unpublished dissertation, Oklahoma State University (1981).

Verbeke, Maurice G. "The Junior College Academic Dean's Leadership Behavior as Viewed by Superiors and Faculty" Unpublished dissertation, Pennsylvania State University (1966).

Walberg, Herbert J. "The American President: Colleague, Administrator, or Spokesman?" Educational Record, Vol. 50 (Spring 1969), pp. 194-199.

White, Kinnard. "Personality Characteristics of Educational Leaders: A Comparison of Administrators and Researchers." School Review, Vol. LXXIII (1965), pp. 292-300.

Wofford, J. C. "Managerial Behavior, Situational Factors, and Productivity and Morale." Administrative Science Quarterly (1971). pp. 10-17.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER FOR THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

Dear Colleague:

The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation in securing data for a research study concerning the role of the college president. This study is in partial fulfillment of the requirements for my doctoral degree at Oklahoma State University. My adviser is Dr. Robert B. Kamm, University Professor and past President of OSU.

The questionnaire is organized for quick completion, and will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Enclosed is a self-addressed stamped envelope for your use in returning the completed form. Your responses will, of course, be treated with professional confidentiality.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and assistance. I am most grateful.

Sincerely

Maryam Ghaemmaghami

I have visited with Maryam relative to this project, and urge your support and assistance.

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW UP LETTER FOR THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Oklahoma State University

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Dear Colleague:

Recently a copy of the enclosed questionnaire was sent to you together with a request for your help in a research study concerning the role of the college president.

I have not heard from you, and since the possibility exists that your response may have been lost in the mail, or mislaid, I have enclosed another for you. About 15 minutes are necessary to complete the questionnaire. Enclosed also is a self-addressed stamped envelope for your use in returning the completed form. Your response will, of course, be treated with professional confidentiality.

Thank you again for your assistance and cooperation. I am most grateful.

Sincerely,

Maryam Ghaemmaghami

Enc.

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO COLLEGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE SUPPORT SERVICES, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY TO OBTAIN PERMISSION TO USE THE INSTRUMENT

Dear Sir,

I am a doctoral student working on my Ed.D. at Oklahoma State University. My dissertation topic concerns presidential leadership. Two dimensions in the leadership study are task orientation and consideration. After a survey of available instruments, I have found the ILBDQ provides the best measure of task orientation and initiating structure. Since I am intending to use ILBDQ as my research instrument, I would like to obtain permission to use this instrument. I greatly appreciate your help in this study.

Sincerely,

Sedigheh Maryam Ghaemmaghami

APPENDIX D

LETTER OF RESPONSE FROM THE COLLEGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE SUPPORT SERVICES, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, CONCERNING STATEMENT OF POLICY

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Concerning the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and Related Forms

Permission is granted without formal request to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and other related forms developed at The Ohio State University, subject to the following conditions:

1. Use: The forms may be used in research projects. They may not be used for promotional activities or for producing income on behalf of individuals or organizations other than The Ohio State University.

2. Adaptation and Revision: The directions and the form of the items may be adapted to specific situations when such steps are considered desirable.

3. Duplication: Sufficient copies for a specific research project may be duplicated.

4. Inclusion in dissertations: Copies of the questionnaire may be included in theses and dissertations. Permission is granted for the duplication of such dissertations when filed with the University Microfilms Service at Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 U.S.A.

5. Copyright: In granting permission to modify or duplicate the questionnaire, we do not surrender our copyright. Duplicated questionnaires and all adaptations should contain the notation "Copyright, 19--, by The Ohio State University."

6. Inquiries: Communications should be addressed to:

College of Admin Science
Support Services
The Ohio State University
1775 College Road
Columbus, OH 43210 U.S.A.

1979

APPENDIX E

THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT

IDEAL LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Published by: College of Administration Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Directions:

a) Read each item carefully.

b) Think about how frequently the leader (President of University) should engage in the behavior described by the item.

c) Decide whether the "College President" should always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never act as described by the item.

d) Draw a circle around one of the five letters: (A) = always, (B) = often, (C) = occasionally, (D) seldom, (E) = never - to indicate your appropriate opinion.

What the IDEAL College President SHOULD do:	Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
1. Do personal favors for faculty members	A	B	C	D	E
2. Make his/her attitudes clear to the faculty members	A	B	C	D	E
3. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the faculty group	A	B	C	D	E
4. Try out his/her new ideas with the faculty members	A	B	C	D	E
5. Act as the real leader of the faculty members	A	B	C	D	E
6. Be easy to understand	A	B	C	D	E
7. Rule with an iron hand	A	B	C	D	E
8. Find time to listen to faculty members	A	B	C	D	E
9. Criticize poor work	A	B	C	D	E
10. Give advance notice of changes	A	B	C	D	E

		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
What the IDEAL College President SHOULD do:						
11.	Speak in a manner not to be questioned	A	B	C	D	E
12.	Keep to himself/herself	A	B	C	D	E
13.	Look out for the personal welfare of individual faculty members	A	B	C	D	E
14.	Assign faculty members to particular tasks	A	B	C	D	E
15.	Be the spokesman of the faculty members	A	B	C	D	E
16.	Schedule the work to be done	A	B	C	D	E
17.	Maintain definite standards of performance	A	B	C	D	E
18.	Refuse to explain his/her actions	A	B	C	D	E
19.	Keep the faculty members informed	A	B	C	D	E
20.	Act without consulting the faculty members	A	B	C	D	E
21.	Back up the faculty members in their actions	A	B	C	D	E
22.	Emphasize the meeting of deadlines	A	B	C	D	E
23.	Treat all faculty members as his/her equals	A	B	C	D	E
24.	Encourage the use of uniform procedures	A	B	C	D	E
25.	Get what he/she asks for from his/her superiors	A	B	C	D	E
26.	Be willing to make changes	A	B	C	D	E
27.	Make sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by faculty members	A	B	C	D	E
28.	Be friendly and approachable	A	B	C	D	E
29.	Ask that faculty members follow standard rules and regulations	A	B	C	D	E
30.	Fail to take necessary action	A	B	C	D	E
31.	Make faculty members feel at ease when talking to them	A	B	C	D	E
32.	Let faculty members know what is expected of them	A	B	C	D	E
33.	Speak as the representative of the faculty	A	B	C	D	E
34.	Put suggestions made by the faculty members into operation	A	B	C	D	E

		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
What the IDEAL College President SHOULD do:						
35.	See to it that faculty members are working up to capacity	A	B	C	D	E
36.	Let other people take away his/her leadership in the faculty	A	B	C	D	E
37.	Get his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the faculty members	A	B	C	D	E
38.	Get faculty approval in important matters before going ahead	A	B	C	D	E
39.	See to it that the work of faculty members is coordinated	A	B	C	D	E
40.	Keep the faculty members working together as a team	a	b	c	d	e

DEMOGRAPHIC, PROFESSIONAL, AND PERSONAL INFORMATION. (Please check (✓) appropriate item.)

41. You are: ( ) Female ( ) Male

42. Your age is:

( ) 20 - 29 ( ) 30 - 39

( ) 40 - 49 ( ) 50 - 59

( ) 60 - 69 ( ) 70

43. Your professional rank:

( ) Instructor ( ) Asst. Professor

( ) Assoc. Professor ( ) Professor

( ) Other

44. Do you have tenure?

( ) Yes ( ) No

45. You are: (Teaching should include all teaching related activities but non-administrative duties - e.g., student advisement, academic (counseling, supervision of interns)

( ) 100% employed/full-time teaching

( ) 100% employed/part-time administration and part-time teaching

( ) less than 100% employed/part time teaching

46. Your highest earned degree is:

( ) A.A. ( ) B.S. or B.A.

( ) M.S., M.A. or M.B.A. ( ) Ed.S.

( ) Ed.D. ( ) Ph.D.

( ) Other

47. You are a member of:

( ) Physical Science department

( ) Social Science department

( ) Humanities department

48. Your salary level for nine months is:

( ) $ 4,999 or less ( ) $ 5,000-$ 9,999

( ) $10,000-$14,999 ( ) $15,000-$19,999

( ) $20,000 or above

Thank you for your participation. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to

Maryam Ghaemmaghami
140 North Duck, Apt. 53
Stillwater, Ok. 74074

VITA

Sedigheh Ghaemmaghami

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF AN IDEAL COLLEGE PRESIDENT IN OKLAHOMA'S PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tehran, Iran, March 5, 1950, the daughter of Mohamad Reza Ghaemmaghami and Shomeiseh Dabirnia, married, no children.

Education: Graduated from Safinia High School, Tehran, Iran, June 1969; received Bachelor of Philosopy degree from department of literature and humanities, National University of Iran, June 1974; received the Master of Science degree in Sudent Personnel and Guidance at Oklahoma State University, July 1979; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1984.